

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**  
**Project of the Southern African Development Commission, SADC**

**MID TERM EVALUATION REPORT**  
**23 APRIL TO 5 MAY 2001**

**Project Number:** RAF/97/032/A/01/12

**Title:** The Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in the SADC Region.

**Duration:** 3 years

**Project site:** 13 SADC countries; based in Pretoria, South Africa

**ACC/UNDP sector and sub-sector:** 063 – Livestock and Livestock Products

**Government implementing agency:** Various

**Primary Target Beneficiaries:** Members of SADC Region

**Executing agency:** Food and Agriculture Organisation, FAO

**Starting date:** 4 May 1999

**UNDP inputs:** US \$2.262 million (AOS not included)

**Government inputs:** (in kind)

---

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

A mid term evaluation of Project RAF/97/032, Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in the SADC Countries, was conducted by a Mission of three persons visiting six National Focal Points (NFP) in the region. During fourteen days of the evaluation staff at the Regional Focal Point (RFP), National Coordinators (NC), National Advisory Committee (NAC) members, stakeholders, UNDP/FAO officers, farmers, SADC, SACCAR and others affiliated with the project or other biodiversity programs were interviewed. The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), Dr. Louise Setshwaelo and her staff arranged interviews and coordinated the itineraries of the Mission's visitations. The Project is well documented and the Mission was supplied with ample background information as well as current reports on program work plan activities and achievements.

The Mission was composed of Professor Hugh Blair, Massey University, New Zealand, Dr. James Banda, Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi, and Mr. Robert McColaugh. Dr. Blair interviewed persons in the Republic of South Africa and Malawi; Dr. Banda met with Project participants in Lesotho and Swaziland; Mr. McColaugh visited Botswana and Zimbabwe and was accompanied by the CTA. The full Mission met with key agencies and officials in South Africa concerning the operations and management of the RFP. The FAnGR project is in year two of a three-year life-of-project, currently the project is slated to terminate in May of 2002.

The Mission was impressed with the networking structures, communications, international linkages and work plan achievements made by the RFP as well as with those of the six NFPs visited. Documentation provides evidence that other NFPs and their national networks are also operational and producing similar results. Of particular note was the enthusiasm shown by the national organizations and the sense of ownership shown by the various stakeholders in this Project. This was a common theme noted in all locations visited by the Mission. The strategy used by the Project in terms of developing the various levels of network structures, the training given thus far and the communication systems provided to the networks is laudatory. The implementation of the strategy fell largely to the CTA who is to be commended on the achievements made in such a short period of time. The Mission questions a three-year life of project for full completion of the current Immediate Objectives and corresponding activities. A major recommendation is to extend the current program through to December of 2002, there appears to be sufficient funding in the current budget for a no-cost extension.

### ***Suggestion 1***

***That the current program be extended through to December of 2002.***

Project activities thus far have developed an excellent framework for future work plan activities. The National Actions, funded through the program, appear to be successful and are filling critical needs at a country level as well as supporting the Goals of FAnGR. The Mission feels in the best of worlds the National Actions should have evolved from National Plans, however that was not possible because the basic data from which the Plans will be derived is only now being collected. The strategy to move NFPs and their various stakeholders into these collaborative activities has done much to solidify FAnGR both regionally and nationally. It is important to realize that many of these outputs are already being used and are in high demand.

The next major challenge after the Breed Surveys are completed and the National Plans developed will be moving project activities to community levels. The Mission recommends that for clarity and better understanding that several of the activities of the current Immediate Objectives be rearranged and a Phase II project proposal developed. The sunk costs made thus far clearly call for an extended program in order to reach the original FAnGR Goals and to accelerate SADC's program

of food security and conservation of genetic resources. The Mission was unanimous in its findings and recommends that the phase II should be community-based and that resource allocations must be provided to capitalise on the investments made to date. FAO is encouraged to move into project design for Phase II now (including notification of this intention to UNDP) as well as extending the current life of project. Suggestions on scope and focus are included in all sections of the text.

Three major and two minor recommendations were identified by the Mission together with their required actions and agencies responsible for execution. Suggested timeframes for initiation and implementation have also been included relative to the remaining twelve to eighteen months of the project. Apparent duplications in the suggested actions are the result of the same suggestion appearing in more than one section of the text (page numbers are provided for text reference).

### ***Suggestion 2***

***That for clarity and better understanding, several of the activities of the current Immediate Objectives be rearranged and a Phase II project proposal developed and this intent notified to UNDP.***

The most significant problem encountered during the evaluation was the lack of professional assistance originally agreed to by the Republic of South Africa. The program and the RFP activities have been seriously hampered because the Regional Programme Coordinator (RPC) position has not been filled. The Mission was not afforded the opportunity to meet with the South African Director General of the Department of Agriculture on this issue, so our opinion is only that, and not a decision made through a face-to-face interview. The Mission recommends that if the position is not filled by June 2001, and the RFP moved under the auspice of the South African Agricultural Research Council, then the Project should secure an additional professional to assist the CTA. During the development of a phase II proposal if there is no movement on the part of South Africa to meet its obligations then serious consideration should be given to moving the RFP to another SADC location. This is clearly not the best option, however the two-year hiatus of this issue has put the rest of the collaborating national programs at risk and the realization of a regional coordination centre located in South Africa out of the question. The Mission is appreciative of the assistance given to RFP by the National Department of Agriculture in terms of office space and support, however the sustainability of the project is still at risk and without a firm commitment and placement of a RPC, other options must be pursued.

### ***Suggestion 3***

***That if the RPC position is not filled during June 2001, and the RFP moved under the auspices of the South African Agricultural Research Council, then the Project should secure an additional professional to assist the CTA.***

### ***Suggestion 4***

***That if during the development of a phase II proposal there is no movement on the part of South Africa to meet its obligations then serious consideration should be given to moving the RFP to another SADC location.***

The Mission wishes to remind the reader that properly managed livestock, especially native small stock, presents one of the few opportunities for poverty mitigation available to the rural poor. This project seeks to assure that this valuable indigenous genetic resource remains available to the large and increasing number of disenfranchised communities in Southern Africa. Further, the growing pandemic of HIV/AIDS has seriously affected available labour normally required for intensive subsistence food crop farming. This project offers a partial, but sustainable solution to this problem

with the potential to alleviate hunger and improve the lives of those most at risk. Currently the decentralized mechanisms now in place and being assisted by RFP efforts are delivering projects and products that allow communities to effectively manage their own resources. This fact must not be overlooked; this project is not just about conservation and utilization of Africa's most valuable indigenous genetic resources, it is also about saving human lives.

In conclusion, the Mission congratulates the donors, the staff of RFP and the national programs associated with the project and encourages the development of a Phase II with a special focus on community-based programs that have the potential to enhance the food security and livelihoods of the rural poor in Southern Africa. We urge both FAO and UNDP to continue this effort; few SADC regional programs have exhibited the successes achieved in only 24 months.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following major and minor recommendations are based upon the Mission's findings and their corrective actions listed throughout the text. The supporting evidence for each suggestion is contained at the relevant page as indicated below. A timeline has been provided for action initiation together with the identification of the responsible agent. Recommendations are prioritised in terms of their urgency as are the corresponding suggestions; all actions are relative to the remaining 12 months or up to 18 months if a no-cost extension is granted.

### ***Major Recommendation One***

#### ***Immediate action by Dept. Agric. RSA/FAO***

That the Department of Agriculture, Republic of South Africa be given until the end of June 2001 to appoint a Regional Programme Coordinator to the FAnGR Project. If this deadline is not met, other options must be considered for appointing a professional to work with the Chief Technical Advisor.

#### **Required actions**

##### ***Suggestion 13 (page 18)***

***Short-term***

***Consider movement of the RFP to the Agricultural Research Council if the RSA can assure immediate staffing arrangements and funding to continue networking activities after Project closure.***

##### ***Suggestion 3 (page 3)***

***Short-term***

***That if the RPC position is not filled during June 2001, and the RFP moved under the auspices of the South African Agricultural Research Council, then the Project should secure an additional professional to assist the CTA.***

##### ***Suggestion 22 (page 23)***

***Short-/long-term***

***The Mission suggests one of the following three options (which are listed in preferred order) be used to solve this issue:***

- The South African Government should be given a final chance to appoint an RPC, possibly from the Agricultural Research Council, to assist in running the SADC-FAnGR Project. A deadline through June 2001 should be given for this RPC to be in place before a second option is taken.***
- Employ an expert as a trainee to understudy the CTA during the current phase of the Project. The Department of Agriculture should be requested to host the RPC, for the remainder of the current phase, along with the CTA.***
- If the Republic of South Africa does not appoint an RPC, then the RFP should be relocated to another SADC country in phase II.***

##### ***Suggestion 4 (page 3)***

***Long-term***

***That if during the development of a phase II proposal there is no movement on the part of South Africa to meet its obligations then serious consideration should be given to moving the RFP to another SADC location.***

## **Major Recommendation Two**

## **Ongoing action by SADC/NAC/FAO**

That SADC countries, their individual country stakeholders and the implementing agent of FAnGR must ensure sustainability of the programme by ensuring that current achievements in community-based projects, plans and policies, structures and communication are maintained and improved.

### **Required actions**

#### **Suggestion 21 (page 21)**

**Short-term**

*For the remainder of the project the activities funded at the country-level should be community-based client driven and less in institutional support.*

#### **Suggestion 26 (page 24)**

**Short-term**

*Encourage member countries to develop project proposals based on the early findings of the project for funding by other organisations. In the future, counterpart funding or local contributions, should be indicated in all budgets; insufficient credit is being given to country inputs.*

#### **Suggestion 28 (page 25)**

**Short-term**

*Continue with, and strengthen, capacity building through staff training and improvement in communication equipment within the countries and over the region so that there is continuity in implementation of the project activities.*

#### **Suggestion 18 (page 18)**

**Short-term**

*The Project should standardize country activity worksheets and include expected or actual host country contributions. Currently the country contributions to the project are not being identified; their identification may be helpful to a donor considering funding phase II by showing the commitment of participating countries.*

#### **Suggestion 17 (page 18)**

**Short-term**

*Care must be taken so that FAO preparation of the State of the World in Animal Genetic Resources Country Report does not overshadow or derail the in-country FAnGR activities. Current national ownership is high and should not be diminished by over-tasking the networks with special donor requirements.*

#### **Suggestion 20 (page 21)**

**Short-/long-term**

*Project resources must be allocated to facilitate community-based work activities and farmer training; this will be paramount in phase II.*

#### **Suggestion 23 (page 24)**

**Short-/long-term**

*That the RFP should continue to seek and develop further mutually beneficial linkages with organisations and institutions within and outside the region.*

#### **Suggestion 16 (page 18)**

**Long-term**

*More effort must be made on the part of UNDP/FAO in the collaboration of its other programs in SADC such as poverty alleviation and biodiversity to lend assistance and provide additional resources to FAnGR. It is felt by the Mission that this is not the sole responsibility of the CTA, but rather also that of UNDP/FAO.*

#### **Suggestion 24 (page 24)**

**Long-term**

*Linkages already established should be strengthened in order to share costs of certain activities and make use of resources more efficient. The pooled resources will ensure*

*reduction in costs and risks of intervention failure, and assure members of the wider applications of the effects of the project.*

*Suggestion 25 (page 24)*

*Long-term*

*Establish more effective (synergistic) and operational linkages and networking and strengthen those already existing with a number of institutions and projects, especially with National Biodiversity Focal Points (NBFTs) and poverty alleviation projects in different countries to ensure that animals are covered under the CBD.*

*Suggestion 27 (page 24)*

*Long-term*

*NACs should encourage hosting government ministries and other national structures to internalise the FAnGR projects through incorporation into the budgets of their respective ministries or directorates or through inclusion of the activities of this project into existing projects. In addition, environment and natural resources, health and agriculture ministers should be urged to include the FAnGR programmes into their ministerial budgets.*

*Suggestion 29 (page 25)*

*Long-term*

*The NFPs, NACs and TCs should include communities or community-based organisations in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects.*

*Suggestion 30 (page 25)*

*Long-term*

*Establish strong and effective community-based networks and linkages.*

*Suggestion 31 (page 25)*

*Long-term*

*Empower communities through education and training workshops and provide initial support for the community-based activities.*

### **Major Recommendation Three**

#### **Medium-term action by SADC Member States and FAO**

That the current project be rolled-over until December 2002 at no additional cost to the donor and that preparations be made for phase II of the programme. Furthermore, some activities scheduled for the current project should be identified for inclusion in the new community-based phase II.

#### **Required actions**

*Suggestion 1 (page 2)*

*Short-term*

*That the current program be extended through to December of 2002.*

*Suggestion 14 (page 18)*

*Short-term*

*If satisfactory agreements cannot be made with the ARC, then additional assistance should be hired to complete this phase of the project.*

*Suggestion 15 (page 18)*

*Short-term*

*A three-year life of project was imposed by UNDP rules at the time of application, therefore the project should be extended and funded. If the RFP situation can be sorted-out then planning by FAO for a second phase should begin during 2001.*

**Suggestion 20 (page 21)**

**Short-/long-term**

*Project resources must be allocated to facilitate community-based work activities and farmer training; this will be paramount in phase II.*

**Suggestion 31 (page 25)**

**Long-term**

*Empower communities through education and training workshops and provide initial support for the community-based activities.*

**Suggestion 6 (page 13)**

**Long-term**

*That consideration is given by the Steering Committee to delaying action on Immediate Objectives 3b and 3d (as specified above) until the second phase of this programme.*

**Suggestion 8 (page 14)**

**Long-term**

*That the Steering Committee give consideration to delaying action on some of the detailed policies and plans for the management and utilisation of farm animal genetic resources until the second phase of this programme.*

**Minor Recommendation One**

**Immediate action by RFP/FAO**

That the goals, objectives, activities and outputs be reorganised to minimise confusion about responsibilities and priorities in the current project and to facilitate the development of phase II project.

