

Mid Term Review

Community Empowerment through Livestock Development and Credit

June 2009



Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Abbreviations.....	iv
Executive Summary	v
1. Introduction	1
1.1. Background and Scope.....	1
1.2. Summary of Methodology used by the MTR.....	3
1.3. Presentation of the Report.....	3
2. Salient Features of CELDAC	5
2.1. Public Private Partnership (PPP)	5
2.2. Credit	5
2.3. Networking	6
2.3.1. Knowledge Management Strategy	6
2.4. Linkages.....	6
2.4.1. Internal.....	6
2.4.2. External	6
2.5. Importance of Livestock and Dairy for Poverty Alleviation	7
3. Relevance.....	8
3.1. Rationale for the Intervention	8
3.2. Project Design.....	8
3.3. Project Focus on beneficiaries.....	9
3.1.1. Direct	9
3.1.2. Indirect.....	10
4. Effectiveness	11
4.1. Use of project resources.....	11
4.1.1. Human	11
4.1.2. Physical	12
4.1.3. Management Inputs.....	12
4.2. Training institutions.....	12
4.2.1. Selection	12
4.2.2. Training methodologies	13
4.2.3. Tools.....	13
5. Efficiency	14
5.1. Baseline Survey	15
5.2. Project Funds.....	15
5.2.1. Fund allocation	15
5.2.2. Proportionality (input: output)	16
5.3. Work plan with respect to outputs.....	16
5.4. Quality of Reports and Timeliness.....	16
5.5. Hand Over Arrangements for equipment.....	17
5.6. Financial Disbursement	17
6. Impact.....	19
6.1 Individual level (personal empowerment)	20
6.2 Household level (livelihood security, income diversification)	21
6.3 Community level (livestock services).....	21
6.4 Livestock Production and Animal Health	22
6.5 Networking Opportunities.....	22

7.	Sustainability	23
7.1.	Indications of project continuation.....	23
7.2.	Project Replicability.....	23
7.3.	Sustainability at Community and Individual Levels	23
7.3.1.	The Community Level.....	24
7.3.2.	The Individual Level.....	24
7.4.	Role of Stakeholders.....	25
7.5.	Community Involvement	25
7.6.	Private Sector Players	25
8.	Lessons Learnt.....	26
8.1.	General Lessons Learnt.....	28
8.1.1.	Key Constraints	28
8.1.2.	Gaps identified.....	28
8.1.3.	Opportunities identified.....	28
9.	Recommendations, Actions, Responsibilities and Timeline	30
9.1.	Actions, Responsibilities and Timeline.....	33

Annexes

- Annex A: Terms of Reference
- Annex B: Evaluation Mission Itinerary
- Annex C: People Met
- Annex D: References Consulted
- Annex E: Summary Curricula Vitae of Evaluators
- Annex F: Case Studies of LLWs
- Annex G: Analysis of Amended Project Logical Framework
- Annex H: Public Private Partnership – Some Thoughts for Developing a Strategy

Acknowledgements

The mission wishes to express its sincere gratitude and appreciation to all those interviewed for the evaluation – the concerned Government officials, the Lady Livestock Workers, Master Trainers, Community members, and in particular team members of CELDAC Project - Component A (Nestle) in Punjab and Component B (Engro Foods Ltd) in Sindh who facilitated both the field work and data collection. The Mission would also like to thank the UNDP/GSP team for their inputs, cooperation and support extended during the assignment. Without the assistance and valuable feedback of these individuals the mission would not have covered as much ground or had the opportunity to analysis the project as deeply as it did.

List of Abbreviations & Acronyms

CELDAC	Community Empowerment through Livestock Development and Credit
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
DAH	Department of Animal Husbandry
DBFM	Design–Build–Finance and Maintain
DBFO	Design–Build–Finance and Operate
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EAD	Economic Affairs Division
EFL	Engro Foods Limited
FMFB	First Micro Finance Bank Ltd
FO	Field Office
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEP	Gender Equality Projects
GRAPs	Gender Reform Action Plans
GSP	Gender Support Programme
HH	Household
IPs	Implementing Partners
LDDDB	Livestock and Dairy Development Board
LFM	Logframe Matrix (also known as Logical Framework)
LHW	Lady Health Worker
LLW	Lady Livestock Worker
MFI	Micro-Finance Institution
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MT	Master Trainer
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NPD	National Project Director
NPM	National Project Manager
P&P	Pathways and Purse Strings
PDDA	Pakistan Dairy Development Association
PDDC	Pakistan Dairy Development Company
PEOP	Punjab Economic Opportunities Programme
PMSU	Programme Management Support Unit
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PRODOC	Project Document
SBE	Small Business Entrepreneur
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SHDDP	Southern Highlands Dairy Development Project
SM	Social Mobiliser
TOR	Terms of Reference
ToTs	Training of Trainers
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USD	United States Dollar
UVAS	University of Veterinary and Animal Science, Lahore
VMC	Village Milk Collector

