

Mozambique: Family Sector Livestock Development Programme (FSLDP)

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country& Project Name	Mozambique: Family Sector Livestock Development Programme (FSLDP)	
Loan No.:	432-MZ	
Project Id.:	1005	
Board Date	04/12/1996	
Effectiveness Date	February 1998	
Original Closing Date	December 2004	
Final Closing Date	December 2006	
Total Project Cost USD(M)	USD 25.7 million	
IFAD loan USD (M)	USD 19.4 million	
Cofinanciers (if any)	GoM USD 4.3 million; project beneficiaries USD 2 million (this was their expected contribution; actual contribution through labour and material contribution not properly accounted for).	
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture	
Principal Components	The project was initiated by IFAD to support the smallholder livestock sub-sector on basic animal health and management capabilities. As it was incorporated within PROAGRI (the agricultural sectoral programme- , its overall goal became improving the impact and effectiveness of the public agricultural programmes and institutions through supporting environmentally sustainable and equitable growth in rural areas with the aim of reducing rural poverty and improving food security". After project review, project components were reorganised into: i) institutional development; ii) livestock; iii) rural extension; and iv) research.	
Project Performance		
Design	The strategic thrusts of the project (build capacity within provincial offices of agriculture and Common Service Units, and support the Unified Extension System to develop mechanisms for problem identification in consultation with the rural community) were and remained relevant throughout implementation. It was never implemented as originally designed though, as it was soon modified so that it could be integrated in PROAGRI's framework for the mobilization of domestic and foreign resources within a coordinated investment programme. The project was then reviewed in 2000, and changes were made to project activities, to the management responsibilities and implementation procedures were restructured, and project components were reorganised. The project name became PROAGRI-FSLDP and components and sub-components were aligned. At this point, FSLDP's design suffered from the same limits of PROAGRI: over complex, over reliant on the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) institutional capacity and over ambitious as it was expected to cover 4 provinces first and then expand nation-wide.	3
Implementation	An UNOPS Supervision Mission of May 1999 found that the Programme was facing a number of implementation difficulties as a result of its over-complex design, its excessively ambitious implementation schedule, and of constraints faced by the implementation agencies and the Programme's Common Services Unit (CSU). The Programme was jointly reviewed in March/April 2000 by Government of Mozambique (GoM), IFAD and UNOPS (the UN Office for Project Services); the loan agreement was amended and the project became an integral part of PROAGRI, assuming also its overall goal. The Programme's CSU was therefore closed and FSLDP started functioning as integral part of PROAGRI's management. This has made it very difficult to separate the intervention of FSLDP from PROAGRI's contribution. The Community Development Fund was not implemented. No baseline survey or case studies on programme beneficiaries were conducted under PROAGRI-FSLDP, and the PCR reports that the current institutional arrangements and design of the M&E system lacks capacity and appropriate operational setup especially at provincial and lower levels. The project faced the same problems as PROAGRI in relation to its implementation at operational level.	3
Relevance	According to the PCR the objective of the Programme was relevant at the design as well as implementation stages. Given the incorporation of the programme within PROAGRI it must have been relevant to the GoM. Beneficiaries' active participation in project activities, as reported in the PCR, appears to demonstrate their relevance to them.	6
Effectiveness	In the absence of data, it becomes difficult to determine the degree of achievement of the stated objective especially in terms of the impact on beneficiaries. In terms of institutional development, the programme has made commendable contribution. The project appears to have influenced institutional development within the GoM, which	4