**Required actions**

**Suggestion 2 (page 3)**

**Short-term**

*That for clarity and better understanding, several of the activities of the current Immediate Objectives be rearranged and a Phase II project proposal developed and this intent notified to UNDP.*

**Suggestion 5 (page 13)**

**Short-term**

*That Immediate Objective Three be rewritten as:*

*3a - create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of breed information,*

*3b - create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of production systems,*

*3c - improved training in FAnGR work and,*

*3d - the rational use of recording systems.*

**Suggestion 7 (page 13)**

**Short-term**

*That Immediate Objective Four be rewritten as:*

*4a - the development and initiation of individual country's policies and plans to guide the management of farm animal genetics resources and,*

*4b - the development and initiation of individual country's policies and plans to guide the utilisation of farm animal genetics resources.*

***Suggestion 9 (page 15)***

***Short-term***

***That Planned Major Output 5 be rewritten as:***

***5a - Characterisation of the main regional production systems completed and,***

***5b - a programme to characterise the major livestock breeds of the region instigated.***

***Suggestion 11 (page 15)***

***Short-term***

***That careful consideration is given to aligning outputs with the appropriate immediate objective.***

***Suggestion 19 (page 21)***

***Short-/long-term***

***A revision should be made of the outputs and their associated activities which must be accomplished during the current life of project and those which can best be initiated in a second phase.***

***Minor Recommendation Two***

***Medium-term action by RFP/SADC/FAO Rome***

That intellectual property rights issues be fully addressed at an inter-governmental level before individual animal information (including molecular genetic information) is recorded on any shared information system.

**Required actions**

***Suggestion 10 (page 15)***

***Long-term***

***That the issue of intellectual property rights be added as a component of planned major output 8 (this is also linked to Suggestion 12 below).***

***Suggestion 12 (page 16)***

***Long-term***

***The issues of ownership versus custodianship and access to data need to be addressed immediately. This will likely require interaction with high-level government officials, as there is the potential for intellectual property rights to be at stake (also see Suggestion 10).***

## **INTRODUCTION**

The project on the Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources (FAnGR) in the SADC Region commenced operations in May of 1999 and is scheduled for a three-year program ending in May 2002. The project was designed to assist the SADC region's efforts with agriculture production and food security. Additionally, the Project seeks to develop a working network of institutions and community programs with interest in the conservation and utilization of indigenous livestock. The basic strategy used for the implementation of FAnGR was the creation of a Regional Focal Point (RFP) with coordination and leadership roles and a collaborating network of National Focal Points (NFP) in each of 13 SADC countries. During this current phase of the project, heavy emphasis has been placed on network formulation, creating communication systems for rapid information transfer and in human resource development. To assist this process a number of regional activities and in-country actions have taken place dealing with indigenous livestock characterization, development of field breed guides, training, preparation of a SADC-wide FAnGR survey and individual country activities supporting the goal of FAnGR.

UNDP has provided nearly US\$ 2.5 million for this program and FAO given the responsibility for implementation. A regional office has been established in Pretoria, South Africa and NFPs in each of 13 countries. These are all linked through email equipment supplied by the Project. Formal linkages have also been established with international organizations such as the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), OAU/IBAR and GTZ.

The importance of livestock in the SADC region is well known, however program rationale is not only expressed in economic terms but also in the critical role livestock play in food, wealth, fuel, traction, clothing, transport, income and social status of most rural households in Southern Africa. In this mixture Indigenous Breeds play a key role; this Project seeks to exploit this fact, promote the conservation and utilization of this important genetic diversity while improving the living standards of rural communities. Further assistance in a second phase of this project is warranted with a major emphasis on community programmes and policy implementation. Timeframes and resource allocations should not be less than in phase I.

A Mission Team was established to undertake the required mid-term review. The Mission was composed of Professor Hugh Blair, Massey University, New Zealand, Dr. James Banda, Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi, and Mr. Robert McColaugh. Dr. Blair interviewed persons in the Republic of South Africa and Malawi; Dr. Banda met with Project participants in Lesotho and Swaziland; Mr. McColaugh visited Botswana and Zimbabwe and was accompanied by the CTA. The full Mission met with key agencies and officials in South Africa concerning the operations and management of the RFP. In addition to the above interviews and visits, the Mission reviewed relevant Project documentation. These documents provided a thorough overview of other Project activities and accomplishments.

## **FINDINGS**

### **Project Objectives and Their Relevance**

The *project* goal (as stated in the Terms of Reference) is as follows:

*“The aim of this project is to strengthen the institutional capacity of the SADC region by putting in place regional and national structures, which will enable proper management of farm animal genetic resources, to improve the living standards of the people of the SADC region and meet food security objectives.”*

However, the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) defined the *programme* goal (as stated in the flier entitled “Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in the SADC Region”) as:

*“To identify, characterise, conserve and improve farm animal resources to maintain biological diversity as a means of creating more sustainable livestock production systems and hence improved food security, rural livelihoods and incomes in the SADC countries.”*

The above *programme* goal was derived from the statement given in Section C of the original project document as submitted to UNDP in 1997 and is more wide ranging with a longer time horizon than the *project* goal (which is 3 years).

The development objectives (as stated in the Terms of Reference and the project document submitted to the UNDP in 1997) are:

*“Immediate objective one – create a functional coordinating centre for the management of farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR) in the SADC sub-region.*

*Immediate objective two – establish a sustainable sub-regional network for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the SADC countries.*

*Immediate objective three – create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of breed information, a databank of production systems, improved training in FAnGR work and the rational use of recording systems.*

*Immediate objective four – the development and initiation of individual country’s policies and plans to guide the management and utilisation of farm animal genetics resources.”*

Before reviewing the relevance of the goal and objectives, it is worthwhile to comment on the regional nature of this project. The project is aimed at SADC countries; it could be argued that this grouping is too large for the project to be successful when actual conservation efforts need to be community-based. However, the Mission considers this to be an appropriate grouping because of the efficiencies gained by being able to coordinate activities across countries with similar conditions and with porous borders that allow exchange of livestock. For example, immediate objective three requires that farmers be surveyed to record numbers and attributes of their animals. Rather than each country developing its own survey, one country was chosen to develop and test the survey protocols. After modification, all SADC countries will use the improved survey. A more high tech example is the presence of two molecular genetics laboratories in the SADC region (Malawi and South Africa). Rather than developing these expensive facilities in every country, there is every reason to encourage collaborative use of the two existing units by the remaining SADC countries. That said, there is still need for each country to address its own individual conservation projects at the community level.

## Relevance of Goal

The Mission has based its evaluation on the *project* goal as defined in the terms of reference for the current evaluation rather than the broader *programme* goal that is defined in the flier entitled “Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in the SADC Region”. The important distinction between these two goals is that the *programme* goal requires not only the establishment of structures and linkages within the SADC region, but also the improvement of food security and living conditions particularly of the rural poor through the implementation of conservation and utilisation of indigenous livestock. The *project* goal is primarily aimed at putting within- and between-country structures in place.

Since there was no goal given in the original project document submitted to UNDP in 1997, the CTA has had to derive a goal. The *programme* goal has evolved through various forms to that stated above. However, the intent of the various versions of the *programme* goal is the same.

Given that there is a wide range of institutional capacity in the SADC region, it is appropriate to focus on ensuring all countries have a functional structure that will develop National Plans and provide oversight to actual conservation and utilisation projects. In addition to the range in institutional capacity seen between countries, it should also be recognised that some countries that previously had strong networks and capacity, are seeing these being weakened by reorganisation, limited funding and policy changes. The establishment of functional structures within the SADC region is achievable in the three-year timeframe of the current Project. Sustainability still remains an issue.

## Relevance of Objectives

*Immediate Objective One:* once it is accepted that the SADC countries will operate as a coordinated entity, it is imperative that an overall regional coordinating centre be put in place. This objective is critical to the sustainability of a coordinated approach by the SADC countries, and it should have been achievable within the first year of the project.

*Immediate Objective Two:* it would be impossible for the regional coordinating centre to manage activities in the various SADC countries. Thus the need for the appointment of National Coordinators to foster both between country linkages and within country activities is undeniable. The establishment of a regional network should be achievable within the first year of the project. It is likely that the full three years of the project will be required to achieve a sustainable network. This is because of the need to generate ownership by the NCs, their Alternates and the within-country NACs through holding regional and national meetings, and through the initiation of within-country projects.

*Immediate Objective Three:* once the management structures and linkages have been put in place (objectives one and two), it is then necessary to scope the problem being addressed. In this project, the issue is to define the numbers and attributes of indigenous livestock present in the various countries, and the community-based farming systems in which they are used. It is suggested that the definition of the indigenous livestock resources and the community-based production systems be split into two separate objectives, since they may be addressed on different time-scales.

Objective three also contains reference to improved training and the rational use of recording systems. The Mission suggests these be defined as new objectives, as while they are related to the definition of animal populations, they are separate issues in their own right. Furthermore, they could be placed on a different timeframe.

### ***Suggestion 5***

***That Immediate Objective Three be rewritten as:***

***3a - create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of breed information,***

***3b - create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of production systems,***

***3c - improved training in FAnGR work and,***

***3d - the rational use of recording systems.***

The achievement of objective 3a would likely take the full three years of the project. Indeed it might be expected that NACs might still be in the process of interpreting the information gathered from breed surveys at the timetabled termination of this project.

Since priority should be given to completing objective 3a, there may not be sufficient time or resources to complete objective 3b within the timeframe of the current project.

Objective 3c will require ongoing training beyond the end of this project. However, it would be reasonable to expect a number of training workshops to be held during the three years of this project.

Objective 3d appears to be somewhat out of place in a timeline sense and may be better placed in objective four. Presumably the rationalisation of recording systems in this project applies to those breeds at risk. Since the identification of the breeds at risk will not be completed until late 2001 (at the earliest), this objective would seem better placed in a follow-up project. Furthermore, the livestock survey questionnaire form available to the Mission did not have a question related to recording systems used by the farmer. When breeds at risk have been identified, there will be a need to revisit the owners of these animals to discuss recording systems. This information must then be integrated with the management and utilisation of the breed in question that is addressed in objective 4.

### ***Suggestion 6***

***That consideration is given by the Steering Committee to delaying action on Immediate Objectives 3b and 3d (as specified above) until the second phase of this programme.***

*Immediate Objective Four:* defining the animal populations (as in objective three) achieves nothing in terms of conservation; it is necessary to have a plan of how to manage and utilise those populations at risk. Thus, objective four is crucial to the overall success of the programme.

Once again, the Mission would suggest splitting objective four into its two components, that is, the management of the farm animal genetic resources and the utilisation of the farm animal genetic resources. The reason for suggesting this change is that while generalised management plans can be developed at the policy level, the utilisation of the resources will typically be encouraged by groups such as the farmers themselves, advisory services, processors and breed societies.

### ***Suggestion 7***

***That Immediate Objective Four be rewritten as:***

*4a - the development and initiation of individual country's policies and plans to guide the management of farm animal genetics resources and,*

*4b - the development and initiation of individual country's policies and plans to guide the utilisation of farm animal genetics resources.*

The implementation of these objectives for each breed identified as being at risk in objective 3 will need to be customised nationally for each breed. Given that the identification of breeds at risk will not occur until late in 2001 (following the breed survey), it is likely that objectives 4a and 4b will not be wholly implemented during the timeframe of the current project. However, it is quite reasonable to expect that some of the generic issues relating to breed management might be addressed within the current project through the generation of NPs. Furthermore, where breeds are already identified as being at risk, a decision should be taken as to whether the breed is of national and/or regional importance and an action plan initiated if required.

### **Suggestion 8**

*That the Steering Committee give consideration to delaying action on some of the detailed policies and plans for the management and utilisation of farm animal genetic resources until the second phase of this programme.*

### **Other Objectives**

The Mission considered whether any other objectives should be added to those already identified. No other objectives were identified for this *project*. Clearly, there are other possible objectives that could be added to the overall *programme*, particularly those that will aid implementation at the village level. Some example objectives might include the use of indigenous livestock and improved low input farming systems to assist with:

- poverty alleviation
- improving health and nutrition
- allowing the implementation of labour extensive farming for children, the elderly and women
- attaining self-reliance for food security using less expensive livestock
- empowering communities through the decentralisation of resource management

### **Planned Major Outputs**

Nine planned major outputs are given on page 3 of the terms of reference. The CTA consolidated these from the eleven 'elements' given in Section B.2 of the application to UNDP and the 'success criteria' listed at the end of each objective in Section D of the application to UNDP.

For clarity and ease of reporting the outputs have been reordered in the following list to appear with their appropriate immediate objective.

