



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

SUDAN: LAND O'LAKES LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT AND DAIRY COOPERATIVES PROGRAMME (LDDCP) MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT

MAY 28, 2008

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Paula Bilinsky, Team Leader/Evaluation Specialist and James Dunn, Agricultural Specialist, Management Systems International.

SUDAN: LAND O'LAKES LIVESTOCK DEVELOPMENT AND DAIRY COOPERATIVES PROGRAMME (LDDCP) MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT



A subsidiary of Coffey International, Ltd.

Management Systems International

Corporate Offices

600 Water Street, SW
Washington, DC 20024



Contract Number: DFD-I-00-05-00251-00 task order #1

Land O'Lakes: Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Programme (LDDCP)
No. 623-A-00-05-00306-00

LDDCP Implementer: Land O' Lakes (LOL)
LDDCP Evaluation: Management Systems International (MSI)

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	II
PROJECT SUMMARY.....	III
ACRONYMS.....	IV
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	V
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM.....	1
A. Problem Statement	1
B. Intervention	2
III. PURPOSE.....	3
IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	4
V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	5
VI. PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
A. Project Administration	14
B. Overall Project Outcomes	15
C. Cross-cutting Issues	15
D. Addressing the “Yellow Letter”	15
E. Meeting USAID/Sudan Priorities	15
F. Planning for the Future	15
VII. LESSONS LEARNED	16
ANNEX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE	18
ANNEX 2: INTERVIEWEES.....	22
ANNEX 3: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	24
ANNEX 4: FIELD WORK SCHEDULE.....	25

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team is pleased and deeply appreciative of the hospitality and assistance offered by numerous individuals during our two week stay in Southern Sudan to conduct the field portion of the evaluation of the Land O'Lakes Livestock Development and Dairy Development Project. From the staff of the MSI office in Juba to all of the Land O'Lakes staff who accompanied us to the field sites and offered so many insights to the communities in which they are working, we owe deep gratitude. Special mention should be made of the MSI staff in Washington, D.C. who got us off to a good start, specifically Mike Conway and Jill Tirnauer. And to Sam Taddesse, Ami Henson and Ayalew Teshome of MSI in Juba, who so skillfully guided us through the intricacies of the New York Hotel and got us where we needed to go, and for the most part got us back on time. Thanks to Garang for leaving us with an excellent record of the field trip. But we owe special gratitude to Alan King and John Kutwa of Land O'Lakes, who escorted us to numerous officials, rode the skies to Kapoeta with us, navigated roads not always seen and found us a place to sleep, whether in a tent or deluxe hut. It was fun. Mostly we want to recognize all those people under the giant shade trees who took the time to tell us of what they believe and what they hope for and are believers now that cooperatives can be a vehicle to better their lives and those of their children. That was the real special part of our stay in Southern Sudan. We hope this report will be useful as decisions are made for the future and we thank you all.

PROJECT SUMMARY

Land O'Lakes, in collaboration with Vetwork Services Trust is operating the Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Program (LDDCP) through the USAID/REDSO Mission with funding of \$6.2 million for a period of four years, until June 2009. The project operates in the Eastern and Central Equatoria State of Southern Sudan.

USAID CA#623-A-00-05-00306-00

ACRONYMS

CAHW	Community Animal Health Worker
CES	Central Equatoria State
EES	Eastern Equatoria State
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GOS	Government of Sudan
GOSS	Government of Southern Sudan
LDCS	Lainya Dairy Cooperative Society
LDDCP	Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Programme
LOL	Land O' Lakes
MARF	Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries
MCRD	Ministry of Cooperatives and Rural Development
MLTC	Marial Lou Livestock Training Centre
MOFACOS	Mogos Farmers Cooperatives Society
NICODO	Nile Community Development Organization
PMP	Performance Management Plan
RLCS	Riwoto Livestock Cooperative Society
SPLA	Sudan People's Liberation Army
SPLM	Sudan People's Liberation Movement

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In designing a development strategy for Southern Sudan, USAID was primarily driven by the history of the region which was characterized by conflict between the central government in the North which had control over the political and economic systems of the country, and the southern region which was marginalized from the rest of the country. The signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) on January 9, 2005, by the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLA/SPLM) and the Government of Sudan (GOS) ended Africa's longest running conflict. The USAID strategy responds to the significant challenges and many opportunities in supporting the Southern Sudanese transition from war to peace. USAID programs are focused towards the need to successfully implement the CPA, resulting in a just and lasting peace.

Within the context of promoting economic development in Southern Sudan, USAID recognized that livestock remains the mainstay of the economy and culture of the pastoral communities that dominate the region. By working with these communities it would be possible to not only realize the 'peace dividends' of the CPA, but also to promote reintegration efforts and reduce conflicts over time. Based on this recognition, USAID entered into an agreement with Land O'Lakes and its collaborator, Vetwork, a Sudanese NGO, to implement the Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Program (LDDCP) a four year, \$6.198,960 million project.

The major focus of the program was to be the establishment of model cooperatives which would be formed after an intensive educational program. Cooperatives doing cattle marketing were intended to improve livestock productivity and quality through a focus on animal health. The cooperatives were organized to: 1) provide vaccines and drugs for animals prior to marketing; 2) establish livestock quarantine and fattening stations to prepare livestock for market; 3) and strengthen linkages with veterinary care services for members.

Cooperatives dedicated to dairy would focus on processing and the sale of dairy products and other products that may be in demand in local markets. As part of this effort, Land O' Lakes would develop a core of local cooperative employees who will learn how to manage a dairy cooperative.

The purpose of this evaluation is threefold: 1) document successes, lessons learned and obstacles faced by LOL in its implementation of LDDCP; 2) provide recommendations to improve the implementation of the LDDCP and/or for design of a future program in Sudan; and 3) address issues outlined in the "Yellow" rating letter and actions taken by LOL.

FINDINGS

Two and a half years into implementation (the project moved sites partially through the first year) Land O Lakes is on track in regard to establishing cooperatives. Four cooperatives have been established or revitalized. These include the Riwoto Livestock Cooperative Society (RLCS); the Nile Community Development Organization (NICODO); the Lainya Dairy Cooperative Society (LDCS); and the Mogos Farmers Cooperative Society (MOFACOS). RLCS and MOFACOS are multi purpose cooperatives involving both livestock conditioning and marketing and dairy production, while LDCS and NICODO focus exclusively on milk processing and marketing. Officials of the government indicated that they viewed these as models and to be extended to other sectors and other regions.

The evaluation team was informed by Land O'Lakes that their team faced multiple constraints, some inherent in the country context such as lack of literacy among cooperative members and delays due to weather, and some due to management decisions taken by them and by USAID. This apparently influenced LDDCP's performance.

The project has been lagging in meeting some of its performance indicator targets. In addition, the indicators in the current PMP miss the more important contributions that the project is making to the general peace process and understate the true impact of the project on the lives of those involved. As shown below, the number of cattle, sheep and goats conditioned and sold is, however, very small given the size of the project.

	2006	2007	2008 (March)	Cumulative Total
Cattle	0	10	7	17
Sheep & Goats	0	222	270	492

Similarly the volume of milk collected and processed to date is small due to lack of refrigeration system and distance to milk collection points. Organized milk collection started in Lainya only in May 2008. In MOFACOS, Mogos milk collection is expected to commence once solar freezers are installed later in the third quarter of 2008.

	2006	2007	2008 (March)	Cumulative Total
RLCS	64	902	1,150	2,116
NICODO	0	56,128	40,278	96,406

In addition, the numbers of households benefiting from LDDCP created cooperatives are limited. As of this reporting the total number of households benefiting are 208 – RLCS (95), NICODO (107), LDCS (6) and MOFACOS (0). However, these numbers are misleading. They do not include households that benefit from animal health protection. 568 households have benefited from livestock vaccinations. In total, LOL reports that approximately 29,000 animals have been vaccinated and treated.

The question of LDDCP's contribution to the livestock and dairy sector can be answered in two ways. In terms of their impact on the entire sector, it is minimal. The project area covers only a small part of Southern Sudan and it will not expand significantly. The number of beneficiaries and their production is relatively small. For example, co-op membership has been very low. RLCS membership was 60 in by the end of 2007 and rose by 6 new members by the end of March 2008. Membership of MOFACOS stood at 84 by the end of March 2008. LDCS membership was only 12 by the end of March 2008. NICODO is a community-based organization (CBO) and is being transformed into a cooperative.