Executive Summary

Introduction: The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the “Community Empowerment through Livestock Development and Credit” (CELDAC) was conducted by an independent review team contracted by the United Nations Development Programme - UNDP. It aimed at assessing the project in terms of: needs and demands of the beneficiaries; how the project achieved its objectives and affected the target group, in particular women; the performance of the project to date with reference to quantitative and qualitative results; utilization of funds and timeliness of reporting; whether the results would continue and if not, provide recommendations that could lead to sustained change; appropriateness of the training approach, infrastructure, institutions and modality adopted; whether extension or replicability was feasible; level, degree and appropriateness of the stakeholders involved; whether linkages were developed; and identification of lessons and recommendations for project strategy, approach and management. The mission was conducted between 24 March and 8 April 2009 with field work in project areas in Punjab and Sindh.

The mission was also asked to look at: performance and success with respect to objectives and achievements; performance of project partners; extension or replication and selection or retention of implementing partners; provide suggestions for project design and implementation improvement; and the role of the private sector in future UNDP development investments.

The methodology adopted by the MTR mission was based on analysis of project and UNDP documentation and interviews with key implementation partners as well as stated partners to CELDAC and down stream service providers. Non-implementation stakeholders were also interviewed. The MTR conducted interviews with target beneficiaries, male and female community members including elders, livestock owners and farmers.

The Project: CELDAC is a pilot project developed under the auspices of UNDP Gender Support Programme (GSP) a programme aimed at providing a framework for coordinated donor support to address gender issues in Pakistan. It was designed as a three year project starting September 2006 and ending September 2009. Its broad stated objective was to “*enhance income and employment generation of rural women through livestock skills development, improved livelihoods and food security at the household and community level*”¹. As stated in the Project Document (PRODOC), CELDAC was to ensure two key outputs: a) train 3 600 women from varying communities as Lady Livestock Workers (LLWs) thereby becoming self-employed and having the ability to generate extra income; and b) income and employment to be supported through institutionalised collateral-free credit and saving facilities.

The project involved the setting up of two separate PMUs – one in Lahore for Punjab and one in Sukkur for Sindh. The strategy for project implementation involved the identification of Master Trainers (MTs), training them as trainers (i.e. Training of Trainers (ToTs)), putting them in place to train LLWs. Social Mobilisers (SMs) were also recruited to mobilise communities. CELDAC also involved the development of training courses, training manuals, identification and then subsequent training in basic animal health care and some rudimentary business development for women from targeted communities. LLWs, it was hoped, could also become Small Business Entrepreneurs (SBEs) or possibly Village Milk Collectors (VMCs).

¹ Project Document CELDAC. Page 1

Salient Features of CELDAC: CELDAC has a number of innovative and important features which are discussed. These relate to the fact that a) it was implemented under Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) arrangements with two large dairy corporations in Pakistan, Nestlé and Engro Foods Ltd. b) it set out to demonstrate that women in remote villages and communities should, and could, undergo some skill development training that would allow them to deliver a basic animal care support service where there was none existant c) it was assumed that credit was necessary for the establishment of a LLW business and d) linking LLWs within a market system that would help generate income, reduce poverty and add value to the livestock productivity.

Key Findings: Key Findings of the MTR mission are presented in line with accepted evaluation categorisation: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

a) Relevance: There is little doubt that CELDAC's stated key objectives of 1) community empowerment; 2) empowerment of women; 3) economic change; 4) poverty alleviation; 5) improvement of household food security; 6) increased access to collateral-free credit and 7) livestock development are highly relevant in the context of Pakistan generally and in both Punjab and Sindh respectively. CELDAC's intervention is appropriate given the vital role played by rural women in domestic livestock management in Pakistan. There is also synergy, coherence and consistency with UNDP's own mission mandate, UNDAF's goal of reaching into communities generating income opportunities, improved access to micro finance and forging alliances with the private sector in the quest for alleviating poverty, overall country programme and more specifically GSP. In particular the focus on gender empowerment was a major thrust of the project addressing issues of discrimination, undervalued contribution and recognition of women in the management and care of animals belonging to the household. The project correctly, and boldly, focused almost exclusively on them to provide them with both very basic skills in animal care and raising their awareness to seek recognition that their work has a financial as well as economic value equal to other family members, namely men.

b) Effectiveness: Overall the MTR has found a mix of effectiveness elements in the way that CELDAC was implemented related to the use of human, physical and management inputs as well as institutions used to develop courses for MTs and LLWs.

c) Efficiency: CELDAC was a pilot project testing both a social development approach and collaboration with private sector partners. The MTR is of the opinion that the relative cost per LLW trained is on the high side (at between USD 700 and USD 950 per LLW), but given the remote nature, training approach (mobile training system) and general outreach strategy it appears acceptable although some comparison with other training programmes would be appropriate. In addition some cost items could have been more efficiently undertaken. There were two baseline surveys undertaken in Punjab and Sindh rather than one reducing time and expenses related to developing duplicate questionnaires and formats. Thus more coordination among the two project components could have contributed to increased efficiency levels. The issue of handing over equipment post project will also need agreement in view of the MOUs with the IPs (this issue has been settled but needs to be made official).