#### Immediate Objective One

1. *A sustainable regional focal point for the management of farm animal genetic resources.*
2. *A regional network on FAnGR developed and critical support services put in place.*

#### Immediate Objective Two

3. *The creation of a National Focal Point and the existence of a National Coordinator in each country.*

*Immediate Objective Three*

4. *A regional databank of FAnGR developed and accessible to all regional institutions and interested parties.*
5. *Characterisation of the main regional production systems completed and a programme to characterise the major livestock breeds of the region instigated.*
6. *The creation of a group of personnel trained in FAnGR work in the region and in each country.*

*Immediate Objective Four*

7. *National plans for the management of FAnGR developed in all countries and the most urgent actions implemented.*
8. *A regional policy developed on the exchange and trade in FAnGR and its legal implications.*
9. *An inventory of country and regional level preservation approaches for breeds of all species as risk.*

These planned major outputs are all appropriate for the *programme* goal, but several are probably unachievable in the timeframe available for the current *project*.

As with the objectives, consideration should be given to splitting planned major output 5 into the two components of livestock characterisation and production system characterisation.

***Suggestion 9***

***That Planned Major Output 5 be rewritten as:***

***5a - Characterisation of the main regional production systems completed and,***

***5b - a programme to characterise the major livestock breeds of the region instigated.***

The connotation of ‘preservation’ in planned major output 9 ought to be considered; it may be more appropriate to use ‘conservation’.

Consideration should be given as to whether there are likely to be significant intellectual property rights issues arising from the collection, storage and access to data on livestock from the SADC region. This could be added to planned major output 8.

***Suggestion 10***

***That the issue of intellectual property rights be added as a component of planned major output 8 (this is also linked to Suggestion 12 below).***

There seems to be some confusion between the planned major outputs as listed above and the outputs and activities listed in Section D of the application to UNDP. For example:

- The development of a computerised system for holding data on breeds and production systems appears as an output in objective one, whereas it is objective three that specifies the need for databanks.
- Training activities appear as outputs in objective two whereas training is in objective three.
- The development of policies and plans appear as outputs in objectives one, three and four, whereas planning should be in objective four.

***Suggestion 11***

***That careful consideration is given to aligning outputs with the appropriate immediate objective.***

## **Project Design**

The project is built around the following five components:

1. Structure and linkages
2. Communication
3. Livestock survey
4. Establishment of databases
5. Development of national plans and policies
6. Selected within-country projects

The first five of these components have been widely discussed and promoted by the FAO Domestic Animal Diversity Group in Rome. These components have already been implemented in the Asia sub-region by FAO, so there is evidence to suggest that the approach delivers the expected outcomes.

There is no disagreement from the Mission that the proposed hierarchical structure, with the accompanying need for linkages and communication, within a sub-region is the most desirable approach for this project.

The implementation of a livestock survey is critical to establishing what animals are present in the sub-region and which of those are at risk of being lost. The use of one country to trial the survey before implementation across all countries is a pragmatic approach that should minimise errors due to survey design faults.

Having collected the livestock information, there is an obvious need to record the data in an accessible and usable form. Issues of ownership versus custodianship and access to the data need to be addressed in full prior to the completion of this component.

### ***Suggestion 12***

***The issues of ownership versus custodianship and access to data need to be addressed immediately. This will likely require interaction with high-level government officials, as there is the potential for intellectual property rights to be at stake (also see Suggestion 10).***

The development of national plans and policies is required to ensure sensible coordination of project activities.

The sixth component, while not strictly fitting with the *project* goal, is accepted by the Mission as being a useful addition allowing some realism to be brought to the project through the implementation of actual breed characterisation and village-level activities. Individual country projects will generate within-country ownership of the project that will lead to an increased likelihood of the project becoming sustainable after funding from UNDP is terminated.

## **Project Management and Implementation**

The Mission found the FAO/UNDP project management hierarchy difficult to understand as to the exact roles between its various levels, administrative responsibilities assigned to New York with others to Accra not Zimbabwe and technical oversight yet in Rome. What is clear is that management of the FAnGR program at both the regional level and with participating SADC countries seems very much on track. The Mission felt that the fiscal accounting provided by either FAO offices or UNDP representation at the country levels provides sufficient assurance that Project funds are accountable and that payments are based primarily on delivery of a product or a service. Discussions with participating agencies and FAO/UNDP offices in the six countries visited reinforced this fact. Problems encountered dealt mainly with delayed disbursements, which are not uncommon with regional programs or in projects still in early stages of implementation. Frank discussions were held with FAnGR stakeholders and Project management on the need for further orientation and guidance at the national levels on proper accessing of funds, the information needed in presentation of accounts and project reporting requirements.

SADC national focal point coordinators, national advisory committee members, FAO/UNDP representatives and others associated with FAnGR all were laudatory in their praises for the direction and assistance provided by the CTA. Clearly the effort of the CTA has much to do with the success of FAnGR at this point in the life of the Project. This is true at both the regional as well as at SADC country levels. It is a sad fact that the Republic of South Africa has not been able to complete its obligation to provide an RPC to assist in the implementation of RFP responsibilities. This lack of professional expertise has seriously jeopardized project accomplishments and calls for immediate action if the project is to have any assurance of regional sustainability or the staffing capability to move into a no-cost extension or a Phase II. The Mission has not been afforded the opportunity to discuss this major constraint with the Director General of the Department of Agriculture in South Africa. Lamentably our recommendations are only opinions, not firm conclusions based upon face-to-face dialogue.

### ***Suggestions 1 to 4***

*(see Suggestions 1 to 4 in the Executive Summary)*

### **Conclusions (Project Management and Implementation)**

The Mission as well as those closely associated with the development of the FAnGR concept and in the implementation of its regional and national work plans concur that progress to date is satisfactory. Project design is seriously flawed to have expected that the approved outputs could have been accomplished during a three-year life of project. The lack of an RPC, as agreed to by South Africa, has placed an unfair work load on the CTA and hindered outputs which could have been achieved had the RFP been properly staffed. The FAO Director General has made inquiries on this point, as has the Council of SADC Ministers; the problem remains.

Discussions with the SADC Secretariat in relation to their current restructuring activities did not indicate any near-term changes in the operations of FAnGR. It is important to maintain this critical linkage to SADC, which is well understood by Project staff and its national stakeholders.

### **Lessons Learned (Project Management and Implementation)**

1. FAO and UNDP have provided sufficient backstopping at the national levels; fiscal issues and reporting requirements might have been improved in some cases with a more complete orientation program with NFP coordinators.

2. FAO was remiss in not making corrections in project design that should have taken place many months ago when it was apparent that the RSA could not meet its commitment on staffing the RFP position. The current options to correct this major problem cast doubt on the sustainability of the RFP and clearly on the commitment and intentions of the Host Country.
3. The investments made thus far in the project have already yielded more than expected and lay an excellent foundation for moving into direct community actions in a second phase. The current enthusiasm and sense of national ownership could be lost in the absence of a second phase.
4. FAnGR has been able to generate inputs from collaborating countries at a much higher rate than expected and a better accounting of this support needs to be recorded to show the leverage the Project has obtained.
5. The structures developed at national levels combined with the communication systems provided to SADC collaborators have proven to be a very effective strategy for the management of a regional 13-country program.
6. Heavy emphasis in future assistance must be at the national levels. Resources must be made available to keep the networks operational and to provide start-up community-based pilot programmes. It is not rational to move forward without adequate outside funding for NFP operations. Most countries have the ability to continue staffing FAnGR actions; they will have severe financial restrictions in terms of implementing community-based activities.

### **Suggestions (Project Management and Implementation)**

#### ***Suggestion 13***

*Consider movement of the RFP to the Agricultural Research Council if the RSA can assure immediate staffing arrangements and funding to continue networking activities after Project closure.*

#### ***Suggestion 14***

*If satisfactory agreements cannot be made with the ARC, then additional assistance should be hired to complete this phase of the project.*

#### ***Suggestion 15***

*A three-year life of project was imposed by UNDP rules at the time of application, therefore the project should be extended and funded. If the RFP situation can be sorted-out then planning by SADC and FAO for a second phase should begin during 2001.*

#### ***Suggestion 16***

*More effort must be made on the part of UNDP/FAO in the collaboration of its other programs in SADC such as poverty alleviation and biodiversity to lend assistance and provide additional resources to FAnGR. It is felt by the Mission that this is not the sole responsibility of the CTA, but rather also that of UNDP/FAO.*

#### ***Suggestion 17***

*Care must be taken so that FAO preparation of the State of the World in Animal Genetic Resources Country Report does not overshadow or derail the in-country FAnGR activities. Current national ownership is high and should not be diminished by over-tasking the networks with special donor requirements.*

#### ***Suggestion 18***

*The Project should standardize country activity worksheets and include expected or actual host country contributions. Currently the country contributions to the project are not being identified; their identification may be helpful to a donor considering funding phase II by showing the commitment of participating countries.*

## **Project Activities and Outputs**

The FAnGR Project has four Immediate Objectives which lead to Goal attainment, that of “putting in place regional and national structures, which will enable proper management of farm animal genetic resources, to improve the living standards of the people of the SADC region and meet food security objectives”. Over seventy Project Activities are included under these four Immediate Objectives, some specific to the RFP and others to NFPs. A brief summary of the four Immediate Objectives, their expected Outputs, as extracted from the Project Document, and their current status is presented below.

### *Immediate Objective 1:*

Create a functional coordinating centre for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the SADC sub-region.

#### Outputs

1. A working RFP Office  
*Completed*
2. A computerized system to hold breed and system information for the region  
*Under Development*
3. A library of information and photographs on FAnGR in the region  
*Under Development*
4. Regional Policy document drafted on the exchange and control of genetic material between countries within the region and with countries outside the region  
*Not Yet Initiated*

### *Immediate Objective 2:*

Establish a sustainable sub-regional network for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the SADC countries.

#### Outputs

1. A core of 24 personnel, in the region, trained in FAnGR work  
*Expected Output Met, Training Continues*
2. Working communications network for FAnGR between NCs in SADC countries and RFP  
*Completed, and Includes Linkages With International Centres*
3. Working information network and data system on FAnGR in SADC countries  
*Under Development*

### *Immediate Objective 3:*

Create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of breed information, a databank of production systems, improved training in FAnGR work and the rational use of recording systems.

#### Outputs

1. A comprehensive databank of farm animal genetic resources in the region by breed and system  
*National Survey Work Taking Place To Produce Data Required*
2. A databank of production systems found in the region  
*Under Development*
3. A Regional Training Plan  
*National Advisory Committees and the Regional Steering Committee Are Providing Input, Under Development*

4. A plan for rationalizing recording schemes in the region  
*Requires Completion of National Surveys, Some National Efforts Underway*

*Immediate Objective 4:*

The development and initiation of individual country policies and plans to guide the management and utilization of farm animal genetic resources.

Outputs

1. Create National Focal Points (NFP) in all countries  
*Completed*
2. A National Plan produced and within country linkages for the management of FAnGR work strengthened for each SADC country  
*National Plans Require Survey Completion, Country Linkages and Collaboration Are Well Underway*
3. Acceptance of National Plan document in each country  
*Future Activity*
4. Practical steps to manage FAnGR more sustainably  
*Underway, Breed Field Guide Produced, Surveys to Commence*
5. Project proposals for further funding  
*Twelve SADC Countries Have Submitted Proposals, Ten Funded*
6. National FAnGR training plan developed  
*No Training Needs Assessments Completed*
7. Summary of national livestock recording scheme requirements  
*Not Yet initiated, Basic Data Required*

The Project has approved some twelve country-level proposals that supplement the regionally mandated activities. These actions include community participation, are in most cases farmer focused, provide a needed learning experience, encourage in-country linkages and lay the framework for NP development. They were selected by NACs and approved by the Regional Steering Committee to assist “national governments provide an enabling environment by developing and implementing appropriate policies and support systems necessary for the proper management of farm animal genetic resources”, a basic purpose of the Project.

**Conclusions (Project Activities and Outputs)**

FAnGR has made sufficient progress in many of the expected Outputs, those that are the responsibility of the RFP and others implemented by NFP stakeholder organizations. The Mission wishes to note that in the best of worlds these National Actions, proposals approved and funded, should have evolved from a NP. However, since the country surveys have yet to be completed the development and approval of the Plans were not possible. The Mission found that the stakeholders have used these activities to good advantage and in some cases are already applying the results. Clearly these activities provided a vehicle for improved collaboration and learning experiences. The country genetic resources surveys should go much smoother as a result of these in-country activities and the utilization of data results much faster.

It is doubtful if all the Outputs, especially those in number 4, will be completed before the end of the current project. Getting 13 countries on-board is not easily accomplished and more so without the staff support promised by South Africa. Hopefully there will be a project extension or a second phase in order to complete these activities and move into community-based programs, which are the heart of the Project. The achievements made to date plus the investments in equipment, training, and database preparations clearly call for a revision of the current time frame and appropriate funding. To lose these sunk costs would not seem prudent use of donor funding.

**Lessons Learned (Project Activities and Outputs)**

1. A three-year time frame was not sufficient for a project of this magnitude.
2. Had the development of the survey questionnaires and testing been earlier time-wise, perhaps more of the outputs might have been accomplished.
3. Investments in communication for the network have been cost-effective.
4. Funding of country specific actions have held the networks together and provided incentives to focus national activities on FAnGR programs of work.