However, the question can also be answered by reflecting that this is the first livestock cooperative activity to be in place in the state of Eastern Equatoria since the war. Thus the project represents a unique opportunity to provide a positive example of the benefits which security as represented by the CPA provides. The cooperatives appear to be the first opportunity for economic improvement for these communities since the war. Before this Land O'Lakes activity there was no meaningful milk processing and marketing. Fresh milk was not being sold in Kapoeta because of milk fermentation and milk handling hygiene problems. NICODO, formerly the Nile Dairy Cooperative, was not run on a profit basis and suffered a high rate of milk spoilage due to poor milk handling and processing techniques and lack of proper packing. This situation has changed significantly as a result of LOL technical assistance.

CONCLUSIONS

There is no question that the need is great, the people deserving of having an opportunity to improve their own situations and to dare to hope that the future for their children will be better than their own. The responses the evaluation team heard from the beneficiaries echo the USAID/Sudan strategy in many ways. They talked about what the project meant to them in regards to the peace benefits and their reintegration into a nation. This is their view in spite of having not yet seen many of the benefits that come from membership in the cooperative. To date the project has lagged in meeting established targets. However, from what the evaluation team was able to see on the ground at the three cooperatives visited, with the necessary physical structures completed and training for cooperative members increased, the cooperatives could be self-sufficient with adequate technical and economic knowledge to carry on if continued for several years. The evaluation team could not travel to Lainya due to security concerns.

Sometimes indirectly and sometimes directly, LDDCP did contribute to meeting USAID/Sudan priorities. It is the only project in the portfolio that reaches the grassroots level of this area. The project is one of the few activities happening that cooperative members link directly to peace in the area. It is possible to believe that should this project leave the area, their faith in the peace may be shaken.

PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

- The evaluation team believes this project should be extended for 2 or 3 years to allow first phase completion.
- USAID should provide better technical assistance through field visits to the main project sites, timely feedback on quarterly reports, and information sharing in regards to other projects that could support LDDCP work.
- Additional efforts by both USAID and LOL staff to identify resources for literacy and numeracy training is necessary.
- Without a project director full time in country, LOL should review and consider reallocating staff assignments which would allow, at a minimum, the dairy specialist/field coordinator more and higher responsibility in the field. Other adjustments could provide more support to the dairy production and processing efforts. Also, LOL leadership must look for every possibility including multi donor development funds that may be available and would require GOSS support.
- It is important that LOL make a stronger case for the very important accomplishments of the project, including that people are now beginning to believe that they can change their situation.
- To encourage greater youth involvement, USAID and LOL should consider instituting more programs to dialogue about raiding, visits to other communities to discourage raiding, and peace training. Again, seeking out other resources could well lead to micro enterprise type opportunities for youth.
- In looking towards the future, the evaluation team had a number of specific suggestions regarding: feasibility/marketing studies, scholarships for Sudanese students, English language training for cooperative leadership, and optional livestock management techniques to deal with pasture shortages and location of cattle relative to milk processing
- LOL's should put in place a strategy and a management system to address issues raised in the "Yellow Letter"

- USAID should take the lead, or encourage Land O’Lakes, in reallocating budget line items to better reflect needs in the field. This should result in greater project impact.

LESSONS LEARNED

- To the extent possible have a good understanding of the situation on the ground to allow for better design and avoid implementation discoveries. It appears that the LDDCP design document was prepared without a full understanding of the circumstances that would be addressed and that implementation activities were rushed, particularly after USAID changed the location of the project area early in the implementation stage.
- Flexibility is important but too much change slows implementation, wastes effort and can often lead to misunderstanding and disappointment. When USAID decided to move early project activities from Rumbeck to Kapoeta, LOL staff found conditions that they seemed unaware of. Housing was not available and project staff lived in tents for two years. Additionally, decisions were made on selecting sites for the cooperatives which then had to be changed once community members were consulted
- To adequately manage, provide oversight, and make informed decisions from a distance (Nairobi) is difficult at best. On site management and frequent field visits are very important. It appeared to the evaluators that opportunities to make the project more effective were missed because of the Country Manager only being in Southern Sudan 50% of the time. For USAID staff never to have visited project sites seems at best irresponsible.
- Involvement of officials at all levels of government is important. It provides a sense of ownership and support for their priorities which is necessary for the longer term, but can also make implementation easier. The Director General of Planning, Investment and Marketing in the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries reminded the evaluators of his own early involvement in the design of LDDCP and his strong continued support for it. The Minister of Cooperatives stated the project can become a model for cooperative development in Southern Sudan and pledged to work closely with project leadership and the people in the selected communities.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Government of Southern Sudan is at a critical juncture in its development, following years of war that were fought to gain not only independence, but also for the freedom to develop socially and economically. While there are many opportunities, the way forward will not be easy. Engagement of the international community in both the transitional phase and long term development will be essential. The new USAID Southern Sudan strategy has been developed to respond, in partnership with the Government of Southern Sudan, to the significant challenges and many opportunities in supporting the Southern Sudanese from war to peace. Economic development activities will be key to the success of this transition, and agriculture will play a critical role.

In developing cooperatives in Southern Sudan, USAID has an unprecedented opportunity to nourish both the heart and soul of a people emerging from a distant past and who have been left behind in all previous development efforts. This is an opportunity for reaping a genuine peace dividend, including the right of people to live in peace in a place they choose and to realize the accomplishment of being food secure for themselves and their families.

Land O'Lakes (LOL) acting as an implementing partner for USAID, and in collaboration with Vetwork Services Trust, has focused its activities on **promoting livelihoods through market-driven, livestock-related activities**. These efforts will promote livelihoods and develop marketing outlets particularly through livestock marketing and milk production and processing. It is the intent of the Land O'Lakes program through building the cooperative approach to assist in averting and resolving conflict, promotion of stability, recovery and democratic reform by contributing to policy dialogue, development and reform in the areas of livestock and cooperatives. An analysis of the progress and accomplishments in meeting these goals, primarily through developing model cooperatives, follows.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM

A. Problem Statement

In designing a development strategy for Southern Sudan, USAID was primarily driven by the history of the region which was characterized by conflict between the central government in the North which had control over the political and economic systems of the country, and the southern region which was marginalized from the rest of the country. This marginalization, coupled with religious and racial discrimination, resulted in a brutal civil war that consumed the country for more than 20 years of the last 50 years of Sudan's independence. The signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) on January 9, 2005, by the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) and the Government of Sudan (GOS) ended Africa's longest running conflict. The USAID strategy responds to the significant challenges and many opportunities in supporting the Southern Sudanese transition from war to peace. USAID programs are focused towards the need to successfully implement the CPA, resulting in a just and lasting peace.

USAID clearly recognizes that many challenges exist and must be addressed over time. The CPA brings high expectations from citizens for tangible peace dividends, honest power and wealth sharing, and an end to insecurity that has displaced more than 4 million people in Southern Sudan and caused over

500,000 refugees to flee the country. It is recognized that the reintegration and safe transition of these people is both essential and a major objective of USAID's strategy. To ensure stability, the communities in which they reintegrate will need assistance in developing water systems, health systems, schools and agriculture, among other needs. USAID recognizes that implementation of the CPA will be slow, but success is critical for peace and stability in the region.

USAID has an exceptional opportunity to work with the new Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS) to promote development and bring not only peace and stability to Southern Sudan, but to the region. USAID recognizes the potential and actual threats to the CPA, but remains deeply committed to the economic and political stabilization process that is critical to consolidating peace and prosperity.

Within the context of promoting economic development in Southern Sudan and generating 'peace dividends' for the CPA, USAID recognized that livestock remain the mainstay of the economy and culture of the pastoral communities that dominate the region. By working with these communities it would be possible to not only realize the economic element of the CPA, but also to promote reintegration efforts and reduce conflicts over time. Based on this recognition, USAID entered into an agreement with Land O'Lakes and its collaborator, Vetwork, a Sudanese NGO, to implement the Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Program (LDDCP) a four year, \$6.198,960 million project.