d) Impact: The MTR found CELDAC to be a pioneering and promising intervention to improve the social and economic status of rural women in resource poor households. Overall the project was judged to have made a commendable and positive impact on several domains in both project areas (Punjab and Sindh). The results show a

positive impact on human and financial assets, social capital and empowerment of target groups.

e) Sustainability: The MTR mission is of the view that CELDAC has undeniably been successful in building a cadre of trained rural women generating income through delivery of primary animal health services. However, the mission feels that these changes may not continue once project support is phased out as planned in September 2009. A major reason for this is that CELDAC is seen as a pilot initiative, which encountered delays in operationalisation and some missed opportunities for institutionalising and “anchoring” the services of LLWs into existing service provision systems in the country. This reflects, of course, the pilot nature of the project which focused on the creation and subsequent acceptance of LLWs in the rural areas of the country. Whilst the pilot nature of the project has been successful a follow up project will need to address this concern. The MTR mission recommends, therefore, the completion of CELDAC as scheduled in September 2009. A Programme Development Mission be planned and launched immediately by UNDP to address the key issues identified.

Lessons: Lessons learnt from the development of this initiative relate to ownership, coordination and sustainability of the programme, as well as to training, networking, supervision and recognition of the importance of LLWs.

Recommendations: The MTR has formulated a number of recommendations which are aimed to assist the managers in thinking through the work ahead. These relate to a recommendation that the managers commence work on formulating a project that will develop linkages between the LLWs and existing organisations in NGOs, other donors programmes, Government and the private sector.

Other recommendations relate to future project design, that social development interventions can gain impact from targeting poor women in remote areas and that the PPP development modality needs to be carefully reviewed by all partners to ensure that the relationship delivers value for money for all partners and that implementation reflects the spirit of partnership with clear roles and responsibilities for all the stakeholders.

The following table summarises action, responsibilities and timeline for the CELDAC PMUs in particular and for UNDP in general and is based on the recommendations outlined in the text.

Action	Responsible Agent	Timeline
Design and Formulation – Follow-up	UNDP/GSP Donors	Next 3 months
Discussion with Pakistan Dairy Development Company- PDDC	UNDP/GSP	Next 3 months
Discussion with Pakistan Dairy Development – PDDA	UNDP/GSP	Next 3 months
Discussion with Livestock and Dairy Development Board – LDDB	UNDP/GSP/CELDAC	Next 3 months
Develop Public Private Partnerships – PPP modalities	UNDP	Next 3 months
Consider institutional linkages NGOs	UNDP/GSP/CELDAC	Next 3 months

1. Introduction

1.1. Background and Scope

The Context

Livestock management in Pakistan is dominated by women and in the rural areas they are responsible for 60% to 80% of feeding and milking of cattle. The role of women in livestock production is generally now accepted to have been underestimated, undervalued and widely ignored the magnitude of which is yet to be fully recognised and quantified. Both Government and donor supported initiatives in the sector have targeted men contributing to continued marginalising of women.

The need to address the existing gender gap including issues of discrimination, undervalued contribution and recognition of women in the management and care of animals, was picked up UNDP in response to a Government request to initiate a pilot programme on women in livestock development and which became CELDAC. This pilot project became structured along similar lines to the lady health workers (LHWs) scheme with the key objective being to provide opportunities for income-generation and self employment for rural women to lead to improved livelihood and poverty reduction at household and community level.

The Mid Term Review

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the “Community Empowerment through Livestock Development and Credit” (CELDAC) project was conducted by an independent review team contracted by UNDP². It aimed to assess the project in terms of:

- Needs and demands of the beneficiaries;
- How the project achieved its objectives and affected the target group, in particular women;
- The performance of the project to date with reference to quantitative and qualitative results;
- Utilization of funds and timeliness of reporting;
- Whether the results would continue and if not, provide recommendations that could lead to sustained change;
- Appropriateness of the training approach, infrastructure, institutions and modality adopted;
- Whether extension or replicability was feasible;
- Level, degree and appropriateness of the stakeholders involved;
- Whether linkages were developed; and
- Identifying lessons and recommendations for project strategy, approach and management.

The mission was also asked to look at:

- Performance and success with respect to objectives and achievements;
- Performance of project partners;

² The two member mission consisted of: Paul Schoen (Team Leader) and Farwa Zafar. Both consultants are independent and external to CELDAC having had no involvement with the project whatsoever prior to the mission. A third mission member was due to join the team but this did not materialise. Additional evaluators were not recruited by either Implementation Partner to join the team.

- Extension or replication and selection or retention of implementing partners;
- Provide suggestions for project design and implementation improvement; and
- The role of the private sector in future UNDP development investments.

The final Terms of Reference (TOR) was received on 25 March 2009. Field work was conducted between 24 March and 8 April 2009 in both Punjab and Sindh.