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country & Project Name	Mozambique: Family Sector Livestock Development Programme (FSLDP)	
	was one of its main objectives and components. The programme achieved little or nothing in relation to the development of capacity in the private sector to supply inputs and a limited range of clinical services to farmers and rural communities. The Community Development Fund was not implemented and the Competitive Agricultural Research Fund was not fully implemented. In general, the programme seems to have gained momentum at operational level, and in the four pilot provinces, only during its last two years of implementation, which corresponded to the extension period. Nevertheless, as the PCR reports, the lack of baseline or M&E data make the impact of the Programme on beneficiaries and the economy is difficult to determine.	
Efficiency	Information about project costs by component is not available. Expenditures are available on cost category basis only. The assessment of efficiency of programme intervention is difficult to conduct as a result of absence of economic analysis data and information on expenditure by output and activity. This makes it difficult to assess how efficiently resources have been converted into project results. The costs incurred for the local self-help projects were not available. The contributions of the beneficiaries in kind (labour and materials) were not estimated, recorded and converted in terms of monetary values. Considering the lack of data on efficiency and on project achievement of its objectives, efficiency is not rated.	NR
Partner Performance		
IFAD	IFAD has provided sufficient support to the implementation of the FSLDP through supervision missions, timely realization of Interim Review and amendments to the Loan Agreement in order to suit changing circumstances. However, it could have contributed more in areas such as the establishment of a functioning Management Information System (MIS) as was agreed in the Loan Agreement. It could also have collaborated more with the Ministry to conduct baseline surveys and other relevant studies. The opening of the country office IFAD in Mozambique in May 2003 has helped create close working relationships with the Facilitation Unit of FSLDP and the Coordinator of PROAGRI in particular and with the Ministry in general.	4
Cooperating Institution	UNOPS has managed to conduct regular supervision missions that have helped to take corrective measures in programme implementation in collaboration with the Ministry. The supervision missions have conducted field visits, contacted beneficiaries and stakeholders and assisted in taking timely measures. Constructive supervision mission reports were produced. There were no major problems in terms of disbursement and replenishment of funds. As is the case with IFAD, UNOPS could have done much more in terms of promoting the establishment of MIS, conduct of baseline survey and other socioeconomic studies.	4
Government	The Ministry of Agriculture is the main implementing agency. Within this, the FSLDP was implemented as part of the overall sector wide programme utilizing funds through the CFFM and funds attributed to technical assistance, studies and research fund. One weakness registered in the utilization of fund is the inability of the Ministry to use the Competitive Research Fund. In general, there are no serious implementation constraints or problems registered with regard to the FSLDP that are separate from that of PROAGRI. On the other hand, the Ministry did not develop a satisfactory management information system (MIS) to monitor the performance of PROAGRI, including the programme activities and outputs against agreed performance indicators as was indicated in the Loan Agreement. By 2006, the GoM had expended only 36.9% of its expected contribution.	3
NGO/Other		NA
Cofinancier(s)		NA
Combined Partner Performance	<i>Partners appear to have interacted well, given the actions they took to modify the project original design and subsequent activities, although no specific analysis of this is made by the PCR.</i>	4
Rural Poverty Impact		
Physical Assets	The PCR reports promoted self-help local impact projects, especially during the extension period (2005-2206) through construction and rehabilitation of livestock structures. Construction of community pharmacies, rehabilitation of dip tank, construction of improved houses for goats, etc. are among the major outputs registered under the community participation. No quantified information on how many infrastructures was built or how many it benefited. Information too vague to be rated.	NR
Financial Assets	No information provided. NR	NR
Food Security	The four pilot provinces have created a close working environment between extension and livestock activities. The collaboration is mostly in the promotion of improved animal husbandry practices and animal health with special emphasis on Newcastle Disease (ND) control through vaccination. This activity is mostly targeted at	NR