**Suggestions (Project Activities and Outputs)**

***Suggestion 19***

*A revision should be made of the outputs and their associated activities which must be accomplished during the current life of project and those which can best be initiated in a second phase.*

***Suggestion 20***

*Project resources must be allocated to facilitate community-based work activities and farmer training; this will be paramount in phase II.*

***Suggestion 21***

*For the remainder of the project the activities funded at the country-level should be community-based client driven and less in institutional support.*

## **PROJECT EFFECTS, IMPACT, SUSTAINABILITY AND COST EFFECTIVENESS**

The effects, impact, sustainability and cost effectiveness of the SADC FAnGR project will depend on the goal and specific objectives set for the Project as well as the activities implemented to achieve the goal and objectives.

The Mission assessed the effects, impact, sustainability and cost effectiveness of the project based on the Project goal. Four specific objectives and the pertinent activities that have been implemented and will be implemented until the end of this funding phase have already been discussed above.

### **Project effects and impact**

The Mission noted that the major effects and impacts of the project during the short time of implementation is that the communication within the regional FAnGR network either among countries or with the Regional Focal Point has improved tremendously. This is mainly due to the establishment of a functional and effective RFP whose effects have benefited all SADC countries participating in the project. The development of this communication system, which includes e-mail and internet facilities, has greatly enhanced access to the global databases by NCs and will allow them to access the Regional database and virtual library on animal genetic resources currently under development.

Each member country has produced breed guides. These breed guides are already being utilised by the individual countries in training and in the breed surveys that are being undertaken now. In addition to this, the Mission has noted that the SADC video on FAnGR and food security will be distributed for use by education and public institutions for bringing awareness and mobilising support for proper management and conservation of farm animal biodiversity as well as training in FAnGR in the region.

This project has also created an enabling structure for helping people understand and change their attitudes towards existing local and exotic farm animal genetic resources and for the implementation of community-based activities which are geared towards development of a package for conserving, managing and profitably utilising the FAnGR existing in the different farming environments in the SADC sub-region.

Previously, the individual countries carried out some characterisation work in isolation without realising that they were contributing to the evolution of FAnGR. The project has enabled the co-ordination of that information on various animal genetic resources for the benefit of all countries. This information will provide knowledge on animal genetic resources available in each country, the production systems or environment in which they are producing, the capacity in terms of physical facilities and human resources in order to provide a basis for future country and regional priorities and development programmes.

The Mission also found that funds provided by the project have allowed several SADC countries to implement characterisation, improvement, conservation and management of FAnGR, which has never been undertaken at this level before. The implementation of community-based activities such as the *“Revitalisation of the Basotho pony mare camps”* and *“Improving and sustaining food self-sufficiency through multiplication and promoting integration of diversity of poultry species in existing systems in Malawi”*, has improved and is expected to further improve household food security, income and welfare (livelihoods) as well as ownership of the Project which is fundamental for sustainability.

The Project has held several training workshops for the NCs and others involved in the project. These people are considered as trainers. This approach has had a multiplier effect in that already, most NCs and the Alternates have trained fellow scientists and technical personnel working on the project. The knowledge gained is already being used in each member country in development of databases, breed surveys and in development of more community-based activities and programmes on animal genetic resources.

The large number of institutions and beneficiaries involved in the Project at country level creates an environment for cooperation and creation of linkages for efficient use of limited resources. This assists in assuring interest and enthusiasm in the sustainability of the Project.

The launching of the Project by involving various stakeholders in each of the countries helped in mobilising public support for and created awareness of FAnGR management. In addition, the stakeholders, together with the project personnel, identified and prioritised specific FAnGR activities relevant to the countries so that results are locally applicable for impact, but with a regional perspective. This was also important for ownership of the project at the country level.

### **Sustainability of the project**

The target beneficiaries of the FAnGR project are SADC people, industries, NGOs, governments and community-based organisations of all participating countries during and after the funding has phased out. This implies that mechanisms have to be put in place to enable the activities of the project to go on after this period. The question of sustainability was assessed at the regional level, national level and local level within the communities.

#### **a) *Regional Coordination***

At the regional level, the Mission has observed that the Government of South Africa, which hosts the RFP on behalf of the SADC, has still not yet identified a National Expert to fill the vacant position. The agreement in the project document was that the host would support this position including the necessary physical infrastructure and the required administrative staff in order to sustain the project activities after the end of the funding period. All countries visited are concerned about the absence of this second professional, especially at a time when implementation of technical and community-based activities is taking place in various member states. This will hamper progress in devolving responsibilities of the RFP to the SADC host country.

### **Suggestions**

#### ***Suggestion 22***

*The Mission suggests one of the following three options (which are listed in preferred order) be used to solve this issue:*

- *The South African Government should be given a final chance to appoint an RPC, possibly from the Agricultural Research Council, to assist in running the SADC-FAnGR Project. A deadline through June 2001 should be given for this RPC to be in place before a second option is taken.*
- *Employ an expert as a trainee to understudy the CTA during the current phase of the Project. The Department of Agriculture should be requested to host the RPC, for the remainder of the current phase, along with the CTA.*
- *If the Republic of South Africa does not appoint an RPC, then the RFP should be relocated to another SADC country in phase II.*

Whatever the option taken, the Tripartite Partners (SADC, FAO and UNDP) should meet to discuss these options and make a decision by August 2001. The Mission felt that the Tripartite meeting should also determine whether support for phase two funding by the donor is to be requested.

The RFP has established linkages with ILRI, OAU/IBAR and SACCAR. ILRI and OAU/IBAR sit as Permanent Observers in the project Steering Committee Meetings. In addition, new linkages have been developed with the GTZ project on Managing Agrobiodiversity in Rural Areas and with the UNDP Southern Africa Biodiversity Support Programme.

## **Suggestions**

### ***Suggestion 23***

*That the RFP should continue to seek and develop further mutually beneficial linkages with organisations and institutions within and outside the region.*

### ***Suggestion 24***

*Linkages already established should be strengthened in order to share costs of certain activities and make use of resources more efficient. The pooled resources will ensure reduction in costs and risks of intervention failure, and assure members of the wider applications of the effects of the project.*

### ***b) National activities and projects***

At the national level, the Mission observed that sustainability is likely because of the interest, enthusiasm and the basic structures and networking so far established. Although the NACs were formed late in some countries, most have now established these structures. The NCs as well as their Alternates have been appointed and are available to coordinate the activities of the project. Countries have formed strong NACs whose members were appointed by either the Minister or Permanent/Principal Secretaries of Agriculture in the various countries. In some cases, Technical Committees (TCs) have also been formed to assist with oversight and implementation of project activities. These committees are composed of members from the hosting ministries, universities, NGOs, Community Based Organisations (CBOs), other link ministries, industry, farmers and other stakeholders. Appointment to the above committees by either the Minister or the Principal/Permanent Secretary of the hosting institutions shows support and ownership of the project. Some hosting ministries or directorates have included FAnGR activities in their budgets, seconded staff to these activities or have integrated the project into on-going activities on animal genetic resources. For example, in Swaziland FAnGR activities have been integrated into on-going work on Nguni cattle and small ruminants, further assistance must target these types of projects.

## **Suggestions**

### ***Suggestion 25***

*Establish more effective (synergistic) and operational, linkages and networking and strengthen those already existing with a number of institutions and projects, especially with National Biodiversity Focal Points (NBFTs) and poverty alleviation projects in different countries to ensure that animals are covered under the CBD.*

### ***Suggestion 26***

*Encourage member countries to develop project proposals based on the early findings of the project for funding by other organisations. In the future, counterpart funding or local contributions, should be indicated in all budgets; insufficient credit is being given to country inputs.*

### ***Suggestion 27.***

*NACs should encourage hosting government ministries and other national structures to internalise the FAnGR projects through incorporation into the budgets of their respective ministries or directorates or through inclusion of the activities of this project into existing projects. In addition, environment and natural resources, health and agriculture ministers should be urged to include the FAnGR programmes into their ministerial budgets.*

**Suggestion 28**

*Continue with, and strengthen, capacity building through staff training and improvement in communication equipment within the countries and over the region so that there is continuity in implementation of the project activities.*

**c) Community level**

The involvement of communities in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation stages of projects is very important for the sustainability of the activities at grassroots level. Apart from including a few farmers and CBOs, the Mission noted that most countries have not yet developed community-based networks. Malawi and Lesotho have village-based livestock groups and workshops had been held to obtain views on the conservation and better utilisation of FAnGR.

Livestock may become increasingly more important in the economy of the rural poor as labour constraints become more critical. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is especially critical in the rural areas where the oldest are now caring for the youngest with limited manpower available for traditional crop farming, whereas these people can manage their livestock resources.

**Suggestions**

**Suggestion 29**

*The NFPs, NACs and TCs should include communities or community-based organisations in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects.*

**Suggestion 30**

*Establish strong and effective community-based networks and linkages.*

**Suggestion 31**

*Empower communities through education and training workshops and provide initial support for the community-based activities.*

**Cost effectiveness of the project**

It was not possible to undertake a full assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the Project since it had only been in operation for 2 years. However, the Mission determined the following as current and potential indicators of the cost effectiveness of the project:

- *Effective and efficient communication:* With the e-mail and internet facilities as well as the SADC-FAnGR newsletter provided to NFPs and the network, the communication among member countries and between members and the RFP is both efficient and effective. National coordinators are able to access the global database on animal genetic resources in Rome and the regional databases that are being established in Pretoria.
- *Effective linkages and networking:* Effective linkages have been formed especially with projects dealing with biodiversity and natural resource management in sustainable livelihoods programmes as a priority for the grassroots or communities for efficient use of meagre resources. At the national level, these will have to be strengthened for greater effectiveness and sustainability. Donor funding will be required.
- *Availability of data and information:* In the short time since the initiation of the Project, the SADC databank is being created, a virtual library on local breeds and other animal genetic resources information collated and a video produced on FAnGR and food security. These impact on creating national and regional awareness of FAnGR and enhancing development of plans. These efforts reflect the cost effectiveness of the project.

- *High rating of FAnGR:* All countries visited rated the FAnGR, especially indigenous animal genetic resources, as a renewed priority for conservation, management and profitable utilisation after realising that some indigenous livestock gene pools are declining to near extinction in the region.
- *Income generation and food security:* The Project is definitely contributing to income generation and food security relevant to the rural poor of SADC, especially those activities that are community-based. Professional staff are available, operational funds are in short supply.
- *Regional agricultural policies and trade:* Project activities are expected to contribute to the development of agricultural policies and trade in FAnGR at the national level with a regional perspective. The policies and increased trade will foster regional integration.
- *Human capacity building:* The Project has enhanced regional cooperation and has built capacity in terms of technical and support personnel working on the Project, and knowledge obtained through training workshops to enhance and develop skills in using information systems and in managing FAnGR. Decentralisation of these activities will be important for the sustainability of the Project.

## Conclusions

The SADC - FAnGR project has had significant impact at the regional and national levels. At both levels the project has developed an enabling environment and structures for further effective implementation of community-based poverty alleviating activities. All the SADC member states are very enthusiastic about the project; in most countries, the NFPs have established effective linkages with other regional projects working on biodiversity issues. Clearly livestock production offers sustainable livelihood options to marginalized rural poor.

The major factor that will ensure the sustainability of this project is South Africa assigning an RPC at the RFP in the immediate future. National Focal Points and their structures should adopt all means and mechanisms to seek support for the continuation of their inputs to project activities.

There are significant in-kind contributions being made by participating countries. However, the magnitude of these contributions is not currently being identified in project budgets; this needs to be rectified. It is clear that countries are willing to allocate professional staff to this programme. This must be matched with a vigorous input by donors for operational costs and community-based start-up programmes.

This is a worthwhile project and should be supported for a second period. The regional design for this project could be adopted for other regions.

## Lessons Learned

At the regional level, the Mission learnt the following lessons:

- *Management and implementation:* In future, projects should remain regional. Positions of a regional nature should be opened to all member states and member states should take the responsibility of maintaining regional aspects of the project activities either through direct support or through encouraging donor/NGO participation.
- *Regional project/program approach:* The regional approach to project design is favoured because pooling of resources at the regional level ensures reduction in costs and risk of

failure and also assures a wider application of results. This fosters regional cooperation and integration. The Mission encourages greater interaction and support between ongoing UNDP programmes in biodiversity and poverty alleviation with FAnGR.

At national level, the following lessons were learned:

- *Procedures or protocol during implementation of community activities:* To implement project activities, the NFPs had to go through the ministry, the Department of Veterinary or Livestock Services and the extension workers before getting to the communities. At community level, the projects had to go through the chief or village headman for acceptability and ownership. This has implications on the sensitivity and time elements required to implement community-based projects.
- *Flow of project funds:* The flow of funds from Accra to the project personnel, especially at the inception of projects was rather long. However, the biggest lesson learned at national level is that national governments have difficult procedures in establishing project accounts. This explained part of the delay in starting project activities. In addition, the project coordinators were not familiar with accounting systems of the donor community where the accounts were eventually maintained.
- *Linkages with other projects, institutions and communities:* Some countries like Malawi did not even know the existence of some important regional projects in their own countries so that linkages could be established. The linkages and networks with the communities were rather weak. As development organisations UNDP and FAO must play a stronger role along with SADC in coordinating functional linkages that will assist FAnGR.
- In the future, an inventory of projects should be kept in the regional virtual library for access by member countries to facilitate establishment of linkages.