The Project

CELDAC is a pilot project developed under the auspices of the Gender Support Project (GSP). It was designed as a three year project starting September 2006 and ending September 2009. Its broad stated objective was to:

“Enhance income and employment generation of rural women through livestock skills development, improved livelihoods and food security at the household and community level”³.

As stated in the Project Document (PRODOC), CELDAC was to ensure two key outputs:

- 1) Train 3 600 women from varying communities as Lady Livestock Workers (LLWs) thereby becoming self-employed and having the ability to generate extra income; and
- 2) Income and employment to be supported through institutionalised collateral-free credit and saving facilities.

The project involved the setting up of two separate Project Management Units (PMUs) – one in Lahore for Punjab and one in Sukkur for Sindh. The strategy for project implementation involved the identification of Master Trainers (MTs), training them as trainers (i.e. Training of Trainers (ToTs)), and then putting them in place to train LLWs.

Social Mobilisers (SMs) were recruited to mobilise communities and encourage collaboration with the project. CELDAC furthermore involved the development of training courses, training manuals, identification of women and their subsequent training in basic animal health care as well as some rudimentary business development in targeted communities. LLWs, it was hoped, could also become Small Business Entrepreneurs (SBEs) or possibly Village Milk Collectors (VMCs) later on.

Implementation modalities differed from previous UNDP arrangements by virtue of the fact that two private companies from the dairy sector implemented the project as Implementing Partners (IPs). These were Nestlé Pakistan (Nestlé) in Punjab and Engro Food Ltd (EFL) in Sindh each taking responsibility for as Component A and Component B respectively although implementing the same project except in the States where they had commercial interest. A PMU was set up in Lahore and Sukkur respectively.

The project received funding from UNDP and was supported with cash and in-kind contributions from the IPs. The total approved budget was USD 6 076 400 (made up of USD 5 000 000 from UNDP/GSP funds, USD 794 400 from Nestlé (cash and in-kind) and USD 282 000 from EFL).

To support the pilot focus of the project on LLWs, linkages with micro-finance institutions (MFIs) to supply credit was also planned.

³ Project Document CELDAC. Page 1

The broad vision of this programme was also to launch a successful public private partnership programme between UNDP, Government of Pakistan, Nestle and Engro Foods Limited and other Donors through the Gender Support Programme to achieve measurable positive impact for rural women in Pakistan. UNDP's vast experience in implementing economic empowerment projects for women at the grassroots was expected to help achieve women's empowerment and their valued recognition as a legitimate member of the livestock "workforce".

1.2. Summary of Methodology used by the MTR

The methodology adopted by the MTR mission was based on analysis of project and UNDP documentation and interviews with key implementation partners as well as other stated partners to CELDAC and service providers. Non-implementation stakeholders were also interviewed such as local veterinarians (vets) and state bodies responsible for livestock or dairy development. The MTR conducted interviews with target beneficiaries, male and female community members including elders, livestock owners and farmers.

In Islamabad, the mission held talks with officers from UNDP, Economic Affairs Division (EAD), Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MoAL), Swiss Development Cooperation and the Royal Norwegian Embassy (as members of the Gender Support Programme (GSP)), Rural Support Programme Network and First Micro Finance Bank Ltd (FMFB). In Lahore, meetings and interaction with staff of the PMU for Component A, the University of Veterinary Animal Sciences (UVAS), Punjab Livestock Department, Livestock, and Dairy Development Board (LDDDB), MoAL, Nestlé Pakistan itself and conducted field visits in Pasrur, Narowal Districts in Punjab. In Karachi the mission held meetings with Engro Foods Ltd (EFL), MoAL Sindh, the Director of Livestock, and the Team Leader of the EU Strengthening Livestock Services Project, Pakistan. The mission visited the PMU for Component B in Sukkur, Sindh and conducted project site visits to villages in Shikarpur, Khairpur Mirs and Naushero Feroz Districts. In-direct project stakeholders were also interviewed including the Pakistan Dairy Development Company (PDDC), Ministry of Special Initiatives.

An Aide Memoire summarizing initial mission findings and recommendations was an important output of the assignment. The Aide Memoire was discussed at a workshop held in Islamabad on May 4 2009 at which UNDP, GSP, EAD, Implementing Partners, development partners (CIDA and DFID), PDDC, UVAS and FMFB attended.

1.3. Presentation of the Report

The presentation of this report follows a layout as agreed between UNDP and the Mission. It presents key findings and recommendations with reference to information gathered through interviews in the field as well as data collected and documentation available.

The layout of the report follows a logical outline in that the key elements of the project are discussed under the core headings of Salient Features of the project followed by discussion of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact and Sustainability. Following on from this analysis, the Mission draws out various lessons it has identified and makes a number of recommendations which it feels will contribute to the further success of the initiative. The Mission was also asked to provide a time line for implementation of these recommendations and attribute institutional responsibility

for their realisation. These are presented at the end of the report but prior to the Annexes.