B. Intervention

Based on its acceptance of the Land O' Lakes unsolicited proposal, USAID accepted a program that was intended to not only address economic concerns through development of model cooperatives, but also reduce conflict over issues such as land and water. The program was also to address the reintegration of returning internally displaced persons (IDPs), involve gender equity and include HIV/AIDS messages in training activities. Based on the importance to the program, as well as the livestock industry nation wide, Land O'Lakes was to engage the GOSS in key policy discussions and identify policy issues hindering successful implementation.

In submitting an unsolicited proposal, Land O' Lakes justified their proposal that clearly met many of USAID's objectives in support of the Government of Southern Sudan and the CPA. In many areas across Southern Sudan, cattle are the primary resources, since land is held communally. Within these cultures, livestock are the critical socio-economic focus of their labor, their planning and their outlook. To protect and enhance the economic well being of these groups, it is essential to help them protect and enhance their livestock and add value to the livestock through better marketing of live animals, meat products and dairy products. In a 1994 Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS) food economy assessment, it was indicated that livestock accounts for 20 to 60 percent of total food requirements through milk, meat, blood and barter for grain. Livestock marketing also provides the main access to hard currency.

In the original proposal accepted by USAID, Land O'Lakes proposed to work in several regions including the Bahr el Ghazal which traditionally exported cattle to neighboring Uganda and the Eastern Equatoria region which had prior to the war exported cattle to Kenya. In both regions it was believed that internal milk demand far exceeded supply and that consequently a strong market existed. Within a few months after signing the Cooperative Agreement, USAID decided that the Bahr el Ghazal region was not a priority area and the Rumbek site which Land O'Lakes had originally selected for implementation was dropped. With some disruption to the program, Land O' Lakes quickly shifted their efforts to the Kapoeta area, the site in the state of Eastern Equatoria which had been identified in the original proposal.

The major focus of the LDDCP was to be the establishment of model cooperatives which would be formed after an intensive educational program on organization formation, management and benefits that can be derived from a democratically formed, business oriented and well managed cooperative. All activities were preceded by extensive community consultation through community meetings and a participatory rapid assessment. Cooperatives doing cattle marketing were intended to improve livestock productivity and quality through a focus on animal health. The cooperatives were organized to: 1) provide vaccines and drugs for animals prior to marketing; 2) establish livestock quarantine and fattening stations to prepare livestock for market; 3) and strengthen linkages with veterinary care services for members.

Cooperatives dedicated to dairy would focus on the sale of dairy products, including ghee (cooking fat), mala (local yogurt) and other products that may be in demand in local markets. As part of this effort, Land O'Lakes would develop a core of local cooperative employees who will learn how to manage a dairy cooperative. Similar to the livestock marketing component, the dairy effort will be based on the increased value that a quality dairy product can command. To implement both components, the program would hire and train, when necessary, a professional staff that would be responsible for the various activities. These positions would range from administrative staff to cooperative development specialists, dairy, marketing and monitoring and evaluation specialists.

The local implementing partner with Land O' Lakes is Vetwork Services Trust, a NGO headed and staffed by Sudanese. Vetwork will concentrate on training to upgrade the capacity of the private veterinary services by providing direct services and training for community animal health workers in disease prevention and cure, and livestock husbandry and nutrition. Vetwork will also support Land O'Lakes with the quarantine process, inspection and certification of livestock at the holding areas. All animals will be vaccinated against common livestock diseases.

LDDCP will provide training support to both stakeholders at the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries (MARF) and at the community level. The project assisted MARF through support of the Marial Lou Livestock Training Centre (MLTC) for one year after which the Government of Southern Sudan (GOSS) took it over. It is expected that Vetwork will be given a contract to assist with training at the Centre.

Strengthening of urban areas is accomplished through the construction of livestock and milk processing facilities in Juba, Kapoeta, Lainya and Mogos. These buildings include offices, storage facilities, boreholes, work areas, and holding pens.

III. PURPOSE

The development context in Southern Sudan presents numerous obstacles and constraints to effective development. Primary among those is the on-going insecurity and a young and evolving state structure. The political situation in the country is fluid and does not lend itself to the long term planning necessary for development to take place. In this context, projects such as LDDCP are often forced to respond quickly to situations beyond their control and to interpret policy changes with little or no assistance. USAID/Sudan has chosen to carry out a number of mid and late-term evaluations to provide information for making any necessary adjustments to implementation. Given this situation, the purpose of this evaluation is threefold:

- Document successes, lessons learned and obstacles faced by LOL in its implementation of LDDCP

- Provide recommendations to improve the implementation of the LDDCP and/or for design of a future program in Sudan
- Address issues raised in the Yellow rating letter and actions taken by LOL

In implementing this evaluation, the questions of effectiveness and strategic relevance, especially in terms of the peace dividend, underlie the entire effort. The evaluation team has attempted to gather data from a wide range of stakeholders and to provide clear and actionable information for the use of USAID and its implementing partners in making decisions. As the original scope included many evaluation questions, they are not repeated here, but may be found in the evaluation plan located in Annex.

IV. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The methods used in this evaluation were a mix of stakeholder interviews, document reviews, and field observations¹. Interviews were held both in the offices of government officials who were related to the project as well as under a tree on the cooperative's grounds with local stakeholders. Construction projects that the project was engaged in were viewed first hand and in pictures. While not included with this report due to concern about the electronic size of the document, numerous photos of the project are available upon request from MSI.

As there was little baseline data either from the project or from secondary sources, the design of this evaluation has been of necessity an “after” picture only. However, given the extreme poverty of the primary beneficiaries and, in some cases, their only recent emergence from the bush during the war, we can fairly confidently say that there has been little assistance provided to them and they have only the most marginal integration into the monetary economy. Even before the war, they were a neglected area of the country. They have traditionally bartered milk and meat, but most of these traditions were disrupted by the war. In the case of one area, Lainya, the community members released their cattle into the wild during the war and are only now rounding them up and re-domesticating them for milk and meat production. Land O'Lakes is assisting in this activity.

The “after” picture we provide in this evaluation is thus a picture of communities only now entering a formal economy so the results produced in the project, while seeming small in production terms, are, for the most part, the first cash products for the cooperative members. The availability of veterinary services is also almost completely new for them. The results reported by the project must be seen within this perspective to truly understand the impact of the project.

Data constraints included the illiteracy of the major beneficiary group, necessitating group interviews with translation; lack of project baseline information on indicators such as milk and meat production as mentioned above; and the short data collection period due to finances, security and weather constraints.

¹ The list of interview questions is attached as Annex 1. The list of informants interviewed is attached as Annex 2. The list of documents reviewed and the teams work plan are attached as Annex 3 and Annex 4.

V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Findings - Project Administration

The LDDCP is a USAID-funded project in Southern Sudan which is working directly at the grass roots level with pastoralists and their livestock. Livestock is the backbone of the entire Southern Sudan economy. The project is providing assistance to the most isolated communities. It is important to note that all results of the project are considered in reflection of the fact that the project was told to change their project site after they had already begun. The move from Rumbek to Kapoeta was both a set back in terms of programming on the ground and morale of the staff. That being said, 15 professional and support staff have been hired and are actively engaged. The evaluation team was impressed by the professionalism and dedication of all LOL staff.

The difficulty in finding qualified Sudanese staff resulted in a team in which the technical specialists are mainly Kenyan expatriates. This has also made it difficult in terms of communication with the Sudanese communities. This issue is partially addressed by:

- hiring and adding to the LOL team Kenyans that speak a similar language as Taposa (locally spoke in the region);
- hiring and mentoring the few educated women found in the community and increasing their skills; and
- hiring a Sudanese marketing assistant and training and grooming him to become a marketing specialist by the end of the project.

Partnership with Vetwork, a local NGO, is functioning well and is clearly building the capacity of the organization as well as providing vital services to the livestock communities. The Vetwork staff work in close collaboration with LOL staff and are engaged in both planning and implementation. At the same time Vetwork brings in other resources such as vaccination supplies from the FAO. Vetwork can be seen to be growing from the new contract due to be awarded by MARF to run their training center in Mariel Lou. Land O'Lakes also supported Mariel Lou in the early stages of the project to facilitate capacity building in the agricultural sector.

There were many delays in implementation, some of them due to factors beyond the project's control (changes in USAID strategies, continuing insecurity) and some that could have been mitigated by the project. The project director was in country only part time. Project staff is restricted in their movements during the rainy season due to a lack of all season roads throughout Southern Sudan. This means that staff access to the cooperatives is limited during the time of highest production (milk production is higher due to increased grazing and cattle are able to graze close to the communities giving access for both milking and sale).