## **ANNEX ONE – COUNTRY REPORTS**

### **COUNTRY REPORT – REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**

#### ***Itinerary***

Professor Blair was hosted at an NAC workshop by the Alternate (Jenny Bester) held on 24 April 2001 at Irene. Various presentations allowed the Mission member to gain an oversight of both completed and planned FAnGR work in the Republic of South Africa.

#### ***Structure and Linkages***

- National Coordinator and Alternate are in place.
- Stakeholder's meeting held and National Advisory Committee formed.
- National Advisory Committee is yet to be formally recognised by Director General of Agriculture.
- There is acknowledgement and frustration that South Africa is yet to appoint the Regional Coordinator. All agreed they wished to have this position in South Africa, and that the hold-up was political.
- Strong linkages within country between Department of Agriculture and Agricultural Research Council. However, concern was voiced at the intention to have independent provincial structures; it was felt this would weaken the linkages between provinces.
- Much of the current strong linkage is based on a small (c.10) group of professionals interested in livestock conservation. These enthusiasts established the Farm Animal Conservation Trust (FACT) in 1994 and operate on a minimal budget.
- An excellent opportunity has arisen to participate in a project to establish a network amongst many institutions that hold biological materials from a wide range of animal species. The project called Biobank SA is being led by Dr P. Bartels and it has been submitted to the Government Innovation Fund. This project should have wider appeal within the current project.
- Linkages with other SADC countries appear to be driven primarily by the current project.
- Linkages with other professional organisations outside of SADC were due to individual professional connections rather than this project. Some concern was voiced at poor feedback from ILRI on specific projects. This concern related to heavy workload of ILRI scientists rather than their unwillingness to provide feedback.

#### ***Communication***

- Communication by telephone, fax and email is at a high standard.

#### ***Livestock Survey***

- A handbook on landrace breeds in South Africa has been produced.

- A significant database about indigenous breeds has been generated (literature, photos, slides, list of breeders).
- Preparation is underway for the livestock survey.
- Implementation has been delayed because of the delay in finalising the survey content from the trial country.
- The NC and Alternate have undergone training for the survey implementation.
- There are concerns about being able to meet the survey timelines. The survey must be completed by October 2001 to enable the rainy season to be avoided.
- Concern was also voiced at the length of the survey form and the potential for interviewer and interviewee fatigue, leading to erroneous answers being collected.
- Consideration may have to be given to providing those breeders interviewed with a reward; this needs to be built in to the budget.
- Important to ensure there is some form of follow-up to the survey so that breeders are assured their input is valued.

### ***Plans and Policies***

Although the following activities were not directly driven by the project, they are part of FAnGR management:

- A draft National Plan has been produced.
- A handbook on landrace breeds in South Africa has been produced.

### ***Within Country Projects***

- The genetic characterisation of 4 species is underway at the Irene ARC Institute. There is concern that funding has restricted the number of micro-satellite markers that will be used (12-15); FAO recommend the use of 25 markers. This project supports 4 MSc students. The project will not be completed until the end of 2002, since the MSc degree is a two-year programme.
- In addition to the above, a number of non-UNDP funded projects have been undertaken under the auspices of FACT.

### ***Other Issues***

- Must tie this project into Rio +10 conference that is to be held in South Africa in 2002
- There is concern about the effects of genotype dumping from other countries into South Africa
- A commercially developed database (IRIS) has been purchased by the South African Department of Agriculture for the recording of livestock. The system could be expanded to include individual animal data from populations at risk within the SADC region
- There is a need to control livestock theft

- There is significant leverage of UNDP funds against existing government funding.

*Suggestions*

- Stock theft be recognised as a major impediment to livestock production
- Irene ARC and Chancellor College Molecular Genetics units to be developed as regional resources
- ARC must be requested to include an allowance for the Regional Coordinator in their 2002/03 budget
- The Director General of the Department of Agriculture should recognise the role of the South African National Advisory Committee
- The South African Biobank initiative should be supported and considered for expansion into other SADC countries

## **COUNTRY REPORT – MALAWI**

### *Itinerary*

Professor Blair was accompanied throughout his visit to Malawi by the NC (Susan Malunga) and the Alternate (Dr Gilson Njunga). The visit took place over three days from 25 April to 28 April 2001. Site visits were undertaken to the Chitedze Research Station, Bunda College of Agriculture, two villages near Bunda and Chancellor College in Zomba. Courtesy calls were made to the FAO and UNDP offices in Lilongwe.

### *Structure and Linkages*

- The National Coordinator and Alternate are in place. Unfortunately, there have been 4 different NCs in Malawi, leading to some difficulties in continuity. The turnover in NCs has been unrelated to the commitment of Malawi to the current project. Due to the changing of NCs, some structural decisions have been delayed. Note that the Alternate was not able to take over the role as NC as he did not work for DARTS.
- A stakeholders meeting was held in March 2000, but the minutes have only just been prepared (due to the turnover in NCs). This meeting produced a comprehensive list of tasks for completion.
- As a result of the above, the National Advisory Committee has only recently been formed and had their first meeting in March 2001. Quarterly NAC meetings have been agreed to.
- The NAC has strong government agency (academic, research, extension) representation; there may be need to consider greater representation for the processing and production sectors.
- There is strong 'buy-in' from government ministries to the project.
- Within country linkages are strong because of the small number of people in the scientific community.
- There are severe funding limitations on travel that make face-to-face meetings difficult to organise.
- UNDP/Malawi government project to consider linkages with this project; this report should be copied to UNDP in Lilongwe to assist with their planning for the next five year period.
- Linkages with other SADC countries are primarily generated by this project and the attendance of professional conferences and workshops.
- The appointment of Bunda College staff to the NAC brings a linkage to the SADC/GTZ project on post graduate training.

### *Communication*

- Telephone and fax communication is adequate.
- Email communication was only established at the end of April, the turnover in NCs and equipment failure had contributed to the delay.

- Internet capability is not yet in place; email and internet are separate services in Malawi.
- The \$US1000 funding per year for communications will not cover all costs.

### *Livestock Survey*

- Breed Field Guide has been produced.
- Preparation for the livestock survey is well advanced.
- The NC and Alternate have undergone training for the survey implementation.
- The trial design and budget are in place.
- Enumerators are being identified.
- A pilot survey has been scheduled for the Dedza region in May 2001.
- Both the NC and Alternate will participate in the pilot survey.

### *Plans and Policies*

- The NC has been asked to produce a National Plan based on the stakeholders meeting. This should be completed by May 2001.
- Breed Field Guide has been produced.

### *Within Country Projects*

- The village-based poultry project hosted by the Bunda College of Agriculture is underway. Two villages have been chosen and Farmer Clubs have been formed. Structures to house the poultry have been built by the villagers, and they await the arrival of chickens and pigeons from Bunda College. It was made clear to the Mission that the village Chiefs are very impressed with the project, with those from other villages requesting that similar efforts be replicated in their villages. Since this cannot be done within the current project, other donors will need to be found. It will not be possible to undertake an evaluation of the success of the project until later in 2002.

Newcastle Disease is a major impediment to poultry production, and some farmers have not had the financial resources to buy the vaccine. To overcome this the project leader agreed to buy eggs at 5 Kwacha and then returned doses to the farmer at 0.3 Kwacha.

- The genetic characterisation of Malawi Zebu cattle is underway, and preliminary results should be available by July 2001. Tissue samples have been collected from a variety of sites across Malawi, and DNA has been extracted. Some DNA profiles have been run and early results examined. This project supports one MSc student.
- Two other projects have been suggested: Malawi Black Pig Rescue and Phenotypic Characterisation of Indigenous Cattle.

### *Other Issues*

- Everyone spoken to is enthusiastic about the project

- The Malawi government must be made aware of the undesirable impact the closing of the Veterinary Certificate programme is having on human resource capacity at the village interaction level
- The building of scientific and advisory capacity in Malawi is being hampered by inadequate operation funding
- The project in Malawi has suffered from a regular turnover of personnel in the National Coordinator position; this has not been caused by the project per se
- Serious limitation of operational funding in Malawi; this will compromise the sustainability of the project. All government staff were on leave for 4 weeks over the time of the mid-term evaluation to avoid operational costs. Chancellor College only received c.33% of the April salary budget from the government.
- The poultry project in Malawi provides a good template for interaction at the village level
- Malawi has little depth in human resource capability at all levels needed to support livestock conservation projects
- There is significant leverage by the UNDP funds against government and university funding. Dr Ambali estimated the leverage at 2:1
- Dr Ambali is developing a biotechnology newsletter which is to be written in lay-language; it is aimed at government officials and institutional administrators
- The NAC wishes to expand its brief to include all animal issues rather than just the conservation of livestock

### *Suggestions*

- Stock theft be recognised as a major impediment to livestock production
- Chancellor College Molecular Genetics and Irene ARC units to be developed as regional resources

## **COUNTRY REPORT –BOTSWANA**

The evaluators met with the following institutions and individuals during a two-day (24-25 April 2001) visit to the Republic of Botswana:

Director of Research, Ministry of Agriculture  
UNDP Representatives, FAO Desk Officer  
National Conservation Strategy Agency  
FAnGR Advisory Committee Members  
SACCAR  
SADC Secretariat

The feedback from all interviewees was positive about the Project; it was felt to be timely and matched well with National priorities. The Advisory Committee represents a broad spectrum of both public and private sector representatives. The current outputs of training, Breed Field

(characterization) Guide, and project synthesis have all contributed to identified needs at national and community levels.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock Research Division, has assigned a professional staff member on a full time basis as the network coordinator in order to move the work program forward as fast as possible. The Project leverages well over 2:1 in host country contributions. There is clearly a sense of ownership by the stakeholders and they are already using some of the outputs in their own institutions for related work requirements. Institutional linkages appear to be in place, Ministry budgets reflect allocations made to support and assist Project Objectives and additional funding possibilities may become available from other donor sources. Sustainability of the network does not seem to be a problem in Botswana.

Discussions with SACCAR and the SADC Secretariat did not clarify their current reorganization process. However, it was felt that there would not be any implementation or administrative changes to the current FAnGR project. FAnGR would continue to seek approval for its work plans and maintain reporting procedures to one of the four sector coordinating hubs to be developed under the on-going reorganization. This will assure the regionality of the program and provide the mechanism to bring project issues before the Council of Ministers.

The only project problems that were identified dealt with timely cash transfers from UNDP to implementation agencies. These were discussed with UNDP representatives and the National Focal Point Coordinator, hopefully as the project matures these difficulties will be overcome.

## **Conclusions**

Clearly the project in Botswana has been successful, the necessary structures are functional, outputs are being produced in a timely manner and a real sense of ownership and enthusiasm were quite evident. Already plans are under way for the utilization of information that will be produced during this phase to help change certain marketing policies and land distribution schemes.

National Budget allocations as well as staff assignments are in place so that current objectives can be met as well as providing assurance that network activities can and will continue.

## **Lessons Learned**

1. Working with the Media has been very important; positive synthesis has taken place about the project that has produced excellent publicity for the program. Sixty-four district counsellors and four members of parliament have visited indigenous cattle breeding programs as a result of the publicized information about the project.
2. Land Board regulations may be changed to allow farmers using indigenous breeding programs to obtain ranches; currently they cannot be allocated land.
3. DNA analysis to determine breed differences will be required.

## **Suggestions**

1. More assistance needs to be given to identification and linkages with other SADC, IUCN and FAO regional projects dealing with livestock and biodiversity programs.
2. Further orientation and training for the national coordinator(s) in terms of UNDP/FAO fiscal procedures.
3. Considerable care must be taken not to diminish the feeling of national ownership and enthusiasm by tasking the NAC with other donor requirements, however closely related these activities are to FAnGR.
4. If a phase II project is funded, farmer training must also be taken into consideration.

## **COUNTRY REPORT –ZIMBABWE**

Evaluators visited the Republic of Zimbabwe for two days (27/28/01) in order to review project progress and achievements. Visits and interviews were carried out with the following institutions and individuals:

Regional UNDP/FAO Headquarters

University of Zimbabwe

Veterinary Services

Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock Research Division

Agricultural Research Council

National Advisory Committee

Matopos Research Station

ICRISAT, SIMNET

Zimbabwe has been tasked to produce and test the model survey questionnaire and computer framework program for the breeds survey which will be conducted in all collaborating SADC countries. This work has been completed, with the collaboration of ILRI, and the finished products will soon be distributed to all National Focal Points. In addition to this intensive activity the network has also produced a national Breed (characterization) Field Guide, given a regional training program on the application of the survey materials and formalized a program of work with the National Advisory Committee.

The Agricultural Resource Council and the Matopos Field Station have been key in the success of the work done thus far in Zimbabwe. There is clear indication that the project has the full support of its stakeholders, enthusiasm is high as is the sense of ownership. Linkages have been developed between a number of public and private sector organizations that have enabled the program to achieve various objectives even when donor funding was delayed. Host country support in terms of staff time has exceeded expectations.

Interviewees were positive about the project, stated that it fit current and projected needs and as a spin-off were already using some of the results of project activities. There is wide demand for the Breed Field Guides, the University has initiated a new course on survey techniques in its Livestock Masters program and survey results have filled several informational gaps needed now for policy development.