The report also includes various Annexes which ensure the completeness of the presentation. These include, the finalised ToR, Schedule of the Mission, people interviewed and met and references examined. The Annexes also include a rapid analysis of the existing Logframe, a number of case studies of LLWs from Punjab and Sindh. “Pen-sketch” profiles of the two evaluators who conducted the review are also included in the Annexes.

During a discussion of the Aide Memoire, UNDP requested the consultants to examine broadly the issue of Public-Private Partnerships with a view to providing some thoughts for consideration in future PPP initiatives and opportunities (See Annex H for some consideration for future PPP establishment).

2. Salient Features of CELDAC

2.1. Public Private Partnership (PPP)

An interesting and salient feature of the CELDAC project was the decision by UNDP to select implementing partners from the private sector and was the first time that UNDP in Pakistan had taken this route. Two respected private sector dairy companies were partnered. The process entailed a series of GSP Steering Committee meetings through which EAD advised UNDP to call upon five dairy companies, based on an approved “Request-for-Proposal” which contained criteria including institutional strengths and perceived role vis-à-vis women’s empowerment in dairy sector and a request that they contribute at least 20% of the total project component was made.

Of the five companies and organisations approached, only two companies responded favourably with a proposal and financial breakdown which then became part of the PRODOC. These were Nestlé Pakistan (Nestlé) and EFL and both of whom went on to become IPs.

In both cases a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was signed between Nestlé and UNDP and between UNDP and EFL.

Both companies hold significant dairy and food business interests in Pakistan with an extensive network of dairy suppliers and milk collection in both Punjab and Sindh. Both companies are also significant world industry players having a business network that spans Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas.

Both companies also have a strong interest in translating their social responsibility ethos into practice and have been involved to some extent in local community development although clearly this is not their core business.

2.2. Credit

An important assumption within the detail of CELDAC was the inclusion of work to be carried out to make credit more available to LLWs. The detail of this was not very clear other than the perception that newly qualified LLWs and SBEs would need capital, even though small in quantity, to launch their businesses in the community. In addition, there was emphasis on the need to develop linkages with banks or institutionalised credit institutions that would be prepared to lend to borrowers without collateral.

Due to the limited demand for credit at this point by the newly trained LLWs along with high interest rates, the pilot intervention, adjusted its results and outputs. These were reflected in the revised Logframe Matrix (LFM) which showed a lower expectation from the credit component than before, in line with the emerging ground realities. The PRODOC states simply that:

“Upon completion of the LLW and conduct of training, identified credit providers will offer a package of credit and savings facilities as well as training in livestock business management, market access etc for the LLW and others in the UC/villages.

Details to be worked out later with the credit providers (on the loan products, loan amount per annum, method of delivery and recovery, expansion process to other loaners etc”⁴.

In addition to the results and outcomes, it was hoped that Output 2 would generate “collateral free credit with support services for livestock ventures available to some 150 000 households”⁵.

2.3. Networking

2.3.1. Knowledge Management Strategy

The IPs of both CELDAC components appeared to manage knowledge generated from the project well although neither shared a common presentation platform and clearly invested differently in scope and scale in the putting out onto the public domain the project detail. In both cases the ability to electronically access available project knowledge is not straightforward with a CELDAC website, information and knowledge banks being largely absent. Both IPs have information about their involvement with the project on their websites but the project itself as a whole did not have a dedicated joint, yet clear site.

Although both components produced dissemination information such as videos showcasing CELDAC and projected activities and achievements through electronic and print media, the MTR is of the view that a stronger communication strategy and awareness raising approach would have been useful.

CELDAC could have also benefited from occasional research studies highlighting CELDAC interventions.

2.4. Linkages

2.4.1. Internal

The two Components of CELDAC had linkages in the areas of the development of the training manual, content composition of the “tool-kits” provided to LLWs and on the revision of the LFM. However, programme coherence in terms of implementation had room for improvement. This also reflected the pilot nature of the project where two different styles of implementation from two different IPs were piloted and is a function of the different locations they work in and approach adopted.

Linkages among the LLWs and the MTs were seen post training but there are some differences from one community to another.

2.4.2. External

External linkages with other projects, institutions and bodies appear to be under-developed. This is perhaps in part due to the PRODOC which was followed by both IPs strictly and which did not elaborate in detail regarding these linkages.

Whilst it is true that external linkages were established, even loosely, with various pharmaceutical companies supplying animal medicine to LLWs or SBE to provide them a “kick-start” pack ready for sale these were not formalised. The

⁴ PRODOC, page 12

⁵ PRODOC, page 12

pharmaceutical companies it was seen by the MTR have maintained direct contact with quite a large number of LLWs and SBEs since their graduation and this seems to be reasonably effective. Quantities of medicine supplied remain small however and LLWs still have to purchase medicine which is sold with a mark-up.