From the perspective of project staff, technical guidance and support by USAID for the project was lacking. Little feedback, with the exception of the "yellow" rating letter has been provided to them. No USAID staff has been out to visit and observe the main work at the cooperatives.

Conclusions - Project Administration

Given the limited opportunity for alternative economic activities in the project area, the USAID mandated change in project area, the desperate need of the people who have been by-passed previously, their high expectations and expressed desire to better their lives plus the very difficult circumstances for the project team to work under, the project has done its best to respond in a thoughtful and effective manner.

The project still requires better advance planning to minimize seasonal and other delays. Project leadership did not provide proactive guidance to ensure that down time was used profitably. For example, LOL should be aware of and pursue all partnership opportunities to provide additional support. This is the type of activity that could be pursued more vigorously if the Project Director spent more time in country. Opportunities to find creative solutions to issues may have been lost due to the lack of connections to other local activities by project leadership.

The extremes of the wet/dry seasons still provide a significant constraint to both programming and operational aspects of the project.

Project implementation and project morale would have benefited from improved support by USAID. The lack of management support to the project has implications in terms of the project making appropriate changes to reflect the changing requirements of USAID.

Findings - Overall Project Outcomes

Land O Lakes is on track in regard to establishing cooperatives. Four have been established or revitalized. The four include Riwoto Livestock Cooperative Society (RLCS), Mogos Farmers Cooperatives Society (MOFACOS), Lainya Dairy Cooperative Society (LDCS) and the Nile Community Development Organization (NICODO). The first two are multi purpose cooperatives involving both livestock conditioning and marketing as well as dairy production and marketing, while the latter two focus exclusively on milk collection, processing and marketing. Officials from GOSS and at the state level indicated that they viewed this introduction of cooperatives as a model and that they planned to extend this example to other sectors and other regions.

Land O'Lakes has indicated that approximately 208 households are benefiting directly from cooperative activities. For example, NICODO milk collection activity benefits more than 107 household. Similarly RLCS and LDCS activities benefit 95 and 6 households, respectively. Households in RLCS and NICODO milk collection zone get 1 SDG or \$0.50 USD per liter of milk and in the LDCS milk collection zone households get 2 SDG or \$1.00 USD per liter. As of March 2008 RLCS has paid out approximately 2,116 SDG or \$1,058 USD to milk producers and NICODO has paid out approximately 153,992 SDG or \$76,996 USD for milk suppliers.

NICODO had been a dairy cooperative previously, but then had been changed into a more general purpose community based organization under the guidance of Oxfam. However the original dairy producers were unhappy and opted to reestablish a dairy cooperative under the guidance of Land O'Lakes. The NICODO plant is located in Juba Town and the demand for their quality milk products far exceeds their ability to supply the market. Following the return of the cattle from their dry season grazing areas, supply is expected to increase significantly. Even given this situation, in 2007 NICODO collected and processed 56,000 liters of milk and in the first quarter of 2008 it had collected 40,200 liters of milk. New milk products have been developed and sold on the local markets with yogurt being by far the most popular. Demand far outstrips supply in all areas, but most significantly in Juba where the NICODO product is perceived as being of superior quality and under prices all competitors.

Education for communities on forming a cooperative and how to run one, as well as the benefits of membership, was given high priority in the early stages of the project and continues today. Interest and membership enrollment has increased with nearly 66 members at RLCS as of March 2008, 84 members at MOFACOS, but with fewer or 12 members in LDCS. NICODO is a community-based organization; however, there are 76 individuals from the old Nile Milk Cooperative. During the group interviews cooperative members expressed appreciation for the training and were excited about the future of the

cooperatives and their own lives. They seemed to see great hope in what the program represented and requested additional training for themselves and neighboring communities.

LOL has also reported that the LDDCP project has created several jobs. As shown below, it claims it has created 84 jobs.

Cooperative/ Organization	Location	Number of Jobs Created
RLCS	Kapoeta North, EES	27
NICODO	Juba County, CES	25
LDCS	Lainya County	5
MOFACOS	Kapoeta East, CES	19
LDDCP	N/A	8
Total		84

Staff at the NICODO facility are being trained extensively on all parts of milk handling and processing. They are involved in creating new products for the urban market as well. Additional training for cooperative staff is planned at RLCS, particularly the two women currently in charge of milk collection.

LOL has also claims to have provided capacity building training to cooperatives. The numbers of people trained by location and training topic are shown below.

Training Location	Capacity Building Training	Number Trained
Kapoeta North, EES	Community Animal Health Workers (CAHWs)	17
	Basic Cooperative Management	39
	Basic Milking & Milk Handling Hygiene	23
	Milk Handling Hygiene, Grading & Processing	7
Kapoeta East, EES	CAHWs	19
	Basic Cooperative Management	51
Lainya County, CES	CAHWs	9
	CAHWs refresher	15
	Poultry Auxiliaries (female)	10
Juba County, CES	CAHWs	8
	Milk Handling Hygiene, Processing & Packaging	25
	Sales & Marketing	9

While the emphasis in the early stages was on training in various communities, other activities also began. In Kopoeta an office building, staff housing, animal holding grounds and water supply points have been established. For RLCS, a milk collection center has been set up complete with weigh scales, milk quality testing equipment, a solar freezer, and a livestock holding area complete with water supply. MOFACOS has established a livestock holding area with a borehole presently being drilled and a *posho* mill (for grinding grains) ready for installation.

In Kapoeta, LOL is still operating out of a temporary office at UN-WFP compound. The staff housing and office is 85% completed. Roofing, fixing of windows, plastering, electrical and plumbing, ceiling and painting is still ongoing. Fixing of window panes, doors and foot paths are still remaining.

In spite of all of the educational efforts undertaken, Land O'Lakes staffs face a difficult situation in preparing members for their roles in managing a democratic and business oriented cooperative. Lack of adult literacy and numeracy are a significant constraint to building cooperatives. There are only a couple of members in each cooperative who can read and write.

For six months of the year when there is virtually no rainfall in their home areas, cattle are trekked far away where there is water and better pasture available. As a result, a smaller number of animals than anticipated have been prepared for market and sold. In part to combat this rather difficult situation, an improved pasture development program has been developed and will be critical for eventually moving to a more confined farming system. This is particularly important for milk producers, but is geared to help in preparing cattle for sale too. The improved pasture is, however, in trial stage. According to LOL, since the pasture is imported variety they have been planted in trail plots to characterize them before increasing the acreage. The trial is being done in three locations: Kapoeta North, Kapoeta South and Lainya County. No animal have been put on the improved pasture as the establishment was delayed due to (a) poor weather condition and (b) project staff have yet to have a dialogue with the communities regarding the new pasture.

Without baseline data on cattle marketing in this area, it is difficult to comment on the actual rate of increase or the price-cost ratio.

Nearly all respondents noted that animal health is one of their primary concerns. Vetwork, a Sudanese NGO and collaborator with Land O'Lakes in this project is responding to this need. Vetwork in partnership with LOL has provided animal health training along with drugs and vaccines for cattle owners. This is being implemented on a cost recovery system. As there was no baseline in regards to animal health before the project started, it is difficult to judge the effectiveness of their activities. It is clear from discussions with GOSS and state government staff that these communities cannot expect to see the government step in to continue with animal health efforts. What can be said is that Vetwork's efforts are aimed at self-sufficiency with cost recovery and animal owners were enthusiastic about bringing cattle in to be treated.

Animal health improvement activities through Vetwork, have benefited more than 568 households with approximately 29,000 cattle (8,032), sheep and goats (20,258) and chickens (810) vaccinated or treated. 640 livestock owners have their animals vaccinated and treated in LDDCP areas of operation of Kapoeta North, South and East in Eastern Equatoria State and Juba and Lainya County in Central Equatoria State. In the original proposal Land O'Lakes, along with Vetwork, proposed to carry out a pilot study on East Coast Fever in Eastern Equatoria, but this has now been deferred as GOSS is currently developing its own approach.

In line with USAID's interest in disputed areas, the project originally planned two trips to the Three Areas to investigate opportunities for livestock programming, but only one has been completed as USAID is still reviewing the situation.