### **Conclusions**

Although the development of survey materials took somewhat longer than anticipated the results have proven quite useful and will be employed by other regional collaborators. The national network utilizes some existing systems, such as the ARC, which have been able to step into the fiscal gap when needed and present direct lines of communication to key Government officials. The placement of the National Focal Point at Matopos positions the program in direct proximity to on-going genetic conservation work and community livestock outreach programs. FAnGR fits a

real need, is seen to be a positive use of stakeholder's resources and will be supported to achieve current objectives and activities funded under the project.

Fiscal shortfalls and lack of human resources are both serious problems in Zimbabwe and will require continued assistance by FAnGR or other donor funded programs if all identified activities and outputs are to be completed in this phase of the project. Stakeholders clearly wish for network sustainability and an active participation with the regional office and its genetic management systems, without donor assistance this may not be possible in the near term.

### **Lessons Learned**

Prior to initiation of the field survey a workshop on Team Building should have been held where the roles of all participants would have been fully explained and understood.

A survey strategy must contain mechanisms for feedback to the farmer as soon as possible after results are obtained.

Care must be taken not to raise farmers' expectations in terms of follow-on activities.

Formal lines of communication must be used about why the survey is taking place including village elders, headmen and/or chiefs.

The technical expertise and project support supplied by ILRI was critical to the development and testing of the survey materials and the required computer programs. This objective component would not have been met without this essential linkage.

DNA analysis will be required to clearly identify breed differences.

### **Suggestions**

Formalize field survey strategies for the other collaborating countries based upon the lessons learned in Zimbabwe.

FAO should assist the NAC in sourcing other biodiversity funding to assist in network operations and the development of a national plan for the management of livestock genetic resources in Zimbabwe.

Further assistance, in phase II, should include data analysis, DNA work, operational databases with active outputs and human resource development.

Review FAO cash disbursements systems to assure timely delivery to network implementation agents.

## **COUNTRY REPORT – SWAZILAND**

### **Introduction**

The national activity on Management of FAnGR in Swaziland is executed by the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Veterinary and Livestock Services) and the University of Swaziland (Department of Animal Production and Health). Its implementation is facilitated by a National Advisory Committee (NAC) and a technical Committee (TC). The NAC is composed of 17 representatives from farmer's associations, individual farmers, NGOs, University of Swaziland and relevant government institutions (Agriculture and Biodiversity in Environmental Division). The

10-member TC is composed of livestock, poultry and environmental specialists from the Ministry of Agriculture, University and Swaziland Environmental Authority.

The evaluation in Swaziland was conducted on 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> April 2001 through individual interviews and group discussions with the National Coordinators, UNDP and FAO Representatives, Principal/Permanent Secretary, NAC and TC members, other staff of the hosting Department and link ministry officials, Biodiversity National Focal Point and other stakeholders.

## **Findings and Problems in the Progress of the Project**

### ***Setting up the enabling structures***

The summary of the activities, indicators and achievements for Swaziland are presented in Table 1. It was observed that many stakeholders were aware of the existence and the objectives of the project in Swaziland and also at regional level. The observations were that the enabling structure through the establishment of the NFP, NAC and TC including the staffing of these were in place for the implementation of the community-based activities.

### ***Implementation of activities and problems encountered***

Nguni cattle are being characterised for conservation as an on-going project. For the current activities on characterisation, the study areas have been identified and the questionnaires developed. However, the whole national activity on characterisation of the FAnGR in Swaziland was adversely affected by the late signing of the Letter of Agreement between FAO and Ministry of Agriculture due to government protocol and that the Ministry did not have a suitable bank account for projects. The outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) disrupted the progress of fieldwork as all resources of the Department of Veterinary and Livestock Services were deployed to assist in containing the disease. Since the disease situation is getting better now, the team has resumed their work.

### ***Sustainability of the project***

As a way of sustaining the project after the funding period, the Ministry of Agriculture, in particular, the Department of Veterinary and Livestock Services will now include this project in their annual budget and also continue identifying or training personnel, through the Government, to assist in running the project activities.

In Swaziland, there is the highest level of collaboration. This project is collaborating with the University of Swaziland to assist on activities. They have a TC of well-qualified members who assist in the implementation. In addition, the project has developed links with the National Biodiversity Focal Point (NBFP) at the Swaziland Environment Authority (SEA). The NBFP is a member of both the NAC and TC and the NFP of Swaziland FAnGR is a member of the Steering Committee of the biodiversity project. The two projects together have produced the Swaziland National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (SBSAP) and a proposal for Biodiversity Enable Activity. In both these, the FAnGR feature highly as one way of sustaining the project beyond funding by donors.

### ***The way forward***

Swaziland is internalising the FAnGR project by the national structures of the Ministry and Department through budgeting.

Collaboration with more organisations and institutions will be fostered and strengthened.

The Ministry will assist the project in setting priorities for the development and initiation of policies and plans on FAnGR in Swaziland, but with a regional perspective.

The Swaziland Environment Authority recommended that the FAnGR project should also be looking at links on issues of biosafety.

Due to the short project period and that implementation of activities is starting now for development of future breeding programmes, the funding should go beyond three years.

### **Conclusions**

The UNDP, FAO, NFP and all collaborators are enthusiastic about the project, although they are not happy with the absence of the South African National Expert at the RFP. The project activities are still on schedule if compared to other SADC countries, despite the problems faced. At country level, mechanisms to sustain the project beyond funding period have been put in place, but an extension period is recommended in view of the regional problem and that community-based activities are just commencing now.

Table 1. Summary of activities, achievements and outputs to date in Swaziland.

Obj. No.	Immediate objectives	Activities	Indicators	Achievements
1	Create a functional coordinating centre for management of FAnGR in Swaziland	<p>Information and communication on FAnGR</p> <p>Set up a NFP office with staff and equipment</p> <p>Institutional capacity building in communication and networking</p> <p>Awareness/stakeholders workshop</p> <p>Development of databank</p> <p>FAnGR documentation</p>	<p>The actual creation of staffed office with functional equipment.</p> <p>Effective communication and networking with others.</p> <p>Launching workshops held</p> <p>Existence of databank</p> <p>Existence of information on FAnGR</p>	<p>The NFP is now ready with functional communication and all equipment, staffed with NCs, Secretary, Vehicle, NAC and TC is also available.</p> <p>Working and effective communication now available to RFP and other NFPs.</p> <p>1 stakeholders workshop and 1 planned for farmers and field staff</p> <p>Three databases are kept for cattle, livestock census and small ruminants</p> <p>Some information is available from the on-going projects on animal resources. Pre-data collected.</p>

2	Establish a sustainable national network for the management of FAnGR	<p>Training and networking</p> <p>Awareness/Stakeholders workshops</p> <p>Institutional capacity building and communication</p> <p>National networking</p> <p>Training workshops</p> <p>Information on breed populations</p>	<p>Training workshops held</p> <p>Sensitisation workshops held</p> <p>Staff training and equipment as well as communication effected.</p> <p>National networking established</p> <p>Breed information available</p>	<p>NCs attended 3 workshops, conducted 2 workshops, total trained is 15 people.</p> <p>1 launching workshop held</p> <p>National networks established through NAC and TC.</p> <p>Pre-data and field guides produced.</p>
---	--	--	--	--

<p>3</p>	<p>Create basic elements of FAnGR work in the country, a databank of production systems,</p>	<p>Breed surveys, training, communication and breed characterisation/evaluation</p> <p>Questionnaires + field guides</p> <p>Breeds surveys</p> <p>Data analysis/interpretation</p> <p>Training workshops</p> <p>National data bank</p> <p>Breeding programmes and conservation planning/action</p>	<p>These are developed</p> <p>Breed surveys completed</p> <p>Awaiting breed surveys</p> <p>Training on surveys held</p> <p>Existing databank available</p> <p>Programmes and conservation and action implemented.</p> <p>Training and recording plans in place</p>	<p>Questionnaires ready now, but field guides sent to RFP already.</p> <p>Breed surveys to be done in August when national livestock statistics are taken</p> <p>Data to be analysed after surveys</p> <p>NCs were trained on breed surveys.</p> <p>Currently, beef cattle, livestock census and small ruminant management are available at the existing databank.</p> <p>Programmes and conservation are not possible without breed surveys.</p> <p>Country plans not available.</p>
----------	--	--	--	---

4	<p>The development and initiation of national policies and plans to guide the management and utilisation of FAnGR</p>	<p>National structures of NFPs, NCs, NAC, TCs, workshops, management/utilisation plans.</p> <p>NFPs, NCs, NACs and TCs</p> <p>Workshops on of stakeholders</p> <p>Production of project proposals for donor funding</p> <p>Linkages with Biodiversity projects</p> <p>National FAnGR management plan</p>	<p>The physical creation of these structures</p> <p>Workshop held</p> <p>Proposals produced and submitted</p> <p>Linkages with Biodiversity project established.</p> <p>FAnGR management plans developed.</p>	<p>NFP, NAC and TC established. NC and alternate appointed.</p> <p>Launching workshop was held and another for farmers and field staff will be held soon.</p> <p>One submitted to the GEF-Biodiversity project for funding.</p> <p>Have developed very strong linkages with Biodiversity project, FAnGR to be part of Biodiversity Unit to be established.</p> <p>Plans will be developed after the breed surveys are completed to document production systems, identify gaps and strategies.</p>
---	---	--	---	---

## **COUNTRY REPORT –LESOTHO**

### **Introduction**

In Lesotho, the NFP is housed in the Directorate of Livestock Services in the Ministry of Agriculture. It is implemented by the Division of Livestock Services and the University of Lesotho's Faculty of Agriculture as collaborators. Here too, the implementation of project activities is facilitated by a National Advisory Committee (NAC). The NAC is composed of representatives from farmer's associations, individual farmers, NGOs, University of Lesotho (Faculty of Agriculture) and relevant government institutions. Unlike in Swaziland, the Biodiversity Focal Point in Lesotho has not yet sent a representative to the NAC

The evaluation in Lesotho was conducted on 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> April 2001 through individual interviews and group discussions with the National Coordinators, UNDP and FAO Representatives, Principal/Permanent Secretary, NAC and other staff of the hosting Directorate. A special stakeholders meeting was held on the evening of 27<sup>th</sup> April to give chance to all to comment on the FAnGR project.

### **Findings and Problems in the Progress of the Project**

#### ***Setting up the enabling structures***

The summary of the activities, indicators and achievements for Lesotho are presented in Table 2. All the stakeholders were aware of the existence and the objectives of the project in Lesotho also at regional because of the Launching and awareness workshop which they participated in when they were setting the country priority areas. The NFP and NAC were formed and the NCs as well as members of the NAC have been appointed by the Principal/Permanent Secretary of Agriculture. The NFP has been staffed. The communication system is functional and working perfectly well.

#### ***Implementation of activities and problems encountered***

A stakeholders workshop was held in February 2000 to create awareness among stakeholders and to solicit support. Priorities were also set at this particular workshop. The breed survey preparations are underway. The field guides were completed and submitted in July to the RFP and two officers attended a breed survey training workshop held in Zimbabwe. These are expected to initiate training on breed surveys at national level. The breed survey has been delayed due to delay in finalisation of the questionnaire by Zimbabwe and ILRI. There is also need for the NFP to provide their budgets to speed up execution of the activity.

The project in Lesotho has started implementing a community-based project on Revitalisation of the Basotho Pony Mare Camps with a view to strengthen mare camps so that they become capable of breeding the horse and increase its population. On this activity, more than 10 Mare Camp Committees have been formed. A horse breeders' strategic workshop of 3 mare camp associations was held on 12-13<sup>th</sup> December 2000 in Maseru and suggestions on the breeding programme suggested and agreed upon by the farmers themselves. The characterisation of the horse has commenced with some selected farmers.

The Mare camps are facing a problem of well-selected top class breeding stallions and also mares. The national stud where farmers can lease stallions faces acute breeding and feeding as well as infrastructural problems, and yet the enthusiasm and demand for stallions by farmers is high. The national stud can potentially produce 10-15 top class stallions a year. The revitalisation and sustainability of the Basotho horse breeding will be dependent initially on the purchasing of selected and tested (for Dorine disease) stallions and some financial support to the Basotho National

Pony Horse stud at Ntaba Tseka. This will make the supply sustainable as both the stud and the farmers themselves will be a source of stallions. There is need to produce field guides for horses in Lesotho as the one that was produced does not contain horses. The horse project was approved later after the field guides for other species had already been submitted.

The breeding season of the horse starts in October during short days. By December 2001 when the project is supposed to end, the hoeses will be pregnant and offspring will not be available for the report. An extension is therefore, important. In addition, more than 10 mare camps have been registered and the extra camps will require extra training.

### ***Sustainability of the project***

The Department of Veterinary and Livestock Services of the Ministry of Agriculture through the PS, has strongly promised to include the project on their national budget. Apart from this, the other staff of the Department are expected to continue performing duties required for implementation, including Agricultural Research Department and National University of Lesotho (Faculty of Agriculture. Salaries of these will continue to be paid by their institutions.