2.5. Importance of Livestock and Dairy for Poverty Alleviation

According to the Pakistan Livestock Census for 2006:

“.. The livestock sector has emerged as a leading sub-sector of the agriculture sector in Pakistan. It contributed over 11% to the GDP during 2005-06 which is more than the aggregated contribution of entire crop sector (10.3%) of the country. Livestock production is one of the major activities [with] about 30 to 35 million people [in] rural areas engaged in raising livestock and deriving 30 to 40% of their incomes.....It is an integral part of socio-economic activities of the rural areas and plays a very supportive role in mitigating the effects of poverty by providing essential items of daily use”⁶

Livestock is therefore critical to Pakistan and in particular its rural areas. The livestock sector in Pakistan contributes almost 50% to the value addition in the agriculture sector, and almost 11 % to GDP, which is higher than the contribution made by the crop sector (47.4% in agriculture and 10.3% to GDP).). The role of the livestock sector in the rural economy is crucial as between 30 and 35 million rural people are engaged in the sector for their livelihood. Livestock provides food such as milk, eggs, and meat for human consumption and organic fertilizer for crop production. Within the livestock sector, milk is the largest and the single most important commodity.

Although women dominate livestock management in Pakistan especially in rural areas -where they are responsible for between 60% and 80% of feeding and milking of cattle the role of women's in livestock production is underestimated, undervalued and widely ignored. The level and magnitude of their contribution has yet to be fully recognised and quantified.

Currently Government and donor supported Initiatives in the livestock sector target only men and as a result most of the beneficiaries are men as well. This contributes to a process of marginalising women and those who are actually involved in almost all aspects of animal health and production activities.

Against this backdrop and the need to address the existing gender gap including issues of discrimination, undervalued contribution and recognition of women in the management and care of animals belonging to the household, that UNDP upon the request of, and in consultation with, Government initiated a pilot programme on to support the development of women in the livestock sector. This pilot project is structured basically along the lines of the successful Lady Health Workers (LHW) scheme implemented by Government. The key objective of the project is to provide opportunities for income-generation and self employment to rural women as well as build their capacity to deliver primary animal health services in their community, thereby contributing to improving livelihoods and reducing poverty at the household and community level.

⁶ <http://www.statpak.gov.pk/depts/aco/publications/pakistan-livestock-census2006/lsc2006.html>

3. Relevance

3.1. Rationale for the Intervention

There is little doubt that CELDAC's stated key objectives of 1) community empowerment; 2) empowerment of women; 3) economic change; 4) poverty alleviation; 5) improvement of household food security; 6) increased access to collateral-free credit and 7) livestock development are highly relevant in the context of Pakistan generally and in both Punjab and Sindh respectively. CELDAC's intervention is appropriate given the vital role played by rural women in domestic livestock management in Pakistan. There is also great synergy, coherence and consistency with UNDP's own mission mandate, UNDAF's goal of reaching into communities generating income opportunities, improved access to micro finance and forging alliances with the private sector in the quest to alleviate poverty, overall country programme and more specifically GSP.

The focus on gender empowerment was a major thrust of the project addressing issues of discrimination, undervalued contribution and recognition of women in the management and care of animals belonging to the household. The project correctly, and boldly, focused almost exclusively on them to provide them with both basic skills in animal care and raising their awareness to seek recognition that their work has a financial as well as economic value equal to other family members, namely men.

3.2. Project Design

The project was designed with a social development framework in mind. It correctly targeted building the capacity of women living in remote villages and communities in both Punjab and Sindh provinces and it correctly identified the need to establish a cadre of subject matter trainers to deliver this aim.

The primary target was clearly LLWs whilst a secondary target was putting in place a group of Master Trainers (MTs) made up of female professional veterinarians and female SM. Project design also correctly factored into the work programme the need to ensure that the MT underwent training to instil in them with the requisite skills to transfer basic knowledge to LLWs. This involved the development of a training of trainers programme for between 40 and 50 MTs before any training of LLWs could take place. The sequencing of events was therefore correct.

Selection of communities and villages was on the whole properly accounted for in the PRODOC and the rather strict selection criteria developed and applied by both Components of CELDAC did generate the identification of women whose opportunities to participate in such a project probably would not have occurred otherwise.

The project was designed with two clear elements, training and skill development on the one hand and credit availability on the other. Whilst the training element became the driver of the project, the credit activity could not be delivered due to the limited demand for credit at this point by the LLWs and the high interest rates of the MFIs.

In interviews with LLWs regarding the second output (i.e. credit facilitation), women appeared unsure what they would use credit for, unsure if indeed they would take it out and also how they would manage its application. This is understandable given

that most LLWs had only graduated from the LLW course in the last year and were in the process of establishing their new responsibilities as entrepreneurs with little planning into the future.

It should be remembered that as pilot project, the purpose of CELDAC was to test both an approach to gender empowerment and also an implementation modality. The approach was explore the possibility of identifying women whose livelihoods could be enhanced and who could then demonstrate that their new skills make a real contribution to local economic and social change.