The provision of assistance and guidance towards the creation or improvement of laws related to livestock is a relatively small part of project activities. While the staff is acutely aware of the need to improve the policy environment, there is a lack of clarity by LOL in what activities might be undertaken to support the effort and on specifically which laws are to be their focus. Policy work done thus far has been on an ad hoc basis. That being said, interviewees indicated that the project has participated in numerous policy discussions on the following: Cooperative Law (anticipated to be enacted in 2008), Health Certificate for Livestock (related to movement of animals both within the country and across borders), Livestock Taxation, the new Livestock Act for Eastern Equatorial and Standards for Milk Processing and

Marketing. Copies of the actual papers/policies were unavailable for inspection and are in various stages of review in the government. Vetnetwork has played a key role in animal related policy discussions and preparation of new legislation.

LOL brought in a Cooperative Development Consultant to work with GOSS officials. The consultant met with Ministry of Cooperative and Rural Development officials at the GOSS level and also gave a lecture to Cooperative Inspectors who were undergoing training. LDDCP has helped to form and strengthen the cooperative by-laws for the Cooperatives.

Conclusions - Overall project outcomes

The cooperatives represent the first opportunity for economic improvement for these communities since the war. These are possibly the most neglected communities in Southern Sudan. This project provides assistance based on their most important notion of cultural identity – livestock. As indicated above approximately 200 households benefit from milk sales and 568 farms have benefited from LDDCP animal health activities.

While the project has been lagging in meeting some of the revised indicator targets, the team believes that project results in the coming year will show good progress. The choice of indicators for the project would on first glance appear to be obvious (# of animals sold, liters of milk sold), but these are process indicators that should be realistically expected to be fairly low as this is an entirely new enterprise for these communities. The indicators in the current PMP miss the more important contributions that the project is making to the general peace process and understate the true impact of the project on the lives of those involved.

The question of LDDCP's contribution to the livestock and dairy sector can be answered in two ways. In terms of their impact on the entire sector, it is minimal. The project area covers only a small part of Southern Sudan and it will not expand significantly. The number of beneficiaries and their production is relatively small.

However, the question can also be answered by reflecting that this is the first livestock cooperative to be in place in the state of Eastern Equatoria since the war. Cooperatives have operated in the country before the war, but few are in active operation now, particularly in Eastern Equatoria. Thus the project is a unique opportunity to provide a positive example of the benefits which security, as represented by the CPA, provides.

In addition to establishing the cooperatives as vehicles to carry out farming business, it is equally important to early on provide members with concrete benefits such as drugs and related animal care. The capacity building that Vetnetwork is engaged in will have long term benefits to the farmers and to the nation as a whole.

Findings– Gender

The project has integrated a gender approach in several different ways. At a management level, women have been included as staff although only at the community level.

At the programmatic level, the idea that women should be included as equal members in the cooperatives was clearly expressed by both men and women respondents in the community. Both women and men are able to hold shares in the cooperative. In most cases, the women bought their own shares. Lists of representatives in cooperative committees showed that women had been elected to various positions. While there are no precise records of women's involvement in decision making, project staff report that

women do speak in the meetings. During the evaluation the women clearly spoke their mind about the cooperative and what they expected to see happen as a result of being part of the cooperative. While LDCS and NICODO do not yet have female members, women participation in both RLCS and MOFACOS is significant (see Table 1 below). Bringing the posho mills (maize mills) to cooperatives in Kapoeta and Mogos also has definite implications for women's labor as they previously did this task by hand or walked into town to have the grain ground. The time savings for women will be significant if they have a machine to grind the grain close to their community.

Women have been trained as community animal health workers (CAHWs). They commented that they wished there were more people trained as they could not meet demand.

TABLE 1: COOPERATIVE MEMBERSHIP (NEW)

Cooperative	2006		2007		2008 (March)		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
RLCS	0	0	50	10	0	6	50	16
MOFACOS	0	0	0	0	63	21	63	21
LDCS	0	0	0	0	12	0	12	0
NICODO*	76	0	0	0	0	0	76	0

* NICODO is now a community-based organization. The 76 members are from the old Nile Milk Cooperative.

While there are no precise records of women's involvement in decision making, Management Committees for the cooperatives have both men and women. At least one-third of the committee members are women and they participate in the decision making of the cooperatives. Also, during the election held for RLCS early this year, the treasure is a woman. In milk collection, women dominate at the Payam committees.

Conclusions - Gender

All integration of women into project activities has been done despite the traditionally powerless position that women generally hold in this society. The time that is saved by women in particular due to shorter transport distance for milk products results in their ability to apply themselves to other productive activities while the cash they receive for milk is used to purchase necessities that are currently difficult to acquire (i.e., clothing, salt, oil). The project can be expected to boost the earning status of the women who are members of the coops as the coop matures in terms of dividends paid out and support for the community.

Findings – Youth

There are no precise records of the age of cooperative members, however, cooperative members and project staff indicate that younger members of the community are somewhat engaged in the cooperative. These cattle communities have a long history of cattle raiding, back and forth, between themselves and neighboring communities. It is primarily the young men who are involved in these activities.

Raiding activities mean that 1) the young men are engaged in revenge raids, taking them away from productive activities such as the cooperative; 2) the older men are also pulled away to help deal with the ramifications of the raids; 3) the cattle are frequently trekked long distance meaning that their condition deteriorates and they are worth less unless time is taken to build up their condition again; 4) milk production is lost during the period in which the cattle are away. The project has tried to address the issue of cattle raiding and, indirectly, the involvement of youth, by using cooperative meetings to help discuss

the issue and encourage discussions with the neighboring communities to lessen tension. During the evaluation, in meetings with the cooperative members in the community, young men from the community were often seen at the edges of the meetings, mainly listening to the discussions.

On a more positive note respondents indicated that they believed that by bringing cooperatives together to encourage discussions about raiding, and as they see the economic benefits to cattle sales, raiding will be reduced and conflict avoided.

Conclusions - Youth

The project will have to continue to deal with issue of youth through the topic of cattle raiding. While deeply imbedded in the culture, there is reason to believe that the impact or frequency of the raids could be lowered if the young men are actively involved in productive pursuits that yield more than raiding

Findings– HIV/AIDS

The project has planned to have a staff member of Vetwork to come in and provide HIV training for the cooperative members. She is based in Kapoeta and will go to each of the cooperative locations.

Conclusions – HIV/AIDS

The HIV/AIDS rate in Sudan is estimated to be fairly low. As the project has no health activities, including training on HIV as part of their training schedule in the cooperatives, is an acceptable approach.

Findings – Addressing the “Yellow” Rating Letter

The “Yellow” Rating Letter, a USAID memo addressing the need for improvement by the project, included four areas of concern: targets, sustainability, programmatic issues, and financial management. These areas are discussed in the text above, but our findings and conclusions are brought together below for ease of reference:

Targets

The targets set by the project have been revised once in the life of the project, after the move from Rumbek to Kapoeta. It would appear that the targets are still set a bit high, given the extremely rudimentary knowledge and systems in place before the project began work. Even with the revision, the project has not yet met some of the targets set.

Sustainability

Perhaps the most difficult issue to deal with in evaluating the LDDCP is the issue of sustainability. This project operates in perhaps the most difficult environment the evaluation team has experienced. Several of the areas are remote and extremely difficult to get to. Roads at many times of the year are impassable and even at the best of times are very rough and treacherous as the team experienced on the trip to the cooperative in Mogos. Some of the better access roads cannot be used because of being heavily mined and have yet to be cleared. Insecurity remains a concern in some areas. Because of this isolation and, according to both government officials and community members, of deliberately being excluded from services and support by past governments, the people of these areas are essentially beginning at ground zero in regards to knowledge of cooperatives, monetary business acumen and literacy. From our interviews with GOSS officials, it is apparent that the government while fully supportive of the effort, currently lacks the capacity or resources to begin to address their basic needs.

With even this small opportunity the communities involved with the LDDCP have responded positively to do all they can with their meager resources. They have worked hard to clear roads, build fences, pay their dues and all because of their high expectations that this can change their lives. They see their future in being organized against what has often in the past been a hostile world.