The linkages above are primarily serving to sustain implementation of the project. There is need for the PS in the Ministry of Agriculture and PS in Environment Authority to discuss the participation of the Biodiversity Focal Point in Lesotho to attend NAC meetings of the FAnGR project and the NFP of FAnGR project to attend meetings of the Biodiversity project in order to share resources and develop plans and policies together like in other countries.

### ***The way forward***

The Department of Livestock Services through Ministry of Agriculture, should include the project in their annual budgets or in on-going activities on animal genetic resources.

Establish collaboration with the Biodiversity project and the FAO funded Statistics project in the Agricultural Statistics Division for purposes of sharing information on methodologies, processing and feedback during the breed surveys and future project activities.

Due to the short project period and that implementation of activities is starting now for development of future breeding programmes, the funding should go beyond three years so that the Farmers Mare Camp Associations and the Basotho Pony Horse Stud are empowered to stand on their own for supply of stallions and mares to farmers.

If funding continues, cataloguing of the breeds and capacity building as well as priority areas and gaps should be brought up by government for contribution to plans and policies.

### **Conclusions**

The FAnGR NFP, the Department of Livestock Services, the UNDP and FAO have an excellent working relationship. All collaborators and stakeholders are enthusiastic about the project, although they are not happy with the absence of the South African National Expert at the RFP. The project activities are still on schedule if compared to other SADC countries, but the collaboration with the Biodiversity project is of importance for sustainability at national level. At country level, mechanisms to sustain the project beyond funding period will be put in place, but an extension period is recommended in view of the regional problem and that community-based activities are just commencing now.

Table 2. Summary of activities, achievements and outputs to date in Lesotho

Obj. No.	Immediate objectives	Activities	Indicators	Achievements
1	Create a functional coordinating centre for management of FAnGR in Lesotho	<p>Information and communication on FAnGR</p> <p>Set up a NFP office with staff and equipment</p> <p>Institutional capacity building in communication and networking</p> <p>Awareness/stakeholders workshop</p> <p>FAnGR documentation</p>	<p>The actual creation of staffed office with functional equipment.</p> <p>Effective communication and networking with others.</p> <p>Launching workshops held</p> <p>Existence of information on FAnGR</p>	<p>The NFP is now ready with functional communication and all equipment, staffed with NCs, Secretary, Vehicle, NAC and TC is also available.</p> <p>Working and effective communication now available to RFP and other NFPs.</p> <p>1 stakeholders workshop held in February 2000</p> <p>National databank only available for the pony horse</p> <p>Some information is available from the on-going projects on animal resources.</p>

2	Establish a sustainable national network for the management of FAnGR in Lesotho	<p>Training and networking</p> <p>Awareness/Stakeholders workshops</p> <p>Institutional capacity building and communication</p> <p>Planning/stakeholders workshop</p> <p>National networks</p> <p>Information on breed populations</p>	<p>Training workshops held and equipment as well as communication effected.</p> <p>Sensitisation workshops held</p> <p>National networking established</p> <p>Breed information available</p>	<p>2 NCs each attended 2 workshops, and conducted 1 workshop for the mare camp breeders associations. Village level training programme initiated April to end in July 2001.</p> <p>1 launching workshop held</p> <p>National networks established through NAC and TC, but they need strengthening.</p> <p>Pre-data and field guides produced.</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<p>3</p>	<p>Create basic elements of FAnGR work in Lesotho</p>	<p>Breed surveys, training and breed characterisation/evaluation</p> <p>Questionnaires or survey protocols</p> <p>Breed field guides</p> <p>Training workshops</p> <p>Breeds surveys</p> <p>Data analysis/interpretation</p> <p>National data bank</p> <p>Breeding programmes and conservation planning/action</p> <p>Training plans and recording systems</p>	<p>Protocols developed and ready.</p> <p>Completed field guides</p> <p>Training on surveys held</p> <p>Breed surveys completed</p> <p>Data analysed/interpreted</p> <p>Databank developed.</p> <p>Programmes and conservation and action implemented.</p> <p>Training and recording plans in place</p>	<p>Questionnaires ready now and awaiting budget development and submission.</p> <p>Field guides sent to RFP already.</p> <p>Enumerators to be trained in June.</p> <p>Breed surveys to be done in July to August together with Agricultural Statistics Division.</p> <p>Data to be analysed after surveys</p> <p>Awaiting breed surveys..</p> <p>Programmes and conservation are not possible without breed surveys.</p> <p>Country plans not available, time to short. For future activities.</p>
----------	---	--	--	--

4	<p>The development and initiation of national policies and plans to guide the management and utilisation of FAnGR</p>	<p>National structures of NFPs, NCs, NAC, TCs, workshops, and management/utilisation plans</p> <p>Establish NFPs, NCs, NACs and TCs</p> <p>Workshops on of stakeholders</p> <p>Production of project proposals for donor funding</p> <p>Linkages with Biodiversity projects</p> <p>National FAnGR management plan</p>	<p>The physical creation of these structures</p> <p>Workshop held</p> <p>Proposals produced and submitted</p> <p>Linkages with Biodiversity project established.</p> <p>FAnGR management plans developed.</p>	<p>NFPs, NACs and TCs established and functional. NCs appointed</p> <p>Launching workshop was held.</p> <p>None completed.</p> <p>Have developed very strong linkages with Biodiversity project, FAnGR to be part of Biodiversity Unit to be established.</p> <p>Plans will be developed after the breed surveys are completed to identify production systems and gaps as well as strategies.</p>
---	---	---	---	---

## **ANNEX TWO – TERMS OF REFERENCE**

### **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**

Project of the Southern African Development Commission, SADC

#### **MID-TERM EVALUATION OF PROJECT RAF//97/032**

#### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

March 2001.

Project Number:	RAF/97/032/A/01/12
Title:	The Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources In the SADC Region.
Duration:	3 years
Project site:	14 SADC countries; based in Pretoria, South Africa
ACC/UNDP sector and sub-sector:	063 – Livestock and Livestock Products
Government implementing agency:	Various
Primary Target Beneficiaries:	Members of SADC Region
Executing agency:	Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO
Starting date:	4 May 1999
Expected date of completion:	4 May 2002
UNDP inputs:	US \$2.262 million (AOS not included)
Government inputs:	(in kind)



**MANAGEMENT OF FARM ANIMAL GENETIC RESOURCES IN THE SADC REGION**

RAF/97/032

National Department of Agriculture. Private Bag XI38, Pretoria, South Africa

TEL: (27-12) 319-7424/7622; FAX: (27-12) 329-7220

Email: [sadc-fangr@fao.co.za](mailto:sadc-fangr@fao.co.za)

## 1. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Southern African Development Community (SADC) has in the past two decades made significant improvements in agriculture and natural resources management. However, periodic food deficits still remain a serious problem in many of the countries in the region, resulting in large imports of agricultural products including livestock and livestock products. The contribution of livestock to household food security and welfare can be estimated best by its ability to positively influence incomes and food production for the rural majority. For the sector to do this more effectively, the region and indeed national governments need to provide an enabling environment by developing and implementing appropriate policies and support systems necessary for the proper management of farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR). SADC continues to place great emphasis on agricultural development through sustainable use of the region's natural resources. Similarly, the SADC strategy for Livestock Production and Animal Disease Control identifies as one of its objectives; sustainable use and improvement of farm animal genetic resources and breeding methods, with emphasis on indigenous livestock. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Global Strategy for the Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources (Global Strategy) provided an excellent framework within which the region could develop its own strategy for sustainable use, improvement and management of its farm animal biodiversity. Within the context of the Global Strategy, the SADC region seeks to build the institutional capacity of individual countries and the region by putting in place structures, which will enable implementation of long-term policies and strategies for the management and conservation of farm animal genetic resources.

The project on *Management of Farm Animal Genetic Resources in the SADC Region* derives its legitimacy from the following:

### *SADC guiding principles*

Farm animal biodiversity:

- Is a natural resource base that provides a livelihood to the majority of the rural communities in the SADC region.
- Contributes substantially to food and agricultural production in the SADC region.
- Contributes to improved health and nutrition of the peoples of SADC particularly those of children, nursing and expectant mothers and the sick.
- Offers the best opportunities to raise incomes, improve food security and alleviate poverty in the region.
- Is in its own right, a renewable resource base, that when managed properly can serve indefinitely, future generations.

This project initiated in 1997 by SADC and FAO became operational on May 5, 1999 based in Pretoria South Africa, and is hosted by the National Department of Agriculture on behalf of the SADC countries. It is an institution-building project funded by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and implemented on behalf of SADC countries by the FAO. The project is designed to put in place a Regional Focal Point that will co-ordinate regional activities and establish a sustainable network for FAnGR management in the SADC region. In addition, the project is to establish national structures to coordinate, develop and implement long-term strategies for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the countries.

### **Project Goal.**

The aim of this project is to strengthen the institutional capacity of the SADC region by putting in place regional and national structures, which will enable proper management of farm animal genetic resources, to improve the living standards of the people of the SADC region and meet food security objectives.

### **Development Objectives**

The project has four major objectives: Immediate Objective 1: Create a functional co-coordinating centre for the management of farm animal genetic resources (FAnGR) in the SADC sub-region. Immediate Objective 2: Establish a sustainable sub-regional network for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the SADC countries. Immediate Objective 3: Create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of breed information, a databank of production systems, improved training in FAnGR work and the rational use of recording systems. Immediate Objective 4: The development and initiation of individual country's policies and plans to guide the management and utilization of farm animal genetic resources.

### **Planned Major Outputs**

- An inventory of country and regional-level preservation approaches for breeds of all species at risk.
- A regional databank of FAnGR developed and accessible to all regional institutions and other interested parties.
- National plans for the management of FAnGR developed in all countries and the most urgent actions implemented.
- A regional network on FAnGR developed and critical support services put in place.
- The creation of a group of personnel trained in FAnGR work in the region and in each country.
- The creation of a National Focal Point and the existence of a National Co-ordinator in each country.

- A regional policy developed on the exchange and trade in FAnGR and its legal implications.
- Characterisation of the main regional production systems completed and a programme to characterise the major livestock breeds of the region instigated.
- A sustainable regional focal point for the management of farm animal genetic resources.

## Major Activities and Outputs to Date

### (a) Major Activities

A strategy to facilitate implementation of activities was developed by the Steering Committee at the inception of the project. This strategy divides project technical activities into the following broad areas, which address specific objectives of the project:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Objectives addressed</u>
1. Breed Surveys <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of questionnaires and field guides;</li> <li>• breed surveys;</li> <li>• data analysis;</li> <li>• interpretation of results.</li> </ul>	3
2. Breeding Program and Conservation Planning and Action <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• development of concept notes for projects on breed multiplication, conservation and relevant support programmes;</li> <li>• development of breeding objectives and strategies for most important species;</li> <li>• development of a framework for recording systems for smallholders;</li> <li>• development of FAnGR management plans for important species.</li> </ul>	3 and 4
3. Training in FAnGR Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• training on DAD-IS;</li> <li>• surveying methods and tools;</li> <li>• community Based Management of FAnGR;</li> <li>• livestock recording;</li> <li>• policy maker's workshop.</li> </ul>	2,3 and 4
4. Information and Communication on FAnGR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• awareness/stakeholders workshops;</li> <li>• development of a databank;</li> <li>• FAnGR library/documentation;</li> <li>• development of a SADC FAnGR website</li> <li>• institutional capacity building in communication and networking.</li> </ul>	1,2,3 and 4
5. Breed Characterization and Preliminary Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• description of production environments;</li> <li>• physical description of FAnGR;</li> <li>• performance and evaluation/information;</li> <li>• monitoring of breed populations;</li> <li>• evaluation/information on adaptive traits;</li> <li>• identification of main breed uses.</li> </ul>	3 and 4

6. Developing FAnGR Management Policy

1

- development of guidelines for national policies on management of FAnGR;
- development of guidelines for a regional policy on FAnGR.

(b) Major Outputs to date

A Regional Focal Point (RFP) for the management of farm animal genetic resources has now been established within the National Department of Agriculture and is fully operational. In addition, National Focal Points (NFPs) to coordinate FAnGR activities have been established within national institutions in the thirteen (13) countries participating in the project. To enhance communication and networking among the countries, the NFPs were provided with communication and computing equipment and they now all have email and Internet facilities operating. This development has greatly improved communication within the regional network as well as access to the global databank on animal genetic resources. Formal linkages have also been established with international organizations such as the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI), OAU/IBAR and GTZ. ILRI and OAU/IBAR participate in the project Steering Committee as Permanent Observers.

Countries in the region have now started implementing activities to characterize, improve and conserve indigenous breeds of farm animals. In implementing these activities, the project emphasizes the concept of community-based management, originally developed for natural resources management. It is anticipated that this method of community participation will help develop ownership of the program by countries and communities and hence facilitate sustainability. In addition it gives a better chance to improve household food security and welfare. As part of the program on information, communication and advocacy, a 16 minutes video on animal genetic resources management, with a special focus on food security, local knowledge and gender has been produced as a joint activity with two other FAO projects.

A summary of project achievements and outputs to date is presented in the following table.