Secondly, the implementation modality of working within a public-private partnership framework, CELDAC offered a real opportunity because of the sectoral overlap within the dairy industry. In this regard, the approach was brave and imaginative.

However for the MTR, project design remained poor with respect to building activities into the project which institutionalised the LLWs and developed market linkages with those who might buy the LLW services on offer. Project design omitted the important element of “finding a home for LLWs post-project”. The implications of this are discussed under the Chapter 7 Sustainability.

It is worth commenting on the project structure adopted for implementation which involved splitting the project into two components with each more or less, mirroring the other in terms of format and organisation. A GSP Steering Committee was appointed to oversee implementation and try and bring uniformity to delivery. However in the absence of an overall Project Director, this led, in the view of the MTR, to some confusion and limited recognition that both IPs are working in partnership with each other and on the same project. There are of course a number of exceptions and collaboration did take place but this seems to be the less than the norm.

Finally reference is made to the Logframe which underwent a revision in 2008 and although an improvement on the version in the original PRODOC remains weak and not very effective as a management or monitoring tool. The amended version lacks clarity, confuses activities and overall needs a greater articulation. A commentary of each Logframe item is presented in Annex G.

3.3. Project Focus on beneficiaries

CELDAC focused on direct and indirect beneficiaries. The following two sub-sections details further this area.

3.1.1. Direct

Direct beneficiaries of CELDAC were the LLWs themselves, although it could also be argued that the skill enhancement of MT veterinarians as “ToTs” was also a prime focus of the effort. But given the major challenge faced by CELDAC at the start of the project in identifying and recruiting female vets and SMs in a country in which gender discrimination is high, resulting in few female vets available for such work and also interested to be a part of the pilot, CELDAC did well to bring on board the full complement required to deliver the activities. It also did well in terms of working with communities to generate interest in CELDAC which went on then to agree that women participated to become LLWs.

3.1.2. Indirect

Indirect beneficiaries include the communities from where LLWs were identified and where they would go back to after their training. Community involvement has been seen to be critical from the start. They had to be sensitised and made aware of the importance of the project and the benefit they can derive from allowing up to two women to participate in the project. Clearly, the change in approach and attitude required amongst communities (mainly driven by men) was an objective of CELDAC. The recognition that women do, and can, play a greater role in and be relied upon for providing animal welfare services for which the community was willing to pay was an important result of the project.

4. Effectiveness

4.1. *Use of project resources*

4.1.1. Human

CELDAC is truly a pioneering initiative both because it is reaching out to women in poor rural households but also because it seeks to contribute to poverty reduction by promoting effectively hidden human livelihood initiatives.

By training rural women in basic livestock healthcare as well as providing a base for them to generate income, CELDAC has made an intervention which addresses existing gaps such as lack of a local animal care service, lack of capital amongst women and low self-esteem and the project tried to realise the overarching goal of gender empowerment, income generation and livestock healthcare. The project has been effective in meeting its target of identifying and training LLWs and successfully mobilised the community to take ownership of the concept by agreeing to nominate females from their community.

The project strategy has been effective given the current security risks for women to be involved in such programmes. Support by the community has been crucial in giving an opportunity to the local females to feel empowered through raised confidence and skill development whilst also providing the opportunity for income generation. It has achieved this by developing a system which identifies and then trains women in consecutive training “batches”. Women who underwent training received dedicated and relatively focused, yet basic animal health and management classes lasting between 4 and 6 weeks. Students were assessed, graduated and received a certificate of achievement. In addition, they were provided a starter “kit” to help become established⁷. They were also provided a contact list of key individuals they might need to get in touch with post training either for business or technical support purposes.

The four to six week ToT training programme was also effective in giving MTs the skills to impart training to LLWs. However, follow-up refresher courses would be needed focusing more on delivery of training as well as practical and hands-on training skills. Delivering high quality training remains a major challenge for the project.

Although CELDAC has trained over 3 000 rural women as “community-based animal health workers”, interviews with the LLWs indicate that they are remain limited in animal health and business skills that they have acquired. While the project has spearheaded the training of women to deliver health advice, significantly more training is required to fully equip them to effectively deliver extension services to “animal nurse” levels.

The project will become more effective once the sustainability is ensured through long lasting linkages anchored with public and private sector players crucial to service delivery.

⁷ This Kit comprised animal pharmaceutical medicine, a carry bag, identification tag, a manual of the course undertaken and some basic equipment to the value of about Rs 10 000 (ca USD 125).

4.1.2. Physical

Physically, CELDAC appears to have been effective in the use of equipment and other resources available. There are clear differences however in the use of resources in the field such as the number of people that make up a ToT team. In the case of Component A for example teams were considered to be four in total including a driver. For Component B, teams seemed to be slightly higher in number.

In both cases however, equipment needed were jointly purchased through UNDP's procurement channels and some savings have been identified here through bulk purchase.

