

## PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

(If Logical Framework is attached to the PCR, questions marked '(\*)' need not be completed)

### A: BASIC DATA

COUNTRY: <b>BOLIVIA</b>	SECTOR: <b>Agriculture and livestock</b>	MIS CODE
PROJECT/PROGRAM TITLE: <b>Dairy Cattle Nutrition Project</b>		
BRIEF DESCRIPTION: <b>Support to the Dairy Farmers' Association of Santa Cruz (FEDEPLE) for the provision of advice and training in the field of animal nutrition</b>		
LEVEL APPROVED BY:	DATE APPROVED:	

### B: OUTPUTS OF IMPLEMENTATION PHASE

1: INITIAL (\*): *(if there is a Logical Framework if there is a Logical Framework (LF), extract from outputs line; for Programme Aid or ATP, extract from appropriate approval document; for Process Projects, insert whatever outputs existed at start of project - if this is not possible insert earliest available outputs.)*

1. Obtain data on chemical composition of local feeds
2. Formulate improved feed rations for Dairy industry
3. Develop recommendations on improved feeding practices appropriate to local conditions
4. Work with small-scale farmers to evaluate these recommendations
5. Prepare extension leaflets on feeding and grazing management for small-scale farmers
6. Train local staff in improved principles of animal nutrition

2: AMENDMENTS: *(where outputs have been revised over the lifetime of the project insert the most recently revised set of outputs).*

1. Data on chemical composition and quality of local feeds and formulation of rations
2. Cost-effective feed rations for the dairy industry incorporated into the FEDEPLE expansion programme
3. Extension leaflets and other publicity/training materials on feeding and grazing management for small-scale farmers
4. Trained local staff in improved principles of animal nutrition and dairy business management
5. Effectiveness of technology transfer of improved animal feeding practices to farmers assessed and project impact measured

6. **Links with other DFID-funded projects in the area established**

3: IF OUTPUTS HAVE BEEN AMENDED GIVE REASONS WHY:

1. **Project extended to support expansion of FEDEPLE into new areas**

2. **To match new opportunities to enhance project impact**

4: **ACHIEVEMENT:** *(mark with an 'x'. If outputs have been amended give two ratings: one against the initial output (I) and one against the latest revised outputs (R))*

	I	R
Outputs completely realised	X	X
Outputs largely realised		
Outputs partially realised		
Very limited realisation of outputs		
Outputs completely unrealised - project abandoned		

**EXPLAIN AND COMMENT:**

**Project has matched FEDEPLE expansion programme by providing support in 2 new areas: San Javier and Samaipata. It is assumed that improvements in agribusiness management will follow after the completion of the current (September) agribusiness consultancy.**

**C: FINANCIAL PROFILE**

1: INITIALLY APPROVED ODA TOTAL COMMITMENT (*in £'000s*):

2: TOTAL ODA COMMITMENT AFTER ANY SUBSEQUENT AMENDMENTS (*in £'000s*):

3: EXPENDITURE PROFILE (*by financial year in £'000s*):

FY:	FY 1	FY 2	FY 3	FY 4	FY 5	FY 6	FY 7	FY 8	Total
Initial Commitment, Forecast:									
Actual Expenditure:									

4: WHEN COMMITMENT CHANGES WERE SOUGHT, WERE THEY PROPERLY JUSTIFIED AND EXPLAINED? (*enter Yes or No*):

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT:

5: ACTUAL EXPENDITURE AS % OF INITIALLY APPROVED COMMITMENT:

6: ACTUAL EXPENDITURE AS % OF COMMITMENT AFTER AMENDMENTS:

**D: MONITORING AND PHYSICAL PROGRESS REPORT**

<b>1: PROPOSED MONITORING</b>		<b>ACTUAL MONITORING</b>	
<b>Monitoring Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>	<b>Monitoring Date</b>	<b>By Whom</b>
Annual supervisory visits, the first to be within 2-3 months of TCO arrival	Dr M Gill	October 1994 August 1996  September 1997	Dr M Gill Dr M Gill, Mr G Gilman, Ms D Brooks Dr M Gill Mr G Gilman
 Annual	 Senior Animal Health & Production adviser	 October 1995 (1 day)	 Dr L M Bell

WAS MONITORING ADEQUATE? (enter Yes or No): **Yes**

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT: **Monitoring greatly facilitated by advisers speaking Spanish. 1995 supervisory visit was not deemed necessary.**

**2: IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THE OUTPUTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE WERE ACTIVITIES/INPUTS:**

(enter a rating between 1 and 5; 1 = very good, 5 = very poor)

		To achieve initially intended outputs (up to the time of any change)		To achieve revised outputs (if applicable, subsequent to any change)	
		ODA Activities/Inputs	Recipient Government Activities/Inputs	ODA Activities/Inputs	Recipient Government Activities/Inputs
(a)	Appropriate?	1	1	2+	1
(b)	Sufficient?	1	1	1	3++
(c)	Timely?	1	1	1	1
(d)	Well-coordinated?	1	1	1	3++
(e)	Efficiently procured and delivered?	1	1	2+	1

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT:

Initial Outputs:

**+ First agribusiness consultancy was disappointing, perhaps partly due to the fact that consultant could not be briefed directly in London/Chatham.**

Revised Outputs:

**++ FEDEPLE support to first agribusiness consultancy was disappointing**

**3: INITIALLY PLANNED PHYSICAL COMPLETION DATE: 15 August 1996, subsequently extended to October 1997**

**4: ACTUAL PHYSICAL COMPLETION DATE: Phase 1: August 1996, Extension: 31 October 1997**

Project Completion Report

5: ACTUAL IMPLEMENTATION TIME AS % OF INITIALLY PLANNED IMPLEMENTATION TIME:  
**100% for phase 1 & 100% for extension**