SUMMARY OF ACHIEVEMENTS AND OUTPUTS TO DATE		
Immediate objectives	Indicators	Achievements
<p><b>Obj. 1</b> <i>Create a functional coordinating center for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the SADC sub-region.</i></p>	<p><i>1.1 The physical creation of a staffed office with all the equipment installed and functional</i></p> <p><i>1.2 Existence of a working databank of breeds and systems found in the region.</i></p> <p><i>1.3 Existence of a working library</i></p> <p><i>1.4. Production of the draft Regional Policy Working Party Report</i></p>	<p><b>1.1. <u>The RFP is now fully operational but still awaits appointment of the Regional SADC Coordinator by the host (the Government of South Africa).</u></b></p> <p><i>1.2. Survey protocols have been developed for the region and were tested in Zimbabwe.</i></p> <p><i>1.3. A regional database for FAnGR literature is currently being developed as a virtual library.</i></p>

<p><b>Obj. 2</b></p>	<p><i>Establish a sustainable sub-regional network for the management of farm animal genetic resources in the SADC countries.</i></p>	<p><i>2.1 Three annual workshops held</i></p> <p><i>2.2 Installation of working communication equipment in each National Focal Point and persons trained to use it</i></p> <p><i>2.3 Existence of a functional network linking all countries in SADC and providing information on FAnGR.</i></p> <p><i>2.4 Up dated information about regional breed populations on Global Databank</i></p> <p><i>2.5 Two information workshops held for planners</i></p>	<p><i>2.1. Two regional training workshops have already been conducted on management of information for FAnGR and breed surveys.</i></p> <p><i>2.2. Communication equipment and facilities are already in place in 13 NFPs. All NFPs now have access to fax, email and Internet facilities.</i></p> <p><i>2.3 FAnGR network between countries has been established and is being strengthened. Linkages have also been developed with international organizations such as ILRI, OAU/IBAR and GTZ. Development of the SADC livestock website for dissemination of information is currently underway.</i></p> <p><b><i>2.4. Countries have now completed draft field guides for breeds found in the region.</i></b></p>
----------------------	---	---	--

<p>O b j .3</p>	<p><i>Create the basic elements of farm animal genetic resource work in the SADC region; a databank of breed information, a databank of production systems, improved training in FAnGR work and the rational use of recording systems.</i></p>	<p>3.1 Surveys undertaken in all countries</p> <p>3.2 Production of a regional databank on FAnGR</p> <p>3.3 A regional training plan</p> <p><b>3.4 A regional recording plan in place</b></p>	<p><b>3.1 Breed surveys for all countries are due to start in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of this year following the recent completion of regional survey protocols and training.</b></p> <p><b>3.2. A regional databank, compatible with the global databank DAD-IS, currently being developed.</b></p>
<p>O b j .4</p>	<p><i>The development and initiation of individual country's policies and plans to guide the management and utilization of farm animal genetic resources.</i></p>	<p>4.1 Functional National Focal Points formed in each country</p> <p>4.2. The production of a National Farm Animal Genetic Resources Plan (NP) in each country</p> <p>4.3. Initiation of activities outlined in the National Plans</p> <p>4.4. The production of concept notes for further projects and identification of donors with each country</p> <p>4.5. Production of training plans and recording scheme requirements in each country</p>	<p>4.1 Thirteen (13) countries now have functional NFPs.</p> <p><b>4.2 Country reports and outputs of the process on the state of FAnGR (to be carried out under the auspices of the Global Strategy), will provide the basic information needed to develop NPs.</b></p> <p><b>4.3. Nine (9) countries have already initiated national activities for the conservation, characterization and improvement of indigenous breeds.</b></p>

## **Major Problems Identified by Management**

The Government of South Africa is still in the process of identifying a person to fill in the long vacant position of National Expert. SADC together with FAO have repeatedly raised concerns with the Government regarding this delay. The continuing absence of the National Expert poses a potentially serious problem in sustaining regional coordination at the end of the funding period. More over, with various countries now implementing technical activities, the RFP is seriously in need of a second professional person to assist in monitoring activities in these countries.

### *2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION*

At the mid-point of the project, the evaluation is intended to make recommendations for any necessary changes in the overall design and orientation of the project and make detailed recommendations on the work-plan for the remainder of the project.

The evaluation will determine performance of the project in attaining the objectives outlined in the Project Document. This will include an assessment of progress made in implementation of the project when measured against the outputs set forth in the document. The report will provide to all the stakeholders (funding agency, beneficiaries and executing agency), an indication of the extent to which progress has been made towards achieving the objectives of the project as well as provide a guide to any necessary adjustments and future opportunities for the SADC FAnGR program. Lessons learnt from the project will be used to support future work within the region and the rest of sub Saharan Africa. Conclusions of the evaluation will have long-term implications on the SADC FAnGR program both at regional and country level.

### *3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION*

The mission will assess progress in the following areas:

1. Relevance of the project to development priorities and needs by reviewing the objectives and underlying assumptions and the realism of their expected results in the period that the project has been operational and is expected to run.
  - i) Assess whether the results meet realistic expectations and objectives.
  - ii) Examine the continuing relevance of the project goal and objectives to priorities of the region and participating countries.
  
2. Quality, clarity and adequacy of project design including:
  - i) Clarity and logical consistency between, inputs, activities, outputs and progress towards achievement of objectives (quality, quantity and time-frame).
  - ii) Realism in the specification of obligations of the beneficiary.
  - iii) Likely cost-effectiveness of the project design.

3. The efficiency and adequacy of project implementation and management, in particular; the role of FAO as the implementing agency and the project manager in ensuring accountability and measurable results and; the role and support of the host institution for the Regional Focal Point as well as that of participating countries for the NFPs. In addition the adequacy of monitoring and reporting will also be assessed.
4. Project results, including a full systematic assessment of outputs produced to date (quantity and quality as compared with work plan and progress towards achieving the immediate objectives). The mission will specially review the status and quality of work:
  - i) The extent to which technical activities being implemented go towards meeting the objectives of the project,
  - ii) whether there is likely to be any impact in influencing people's attitudes and actions in the management of farm animal biodiversity and its conservation,
  - iii) measures being taken to sustain these and similar efforts in the countries and the region and
  - iv) short and medium term work plans of the countries to see how they contribute towards meeting the objectives of the project.
5. The regional and in-country coordinating mechanisms for the FAnGR activities:
  - i) Determine the extent if any, to which country networks for FAnGR, have been created and functioning,
  - ii) examine the cooperation achieved between institutions and organizations especially the ability of the National Focal Point and the Advisory Committee to leverage support of institutions within the country,
  - iii) assess the ability of the Regional Focal Point in coordinating and strengthening the regional network and cross country activities and
  - iv) assess the extent to which the Regional Focal Point has established linkages with other institution/organizations outside the SADC region.
6. The prospects for sustaining the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project. The mission should examine in particular:
  - i) The effectiveness of the project and the extent to which it has strengthened the technical and institutional capacity of participating SADC countries towards better management and conservation of animal genetic resources,
  - ii) changes and improvements in the institutional structures, policy framework and the human resource capacity in selected countries to determine progress and changes towards better management of farm animal genetic resources and

- iii) the extent to which efforts to attain long-term sustainability of the FAnGR program within the SADC region and in individual SADC member countries have or have not been successful and the likelihood of such sustainability being achieved.

7. The cost effectiveness of the project.

8. Examine major factors that have facilitated or impeded progress towards achieving project outputs.

Based on the above analysis the mission will draw specific conclusions and make proposals for any necessary further action by SADC and/or FAO/UNDP to ensure sustainable development, including any need for additional assistance and activities of the project prior to its completion. In addition, the mission will make specific recommendations for any reorientation of the project work and follow-up of project initiatives to maintain activities and momentum for FAnGR management and conservation program in the region. The mission will also draw attention to any lessons of general interest. Any proposal for further assistance should include precise specifications of objectives and the major suggested outputs and inputs.

#### 4. COMPOSITION OF THE MISSION

The Mission shall comprise of three independent consultants, viz. Representatives of the UNDP (donor), FAO (executing agency) and SADC (beneficiary). The UNDP, FAO, and SADC will nominate their respective representatives to the mission. The Representative from UNDP will assume the role of the Mission Leader. The Project CTA will be attached to the mission as a resource person, and will accompany the mission on visits to participating countries.

Candidates who have previously been involved with elements of project design, implementation, supervision and management will not be eligible. In addition to the limits imposed by employment (as described above), the members of the mission should be experienced in project evaluation, familiar with the design and implementation of field projects (with international organisations), skilled and knowledgeable with management, organisation and with some background knowledge and experience of animal production in general and animal genetics/breeding. The members of the mission are required to have good communication skills in written and spoken English.

#### 5. METHODOLOGY AND CONSULTATIONS

The mission will maintain close liaison with the representatives of the donor and FAO and the concerned national and regional agencies, as well as with project staff. Although the mission should feel free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of SADC, UNDP or FAO.

Information will be gathered through review of documents, group and individual interviews and discussions including site visits. More specifically, the evaluation will be based on the following sources of information:

(1) Structured interviews with representatives from all the three stakeholders:

- Relevant persons from institutions and farmers in SADC countries to be visited.

- National Advisory Committees.
- SADC Livestock Sector Coordinating Unit.
- SADC Secretariat.
- National Department of Agriculture - South Africa.
- UNDP South Africa and in countries to be visited.
- FAO South Africa and in countries to be visited.

(2) A review of documents related to the project such as the project document, all project progress reports, the report from the Tripartite Review, the brochure, country reports etc.

(3) Visits to at least five other countries. It is suggested that the mission visits Zimbabwe, Swaziland, Lesotho, Botswana and Malawi. One member of the mission will visit Zimbabwe and Botswana, one member Swaziland and Lesotho and the third member will visit Malawi including institutions/organizations in South Africa. The CTA will accompany the mission to Zimbabwe and Botswana. In each country the National Coordinator of the project will be attached to the mission as a resource person.

#### 6. *TIMING AND ITINERARY OF THE MISSION: APRIL 23 – MAY 4, 2001.*

The mission will include three phases: Phase 1 will be the preparation of the evaluation/assess methodology based on a review of documents and interviews in South Africa. This phase will also include briefing and debriefing at the FAOR-South Africa as well as discussions with relevant people in the country. Phase II will consist of country visits to review documents and hold interviews/discussions with National Advisory Committees and other stakeholders. The National Coordinators will provide information on institutions and persons to be visited. Phase III: The mission shall return to Pretoria to prepare and submit the report to the FAOR and UNDP offices in South Africa.

This report will include the findings, conclusions and recommendations.

	Date	Activity
(1)	April 21/22	Arrival in Pretoria
(2)	April 23	Briefing at FAO, UNDP and Review of documents
(3)	April 23 - 24	Meetings with Project Management, NDA and other institutions
(4)	April 24	One Team member departs for Zimbabwe and Botswana One Team member departs for Lesotho and Swaziland
(5)	April 25	One Team member departs for Malawi
(5)	April 28	All members return to Pretoria
(6)	April 29-May 4	Preparation of the Report
(7)	May 2	Presentation of draft report
(8)	May 4	Presentation of draft final report
(9)	May 5/6	The team departs.

#### 7. REPORTING

The mission will be fully responsible for the preparation of a report, which reflects the independent but joint views of the members of the Mission; these views may not necessarily reflect the views of SADC, the UNDP or FAO.

The report will be written in conformity with the following standard headings:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

FINDINGS

- Project objectives and their relevance
- Project design
- Project management and implementation
- Project activities and outputs
- Project effects, impact and sustainability
- Cost effectiveness of the project

CONCLUSIONS

LESSONS LEARNED

RECOMMENDATIONS

The report will be completed, to the extent possible, in South Africa and the findings and recommendations fully discussed with all concerned parties and wherever possible consensus achieved. The Mission Leader will be responsible for finalisation of the report, which will be submitted to FAOR-South Africa in final form within two weeks after completion of the mission. The report will be submitted typed and on diskette, preferably in Word (version 6.0) or equivalent. FAO will submit the report to the UNDP, SADC and National Department of Agriculture in South Africa for comment.

The Mission Leader will also be responsible for completion of the FAO/UNDP Project Evaluation Information Sheet.

## **ANNEX THREE – BACKGROUND DOCUMENT LIST**

### MID TERM EVALUATION OF PROJECT RAF/97/032

---

---

#### REFERENCE:

A: AGENDA

B: TERMS OF REFERENCE

C: PROJECT DOCUMENTS

- 1 Strategy For Implementation Of Activities
- 2 Inception Report
- 3 Project Budget

D: 1<sup>st</sup> SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT- NOVEMBER 1999-11-23

- E:
1. RESULTS ORIENTED ANNUAL REPORT – JANUARY 2000
  2. Annual Programme Report

F: 2<sup>nd</sup> SEMI-ANNUAL REPORT: MAY-NOVEMBER 2000

- G:
1. 1<sup>st</sup> TRIPARTITE REVIEW REPORT: 5<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2000
  2. SACCAR Report
  3. Results Oriented Annual Report January 2001

H: THE PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE FOR THE  
MANAGEMENT OF FARM ANIMAL GENETIC RESOURCES IN THE SADC REGION

1. Minutes Of The First Steering Committee Meeting – July 5-8, 1999
2. Minutes Of The Second Steering Committee Meeting 13-14 April 2000
3. REPORTS ON STAKEHOLDERS MEETINGS

I: TRAINING WORKSHOPS

J: COUNTRY PROJECT BRIEFS  
Botswana  
DRC

Lesotho  
Malawi  
Mauritius  
Mozambique  
Namibia  
South Africa  
Swaziland  
Tanzania  
Zambia

---

---