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country& Project Name	Mozambique: Family Sector Livestock Development Programme (FSLDP)	
	smallholders. There are indications that the vaccination campaign against ND has contributed to increases in food security and improving the income of participating smallholder producers. Participation is not quantified in the PCR.	
Environment	There is lack of collaboration between extension and forestry in almost all of the provinces. However, the extension service has actively promoting soil and water conservation; and conducting extension campaigns against uncontrolled bush fire practiced by farmers to clear land for cultivation.	4
Human Assets	Both formal and non-formal training were planned for the 1999-2004 period. Producers were trained as vaccinators and livestock promoters to support the livestock services in their respective areas among others. There is no documented evidence of post-training evaluation that could have allowed to assess to what extent beneficiaries had acquired knowledge and to what extent they applied such knowledge and skills in their tasks. The frontline extension workers and other extension staff in particular and the staff of the MoA in general are regularly sensitized on HIV/AIDS. Through the extension network, MINAG is informing producers about the danger of HIV/AIDS as part of the normal activity of extension. However, more needs to be done in relation to the mitigation aspect of the programme.	3
Social Capital and Empowerment	The status of public extension in terms of working with farmers associations is still limited, in part due to the weak development stage that still characterizes this type of organizations across the country. Most of them still did not have legal status they lack credit opportunities, and need a strong technical and managerial backstopping by both public and non-public extension service providers. The PROAGRI-FSLDP community development fund was not realized in order to allow the implementation of some local development projects involving farmers associations and other groups of farmers. Overall, the PCR reports that in the absence of concrete studies, it became difficult to assess the degree of impact on social capital and people empowerment.	NR
Ag. Productivity	The PCR does not contain much information on agricultural productivity. It reports that a number of technical information and technologies have been disseminated in all districts by public extension, particularly in the four pilot provinces. Although the technology packages had resulted in substantial increase on maize and rice yields (an average of 200 to 300%), the use of only one technology package for each crop across different agro-ecological zones; technical problems related with appropriate use of technological packages among some extension staff and contact farmers; delays in acquisition and distribution of agricultural inputs; as well as market distortion and failures, all had limited the success of the initiative of promoting intensification among smallholders.	4
Institutions and Services	The project has achieved its major impact in helping MoA to develop its institutional capacity in terms of planning, financial management, procurement and asset management areas in which visible impact can be observed within the decentralisation policy of the GoM. This is especially true in relation to the capacity that is created at the central and provincial levels. Much needs to be done in consolidating and improving the capacity at district and lower levels. The support provided by the programme in establishing a unified extension service (UES) is another area. The four pilot provinces of Gaza, Manica, Tete and Nampula have benefited more since they received large portion of the support from the programme, especially in the area of TA. These provinces have created a close working environment between extension and livestock activities.	4
Markets	No information provided.	NR
Rural Poverty Impact		4
Overarching Factors		
Innovation	Under the campaign against Newcastle Disease, the involvement of community vaccinators and livestock promoters are innovative approaches that should be continued and expanded in other areas that did not benefit from the service before.	4
Replicability and Scaling-up	No information provided.	NR
Innovation, Replicability and Scaling-up		5
Sustainability and Ownership	Within the framework of the GoM Plan for Reduction of Absolute Poverty (PARPA) there seems to be a conducive political, policy and economic environment, as the Plan identifies agriculture, rural development and good governance among the 6 priority action areas. There has been a strong donor financial commitment and conviction in PROAGRI I and this is expected to continue in the future. Therefore, there will be sustainable financial support to carry out the delivery of services and the support to the beneficiaries. The sustainability of programme interventions with regard to the farm family operations with improved animal husbandry and disease control depends	3

Item	Assessment Remarks	Rating
Country& Project Name	Mozambique: Family Sector Livestock Development Programme (FSLDP)	
	mainly on the availability of services provided by the public services, the private sector or the producers themselves organized in associations. According to the PCR, the involvement of smallholders during the extension period (2005-2006) is encouraging. Smallholders have shown their willingness in participating and conducting of different demonstrations on improved animal health and husbandry practices and construction of community pharmacy.	
Targeting	The PROAGRI-FSLDP operational area covered the full range of smallholder farming systems within the various agro-ecological zones of the country. The selection of district was based on concentration of smallholders, concentration of livestock, crop and livestock production potential. This targeting approach, which reflected PROAGRI's nation-wide approach, proved over ambitious. Some results in fact appear to have been achieved only in the four pilot provinces.	2
Gender	In the livestock sub-sector, women are engaged in the production of small ruminants and poultry. PROAGRI-FSLDP aimed at establishing the first comprehensive livestock production support system which explicitly included support to small ruminants and poultry production. In addition, the program addresses the principal constraint to expanded village poultry production, i.e. Newcastle disease with the aim of having positive impact on women. Women were direct beneficiaries and were involved as vaccinators in many localities. However, during implementation, gender issues were not formally institutionalized within the Programme in particular and at the MoA level in general.	4
Overall Performance		4
Estimated number of beneficiaries	Not available.	
PCR Quality		
Scope	The PCR covers partially the issues in the guidelines.	5
Quality	The quality of the PCR is not very good, given that the information it contains is provided in absolute terms, with no target or benchmark to assess achievement; but this might be due to an actual lack of information by the project itself.	5
Lessons	Lessons are brief but relevant to an eventual project within the same institutional framework.	4