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT:

**All original outputs were achieved within original deadline, new outputs were added for project extension and these were achieved within the planned time limit.**

**E: CONDITIONS**

*(Set out each individual project condition - initial and subsequent amendments - in the table below and for each rate whether the condition was:*

- 1 = Wholly met
- 2 = Largely met
- 3 = Partially met
- 4 = Largely unmet
- 5 = Not met at all

*For ratings 1 and 2 only assess to what extent compliance had on the achievement of objectives, and for 3-5 only assess to what extent the lack of compliance had on the achievement of objectives:*

- A = Major Positive Effect
- B = Significant Positive Effect
- C = Minor/Negligible Effect
- D = Significant Negative Effect
- E = Major Negative Effect

*Conditions can be extracted from intergovernmental agreement, Logical Framework, or approval document.*

*Additional space will be created within the table if insufficient space exists).*

CONDITIONS	COMPLIANCE (1-5)	For Rating:	
		1,2	3,4,5
		Effect (A-E)	Effect (A-E)
Initial:			
(a) <b>ADEPLE (later FEDEPLE) identifies suitable counterparts</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>B</b>	
(b)			
(c)			
(d)			
(..)			
Subsequent Amendments:			
(a) <b>No amendments</b>			
(b)			
(c)			
(d)			
(..)			

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT:

**The support given by FEDEPLE to the project as a whole and the TCO in particular was excellent. That support made a major contribution to the success of the project.**

**F: ACHIEVEMENT OF PURPOSE, GOAL AND PIMS MARKERS**

1. **LIKELY ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES** (Set out in the table below: each individual objective against purpose and goal, both initial and subsequent amendment; each individual ODA priority objective assigned together with its PIMS marker {1-4}; and for each rate whether it is:

- 1 = likely to be completely achieved      4 = only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent  
 2 = likely to be largely achieved          5 = unlikely to be realised  
 3 = likely to be partially achieved        X = too early to judge the extent of achievement

Additional space will be created within the table if insufficient space exists).

Immediate Objectives: Purpose		Rating [1-X]
<u>Initial:</u>		
1. Obtain data on chemical composition of local feeds		1
2. Formulate improved feed rations for Dairy industry		1
3. Develop recommendations on improved feeding practices appropriate to local conditions		1
4. Work with small-scale farmers to evaluate these recommendations		1
5. Prepare extension leaflets on feeding and grazing management for small-scale farmers		1
6. Train local staff in improved principles of animal nutrition		1
<u>Subsequent Amendment: Purpose</u>		1
Animal feeding systems diversified and improved through the better utilisation of local natural resources and better practices.		
<b>Wider Objectives: Goal</b>		
<u>Initial:</u>		
Initial		
1. Improved livestock productivity in the Department of Santa Cruz through improved animal feeding practices and hence increased income of dairy farmers.		1
2. Improved utilisation of natural resources in the production of milk.		1
<u>Subsequent Amendment:</u>		
Incomes of small dairy farmers in the Department of Santa Cruz raised through improved milk production		
<b>PIMS Markers assigned to ODA Priority Objectives</b>		
<u>Priority Objectives:</u>	Marker 1-4	

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT (even if X-rated):

**It is assumed that improvements in dairy business management will follow from the current (September 1997) consultancy on agribusiness management. Other objectives have already been realised.**

2. OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT OF IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES/PURPOSE

*(given the ratings in question 1 give an overall rating of immediate objectives/purpose):*

**The overall rating is 1, all immediate objectives, revised as a single Purpose have already been achieved or are expected to be so shortly.**

3: LIST THE CONDITIONS NECESSARY FOR SUSTAINABILITY TO BE ACHIEVED:

1. Counterparts remain in post
2. FEDEPLE can obtain credit on behalf of small-scale producers.
3. Price of milk to consumers remains stable or increases.
4. Demand for milk and milk products increases in line with FEDEPLE projections.

4: DO YOU EXPECT THAT THE PROJECT WILL BE SUSTAINABLE?

*(enter Yes, No or Don't know):*

**There appears to be strong government recognition of the success of the project and support for the future expansion of milk production.**

EXPLAIN AND COMMENT:

*(for example, is project likely to achieve impact not originally envisaged; should the judgement on sustainability be qualified?)*

The only doubts regarding sustainability relate to the responsiveness of the local market and the availability of credit. However, unforeseen benefits in decreasing malnutrition may ensue if present interest in giving free milk to schoolchildren becomes a fact.

**G: PARTICULAR LESSONS FROM IMPLEMENTATION PHASE**

1: WHAT ARE THE MAIN LESSONS ODA CAN LEARN FROM THE IMPLEMENTATION PHASE OF THIS PROJECT?

- (a) Positive aspects which may be replicable:
  - i. **Working directly with beneficiaries rather than intermediate users contributed significantly to the success of the project.**
  - ii. **The benefits from delivering exactly what the producers required.**
  - iii. **The importance of adaptability of the Project manager without compromising his/her technical standards.**
  - iv. **The benefits of working with a commercially focused non-government organisation.**
- (b) Negative aspects which may be avoided in future:
  - i. **More attention should have been paid to local sustainability at the start of the project, e.g. milk marketing infrastructure**
- (c) Other/General lessons:
  - i. **It is not always easy to predict how a market will develop at the start of a project, particularly if macro-economic effects may be significant. However, perhaps the monitoring of such effects should have been included in the TCO's TORs.**