Lack of sustainability can come from a lack of human resources or monetary resources. LDDCP has attempted to respond to the lack of available Sudanese expertise through a policy of mentoring local staff to bring up their level of skills. The project has introduced the idea of paying for animal health services and the cooperative members have responded enthusiastically despite the cost. In addition, the drugs and vaccination supplies are provided on a cost-recovery basis.

Programmatic Issues related to modification of activities and what to report

The evaluation team analyzed the quarterly reports and queried the program team as to their efforts in modifying programmatic activities after the move to Kapoeta. It appears that there was a real gap in getting programs moving on the ground as much time was spent in gaining an understanding of the new area and in approaching communities with the idea of building a cooperative. Once the people had agreed to form cooperatives more time was taken in deciding on the appropriate site for infrastructure such as holding grounds and bore holes. In addition, the lack of existing buildings meant that time has been lost in building structures for staff housing and offices. The current offices and housing (tents) is not conducive to working effectively or efficiently but there appears to be no other choices available.

As mentioned above, the project has continued with reporting on the indicators chosen at the start of the project. They have included pictures in their reporting to assist in the understanding to the project context.

Financial Management

While access to the project's full books was not possible, the budget in the quarterly report shows an overall slow burn rate with a particularly large discrepancy in the amount budgeted under "Program Services". In discussions with project staff, this under-spending was in the area of training and training support. It was explained that that budget had been determined according to expectations that they would be holding trainings in hotels and paying hotel and per diem for participants. In fact, the trainings that have been held thus far have been done under a tree in the community due to lack of any infrastructure in the area.

Conclusions - Addressing the "Yellow" Rating Letter

Targets

Given the trends in reporting on indicators that have yet to be met and activity on the ground, the evaluation team believes that the project will now begin to meet targets as presently prescribed in the PMP. The reality on the ground in Eastern Equatoria was not well understood by either the project or USAID/Sudan so it should not be a surprise that the targets were not as realistic as they might have been for the beginning of the project. It took them longer to establish the cooperatives to a point where they could actually begin marketing products. Targets should also have been set to reflect seasonal realities.

Sustainability

There is no question that the need is great, the people deserving of having an opportunity to improve their own situations and to dare to hope that the future for their children will be better than their own. The responses the evaluation team heard from the beneficiaries echo the USAID/Sudan strategy in many ways. They talked about what the project meant to them in regards to the peace benefits, economic growth and their reintegration into a nation. This is their view in spite of having not yet seen many of the benefits that come from membership in the cooperative. To date the project has lagged in meeting

established targets. However, from what the evaluation team was able to see on the ground at the three cooperatives visited, with the necessary physical structures completed and training increased, the cooperatives could be self-sufficient with adequate technical and economic knowledge to carry on if given several more years of support.

Programmatic Issues related to modification of activities and what to report

The LDDCP did an adequate job of responding to the changes presented to them, but could have been more creative in their use of time and resources at the beginning of their work at the second project site. Little proactive thinking went into alternative activities that could have supplemented or replaced originally planned activities. Reporting remained in the standard format and an opportunity to show what the project was really impacting was lost until recent efforts, such as a PowerPoint presentation covering all aspects of the project, to tell their story more effectively.

Financial Management

The project could have been more effective in using their budget to ensure that activities happened, if not exactly as planned, but in a way that ensured that momentum was not lost. Again, it is felt that better leadership in this area might have improved the spending pattern and led to greater impact on the training side.

Findings - Meeting USAID/Sudan Priorities

The scope of work asks the evaluators to determine whether or not the contributions of the LDDCP are relevant to the following USAID/Sudan priorities: household food security, employment opportunities, conflict mitigation, returnees, and urban development.

Clearly, livestock products and the money earned by their marketing can be a help for household food security. Given the complexity of household food security and its reflection of cultural and social values, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the marketing of livestock products results in a healthy yearlong diet for the entire household.

The project has resulted in 61 mostly full time jobs and as the cooperatives expand, that number could be expected to rise.

Currently, conflict in this area is largely related to cattle raiding and the cooperative is filling its role in mitigating the situation by providing peace training and encouraging community relationships through visits.

The area that is covered by LDDCP did not see a wide dispersal of population during the war. People moved into the bush during insecure time and then rapidly returned to their homes. Community members indicated however, that the provision of assistance in building the cooperative and the interest paid by the government in this effort has resulted in the feeling that these communities, previously ignored by the government, are now part of a government that recognizes their worth.

LDDCP's contribution to urban development included renovation of the NICODO milk plant, and structures at the field sites and the provision of critical food products – milk and yoghurt – to the thriving Juba market. They cannot yet meet demand and they are providing a locally produced healthy and safe product to urban dwellers. The construction of the LDDCP housing and office structure and the animal holding pens and treatment facilities also contribute to Kapoeta's urban development.

Conclusions - Meeting USAID/Sudan Priorities

Sometimes indirectly and sometimes directly, LDDCP did contribute to meeting USAID/Sudan priorities. From the perspective of the conflict mitigation and the peace dividend, the following are critical to understanding the project's contribution. It is the only project in the portfolio that reaches the grassroots level of this geographic area. There is little that reaches this area in terms of the government or an official perspective on the future. The project is one of the few activities happening that cooperative members link directly to peace in the area. It is possible to believe that should this project leave the area, their faith in the peace may be shaken.

VI. PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Project Administration

- The evaluation team believes this project should be extended for 2 or 3 years to allow first phase completion.
- USAID should provide better technical assistance through field visits to the main project sites, timely feedback on quarterly reports, and information sharing in regards to other projects that could support LDDCP work
- Additional efforts by both USAID and LOL staff to identify resources for literacy and numeracy training is necessary.
- The training budget should be used more effectively. Bring to the cooperative more experts on the topics they are most interested in such as animal health. Given current spending levels, they might consider hiring a training manager to get this effort going.
- Without a project director full time in country, LOL should review and consider reallocating staff assignments which would allow, at a minimum, the dairy specialist/field coordinator more and higher responsibility in the field. Other adjustments could provide more support to the dairy production and processing efforts.
- It is important that LOL make a stronger case for the very important accomplishments of the project, including that people are now beginning to believe that they can change their situation. This is a major accomplishment and can only be seen when meeting directly with the cooperative members. Look to the contributions the project has made to peace and cooperation and to the beginnings of food security through economic and infrastructure development. Clearly, the benefits extend beyond only sales and returns at this time of implementation.
- Identify and note secondary benefits of project interventions such as the substantial saving of firewood and water as a result of the energy saving equipment for milk production introduced by the project. In addition, highlight the use of innovative equipment such as solar-powered milk freezers. These are an important contribution to economic returns and the environment.
- LOL leadership must look for every possibility including multi donor development funds that may be available and would require GOSS support. This is the type of activity that could be pursued more vigorously if the Country Manager spent more time in country.

B. Overall Project Outcomes

- Look for opportunities to create partnerships so that more services can be brought to people who have had so little over the years. Seek out NGOs and other organizations to expand the impact of the overall program.

C. Cross-cutting Issues

- To encourage greater youth involvement, consider instituting more programs to dialogue about raiding, visits to other communities to discourage raiding, and peace training. Again, seeking out other resources could well lead to micro enterprise type opportunities for youth.

D. Addressing the “Yellow Letter”

- USAID should take the lead, or encourage Land O’Lakes, in reallocating budget line items to better reflect needs in the field. This should result in greater project impact.

E. Meeting USAID/Sudan Priorities

- More effort should be put into conflict mitigation activities. Provide more training and community exchanges with the youth involved.

F. Planning for the Future

While the evaluation team believes the Land O’Lakes team has done a very commendable job in implementing the LDDCP, and has established a firm foundation for future development of the cooperative movement, we offer some suggestions for Land O’Lakes to consider as current implementation proceeds and for potential extension.

- Begin or complete studies to determine the actual feasibility of some of the proposed activities such as establishing numerous milk collection centers, transport, processing and marketing of milk. A solid cost/benefit analysis should be completed before significant investment is contemplated and to address the issue of sustainability. The same process should be followed for the livestock cooperatives if additional costs associated with fattening cattle which will require supplemental feeds, as well as the animal health supplies.
- It could be informative to also examine different approaches to the marketing of cattle. For example, fattening at the cooperative vs. selling to others who may do the fattening as a separate business in the chain. Selling directly after health inspection, even though in poorer condition may be another option. While the original plan called for provision of feed stuff and then holding the animals for a period of time, this may or may not be the best economical option. Again, this relates to the issue of sustainability.
- In relationship to the above, consider accelerating the pasture improvement program. This would begin to build support for some home based dairy production systems vs. driving all of the cattle to distance places. It would also allow the gradual introduction of improved genetics.

- Consider providing a few scholarships/internships for livestock or veterinary students (Sudanese) at the Marial Lou Training Centre. This would help address the dearth of qualified Sudanese professionals needed to become involved in the LDDCP in the future.
- Establish opportunities for English language training for cooperative leadership and other members of the cooperatives. By contracting a firm in either Kenya or Uganda it would be possible to get both the assistance to develop a training plan as well as providing the instruction, and costs could be kept to a reasonable level.
- Carefully examine options to get milk from the dry season areas to the processing plants near urban centers. In some cases river traffic might be an attractive option. If successful, the additional milk during six months of the year would make the processing plants more profitable and human nutrition improved.
- Make an effort to publicize the LDDCP with NGOs and other donors in Southern Sudan. Encourage visits and involvement in the project, which could lead to the additional resources available to the communities.
- As milk collection center increase consider the possibility of working with milk transporters to secure micro credit for the purchase of small motorcycles or other types of transport.
- Examine the chain of milk processing and marketing at the NICODO plant to assist in developing a high quality system for milk products.

VII. LESSONS LEARNED

- To the extent possible have a good understanding of the situation on the ground to allow for better design and avoid implementation discoveries. It appears that the design document was prepared without a full understanding of the circumstances that would be addressed and that implementation activities were rushed, particularly after USAID changed the location of the project area early in the implementation stage.
- Flexibility is important but too much change slows implementation, wastes effort and can often lead to misunderstanding and disappointment. When USAID decided to move early project activities from Rumbeck to Kapoeta, LOL staff found conditions that they seemed unaware of. Housing was not available and project staff lived in tents for two years. Additionally, decisions were made on selecting sites for the cooperatives which then had to be changed once community members were consulted
- To adequately manage, provide oversight and make informed decisions from a distance (Nairobi) is difficult at best. On site management and frequent field visits are very important. It appeared to the evaluators that opportunities to make the project more effective were missed because of the Country Manager only being in Southern Sudan 50% of the time. For USAID staff never to have visited the major project sites seems at best irresponsible.
- Involvement of officials at all levels of government is important. It provides a sense of ownership and support for their priorities which is necessary for the longer term, but can also make implementation easier. The Director General of Planning, Investment and Marketing in the Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries reminded the evaluators of his own early involvement in the design of LDDCP and his strong continued support for it, while the Minister

of Cooperatives stated the project can become a model for cooperative development in Southern Sudan and pledged to work closely with project leadership and the people in the selected communities.

ANNEX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Livestock and Dairy Cooperatives:

1a. Land O' Lakes Staff:

- 1) The major focus of the LDDCP was to develop model private sector cattle marketing and dairy cooperatives. How successful have you been to date? What have been the major accomplishments?
- 2) What impediments have you faced that have negatively impacted on what the program planned to accomplish?
- 3) Please explain the process for becoming a member of the cooperative.
- 4) How successful has the program been in developing membership to the levels anticipated? What factors do you attribute to meeting your goals or perhaps falling short?
- 5) Has communication been a problem in either explaining the concept of a cooperative or educating membership in other aspects of the LDDCP? What various methods have been used in your efforts to effectively communicate?
- 6) Have you found that the cost of joining the cooperative has been an inhibiting factor? If so, what alternatives have you explored?
- 7) What efforts have been made to encourage the involvement of women in the cooperatives? What roles do they currently play?
- 8) What efforts to provide market information to the sellers have you undertaken?
- 9) Are the cattle marketed through the cooperative restricted to members or can others use the marketing facilities for a fee?
- 10) How many animals have actually been marketed through the cooperative to date as compared to the anticipated number?
- 11) How well have the livestock stations worked in providing the services planned, e.g., veterinary care, health inspection and feeding? Has it been possible to secure adequate feeds to actually improve the condition and weight of the animals?
- 12) Moving to the dairy cooperative, please describe what Land O'Lakes has provided to date.
- 13) How many milk collection centers have been established against the number planned and what is the status of membership and sales against what was planned?
- 14) Has cost of becoming a member of the dairy cooperative been a factor in developing membership?
- 15) In the circumstances that most people find themselves in, is the purchase of milk and milk products a high priority?
- 16) Please describe exactly what has been accomplished to date, e.g., new products developed, min-processing capacity, sales promotions, packaging, etc.
- 17) Given the economic situation of most consumers what are the advantages to producers in utilizing the cooperative vs direct selling of fresh milk?
- 18) What has been accomplished to help the milk holding centers and dairy processors meet quality standards that would add value to the product?
- 19) At the dairy producer level please describe what has been done in way of improved farm management, improved breeding, feeding and animal health.
- 20) What follow up is given (or is planned) for each cooperative.
- 21) Given some of the constraints faced in this environment why do you believe a more sophisticated cooperative model is the answer for these producers? Have you modified your approach in any

way to take into account previous negative experience with cooperatives, if any, or an approach that might be more consistent with cultural and social ways of trade and business practices?

- 22) For both cattle marketing and dairy processing and marketing, is the LDDCP a sustainable approach? If yes, please explain what it will take to make it so.
- 23) As we look ahead to the future what modifications would you suggest to make this a better or more sustainable project?

1b. Cooperative Members and Beneficiaries:

- 1) Are you presently a member of either the cattle marketing or dairy cooperative? If not, why not?
- 2) What is your overall impression of the LDDCP and please give us some concrete benefits that you as members have realized
- 3) What specific things have not worked so well and that you would like to see changed in the future.
- 4) What are the most serious problems you face as animal and milk producers?
- 5) Do you believe a cooperative is a good way to do business or do you have experience with other approaches that you would be more comfortable with?
- 6) Have you as individual members actually sold cattle or milk products through the cooperatives? If not, why not
- 7) LDDCP, with their partner Vetwork, promised to provide members with animal health services, drugs and advice on farm management practices. How satisfied are you with the services provided?
- 8) What other specific problems related to cattle production and marketing and dairy production and marketing would you like to see additional help with?
- 9) How did you handle milk sales before and do you believe the milk collection centers and processing facilities have improved your livelihoods?
- 10) Do you believe that at the end of program activities members (without outside resources) will be able to keep the cooperatives running?
- 11) What other suggestions do you have that would improve the operation and success of the program and your cooperatives?

1c. Government of Southern Sudan:

- 1) Has the LDDCP met your expectations as far as improving the livelihoods of the livestock producers in the program area? If yes, could you give us some concrete examples?
- 2) What activities have not met your expectations?
- 3) From your perspective what are the most serious problems that people in the LDDCP area face as livestock and dairy producers?
- 4) A major focus of the project is to introduce modern private sector driven cooperatives to market animal products. Do you believe this is an appropriate model? Could you suggest other ways that might work as effectively?
- 5) What suggestions could you offer that would improve the effectiveness of the program in the future.
- 6) The LDDCP intends to provide animal health and related services to producers through a partnership with Vetwork. Are you satisfied with results of that effort to date? If not, what suggestions would you make to improve the performance of the animal health element of the program?
- 7) Do you believe capacity building has been dealt with effectively? What suggestions would you have to improve the program in this area?
- 8) The LDDCP identified a number of policy issues that needed to be addressed, e.g., importation of animals, animal health and breeding and taxation during the life of the program. Do you agree and what progress, if any, has been made in this area?

- 9) Given that resources are always limited, are there other areas that you would suggest be addressed within the livestock sector—or perhaps in an entirely different area?
- 10) One of the objectives of LDDCP was to assist in the peaceful integration displaced persons as they returned to the area. Do you believe the program has made a contribution in this area? Could you provide us with some concrete examples?
- 11) Are you satisfied with the overall management of the LDDCP and the personnel who are involved with the program?

1d. Policy Environment/Urban Structures

- 1) Have you been involved in any work regarding GOSS policies towards cooperative development or livestock marketing?
- 2) What has been the result of that work? Have you seen changes in the policies themselves?

1e. Cross-cutting Issues

- 1) What structures have been rehabilitated or built by LOL?
- 2) How is LOL working with women to increase their productivity and earning power?
- 3) Are there activities specifically focused on youth or is their involvement encouraged in any way?
- 4) How is LOL addressing the HIV problem?

2. Vetwork:

2a. Land O'Lakes Staff:

- 1) How would you describe collaboration with Vetwork and exactly how things are to work?
- 2) Can you describe what has happened that has benefitted the livestock and dairy producers giving specific examples?
- 3) From your perspective has sufficient progress been made by Vetwork in areas such as disease prevention, animal health, nutrition and breeding and proper milking practices as identified in the Cooperative agreement?
- 4) What would you do differently, if anything, to make the program more effective and beneficial to livestock and dairy producers?
- 5) Tsetse flies and tick control were mentioned as two very serious animal health issues. How have those efforts progressed and what is the current status?
- 6) A major effort for Vetwork and LOL was to be the implementation of a pilot study on East Coast Fever. What is the status of that program and its prognosis?
- 7) It seems that much of potential success hinges on a strong cadre of community based animal health workers. How are they supported?
- 8) What's the chance that this private sector approach can be sustainable?
- 9) While LDDCP provides support for an infusion of animal drugs and other supplies, how well is the revolving fund working and what is the chance it will be sustainable?
- 10) What was the issue that delayed the start up of the animal health program? Was it resolved satisfactorily to all parties?

2b. Vetwork Staff:

- 1) Animal health interventions seem critical to the success of the LDDCP. How well has your collaborative effort with LOL worked?
- 2) What has worked well and what has not? Please provide specific accomplishments. How would you organize things differently for future success?
- 3) What has been your major constraint to successful implementation of this portion of the program?
- 4) Has your involvement with community animal health staff been successful and productive?
- 5) Is the overall animal health effort as organized under LDDCP a good model?

- 6) Based on a private sector approach can the program be sustainable?
- 7) How well has the revolving fund for animal drugs and other supplies worked and can it be sustained without external support?
- 8) What is your relationship with the GOSS and is there room for increased collaboration?
- 9) Vetwork, in collaboration with Land O' Lakes, intended to carry out a pilot study on East Coast Fever. What is the status of that study and will the result be beneficial to the people living in southern Sudan?
- 10) From the materials provided to us it appears that there was some delay in reaching an agreement with LOL. What was involved and what impact did it have on the success of your work and the success of the project?

2.c Government of Southern Sudan:

- 1) How aware are you of the work that Vetwork and LOL are doing?
- 2) How satisfied are you with the work of Vetwork in providing animal health services?
- 3) Is there a satisfactory relationship with government staff?
- 4) Is the private sector approach to animal health services something you support and can it be sustainable?
- 5) Is any of this work duplicative with Ministry work in animal health?
- 6) Do you have suggestions for us to help improve provision of animal health services?

2.d Livestock and Dairy Producers.

- 1) LOL in collaboration with Vetwork has organized to provide animal health services, including key drugs, to cattle and dairy producers. How aware are you of the program and what is being offered to you.
- 2) If you are aware of these services, have you taken advantage of them? If not, why not?
- 3) Are the services and supplies that Vetwork is providing appropriate for your needs? Would you have other suggestions?
- 4) Under the present system you are required to pay for drugs so that additional drugs can be purchased. Do you believe this is a good approach?
- 5) Do you have access to other organizations that supply such drugs, supplies and other services?
- 6) Are you aware of the community animal healthcare workers that are part of the LOL and Vetwork system? Have they been to see you and do you believe they are helpful?
- 7) What are the most serious animal health problems you face?
- 8) Would you have suggestions to make the provision of animal health services and animal drugs and supplies better or more available to you? Please be specific.

ANNEX 2: INTERVIEWEES

Land O' Lakes Staff

Joyce Kweyu	Accountant
John Kutwa	Milk Collection/Processing Specialist/Field Coordinator
Lewis Karinenyeh	Monitoring and Evaluation Manager
Alan King	Country Manager/Project Director
Mark Lokiru	Cooperatives Development Specialist
Raphael Lotira	Marketing Specialist
Seraphine Longarikit	Cooperative Manager
Josephine Nalimlim	Cooperative Development Assistant
Ndirmiro Kakongo	Milk Processing Technologist
Angemela Hudda	Dairy Assistant
Wycliffe Lotieng	Cooperative Manager

Management Committee of the Riwoto Livestock Cooperative Society

Evaristo Cheche	Chairman
Peter Lobuin	Secretary
Maria Loriang Lokatiri	Treasurer
Lino Lokirion	Member
Elisabeth Lomor	Member
Diogo Lokale	Member
Henry Lomong	Member
Lokatiri Belekit	Member
Elisabeth Nakai	Member
Francis Iko	Member

Board of Members of the Mogos Farmers Cooperative Society

Aurelio Lokeno	Chairman
Rosa Kuron	Vice Chairperson
Peter Gordon	Secretary
Marko Lokii	Assistant Secretary
Eugenio Nawi	Treasurer
Andrea Napurei	Information Officer
Joseph Lokor	Member
Stephano Lokuam	Member
Palachido Loyepio	Member
Magdalena Longolio	Member

Nile Milk Cooperative (NICODO) Staff

Stanley Ladu	Coordinator
Victoria Lokisang	Dairy Manager
Rose Peter	Processor
Mary Vitaliano	Processor

Government Officials

Anjelo Omen	Acting Director of Cooperatives, EES
Quinto Asaye	Inspector for Animal Health, EES
Dr. John Kanisio	Director General, Planning, Investment & Marketing MARF, GOSS
Dr. Agol Kwei	Director of Veterinary Services, MARF, GOSS
Prof. Louis Jaja	Veterinarian, MARF
Bortel Mori	Under-Secretary of MCRD, GOSS
Abdun Ayuen	Director-General of MCRD, GOSS

USAID Staff

Gary Alex	Farmer-to-Farmer Program Manager Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade, USAID/Washington
Lance Downing	Temporary Sudan Economic Growth Team Leader for Sudan, USAID/Washington
Jim Yazman	Livestock Sciences Specialist, USAID/Washington
Yugulle Labadiah	Agriculture and Natural Resources Specialist, Economic Infrastructure Division, USAID/Nairobi

ANNEX 3: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The following publications and papers served as the major documents reviewed by the evaluation team in preparation for conducting the evaluation of the Land O'Lakes Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Program.

- Cooperative Agreement No. 623-A-00-05-00306-00, Creating Model Private Sector Cattle Marketing and Dairy Cooperatives and Livestock Policy Dialogue for South Sudan, June, 2005.
- Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Program (LDDCP), Cooperative Agreement 623-A-00-05-00306-00, Revised Program Description and Budget, June, 2006.
- USAID/Sudan 2006-08 Strategy Statement
- U.S. Agency for International Development Fragile States Strategy, January, 2005.
- Portfolio Review “Yellow” Rating, letter dated December 27, 2007
- Land O'Lakes Annual Work Plans for LDDCP.
- Quarterly Reports for Land O' Lakes for LDDCP, Dated July/September, 2005 through January/March, 2008.
- Sudan-Evaluation/Special Study Quality Management, April 2008. Prepared by Management Systems International.
- Organizational Self Assessment Report of Nile Community Development Organization (NICODO).
- Assessment of USAID/Sudan's Economic Growth Portfolio, September, 2007.
- Management Systems International (MSI) Evaluation Scope of Work for Land O'Lakes Livestock Development and Dairy Cooperatives Program, May, 2008.

ANNEX 4: FIELD WORK SCHEDULE

May 18 – May 30, 2008

Sunday, May 18

Arrival in Juba, meeting with MSI staff

Monday, May 19

Interviews with Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries

Fly to Kapoeta

Tuesday, May 20

Courtesy calls on local officials.

Drive to Riwoto, interview cooperative members and management, view cooperative buildings and equipment.

Return to Kapoeta

Wednesday, May 21

Courtesy calls on local officials

Drive to Mogos

View cattle holding grounds

Thursday, May 22

Interview cooperative members and management

Drive to Kapoeta

Friday, May 23

View LOL powerpoint presentation

Fly to Juba

Saturday, May 24

Visit NICODO Dairy Cooperative, interview staff, see production facility

Sunday, May 25

Off

Monday, May 26

Interviews at Ministry of Cooperatives and Rural Development

Tuesday, May 27 to Thursday, May 29

Report writing

Friday, May 30

Return to Washington