Logistically, Component A is located in Lahore, in a large and vibrant urban setting whilst Component B is located in the less developed urban area of Sukkur in possibly more difficult and less secure confines. This has meant that from a security point of view, more thought, attention and investment in ensuring safe delivery of the project has raised some costs under Component B and some additional physical demands on those involved.

4.1.3. Management Inputs

The CELDAC Components were identical in management structure but not in management input. Whilst within Component A, the National Project Manager (NPM) was the day-to-day management driver of the project, within Component B; the National Project Director (NPD) was the overall manager with full day-to-day delivery responsibility. The NPM for Component B was more thought of as logistical and operational rather than having technical responsibilities built into the role.

Whilst Nestlé paid the salaries of the NPM and NPD in full, only the NPD was paid for by EFL. Unfortunately, and beyond the control of Component B, several NPDs have had to be appointed which has interrupted some continuity in delivery although quality remains generally good.

With respect to Component A, Nestlé combined market recruitment and secondment of in-house staff to run the PMU and outfield activities. Components B on the other hand relied almost entirely on market recruitment for staffing the PMU and out-field activities. Senior technical managers from Component B are also seen to be experienced development practitioners whilst this is not entirely the case with Component A⁸.

4.2. *Training institutions*

4.2.1. Selection

The training institutions selected to work with CELDAC included principally the University of Veterinary Animal Science (UVAS) in Lahore and the Directorate of Animal Husbandry (DAH), in Karachi part of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock. Whilst UVAS was a key developer of both the MT training of trainer programme and the training of LLWs in Punjab, Component B in Sindh adapted the Punjab training manual in consultation and guidance from DAH. UVAS is also responsible for

⁸ The NPD for Component A is however a highly experienced development specialist whilst the NPM is not coming from a human resources background.

running the examination process in Punjab whilst for Component B, this task is undertaken by DAH. DAH also ran the ToT programme for Sindh.

4.2.2. Training methodologies

ToT training was conducted early in the delivery of CELDAC in both Components and lasted approximately one month (4-6 weeks). ToT was held in the grounds of UVAS and in Karachi for the respective MTs under CELDAC. Methods were essentially in teaching subject matter expertise and delivering a programme at a basic level which could be absorbed easily by women whose education was limited (Education levels of LLWs ranged from primary to 12th grade).

Courses on which LLWs participated is seen to be centred on a combination of theory and practical hands-on animal health training, such as vaccination techniques, animal examination and health problem identification. In addition, some exposure to business management was provided including filling in income and expense diaries.

Courses for LLWs held in a selected village, which was part of the cluster of target villages in an identified district with the rural women being brought to the venue from their communities and later dropped back home over the period of the course. An LLW course was designed to last between four and six weeks at the end of which they would undergo an examination based on their theoretically acquired information and practical application of their knowledge. Examination is by observation of their skill and by viva interview. Upon successful completion each LLW was awarded with a certificate.

4.2.3. Tools

For both the TOT programme and LLW basic training, students receive a manual of the course and a summary of the programme they underwent. These are hard copy booklets or manuals which are issued on completion of the course and are designed to be used as refresher or reference material to be consulted as needed.

In the case of LLWs, they have also been receiving a “starter-kit” (worth about Rs. 10,000) which consists of basic veterinary equipment, animal pharmaceutical products and some animal supplement. Both Components did not however, collaborate on what the kit should contain.

For marketing purposes, the PMU of Component B felt that additionally, the LLWs should be given a plaque erected nearby from where they are operating as a community LLW to inform the community that they are there.

5. Efficiency

Given that this project was testing out a public-private implementation initiative it is not surprising that the two components of the project are implemented differently. There were some common purchases however made by UNDP for both Components (e.g. about 30 4x4 vehicles) although this bulk purchase did not extend throughout the project. Varying methods and cost choices for training both sets of MTs as trainers and development and delivery of LLW courses show variation in cost and delivery efficiency. Differences may be justified on the grounds that the two Provinces pose different challenges but some basic analysis reveals a ratio cost difference of about one to one and half times cost (i.e. it one and half times as much as to train an LLW in Punjab as it did in Sindh). Although the costs invested appear high the project provided a learning opportunity for all partners.

The following are specific identified issues under efficiency:

MOUs. The use of MOUs between UNDP and its private sector partners is highly commendable as a basis of common understanding but analysis of these give the impression that this is contractual document rather than partnership in nature and may lead to inefficiencies.

CELDAC as learning opportunity for PPPs⁹. All three parties to CELDAC (UNDP, Nestlé and EFL) were pilot testing a relationship and all have had to learn how to deal with each other. In addition, both Nestlé and EFL have had to learn how to deliver such an initiative given this is not their core business.

A benefit of the private sector partnership however, is demonstrated by their ability to temporarily fund operational activities at times of slow financial disbursement from core sources (particularly evident at the start of CLEDAC). The public-private sector partnership experience has tested some new strategic modalities which will take some time to take shape but may most likely lead to defining the contours for PPP in the future (see Annex H for a short analysis of PPPs in general).

Training Development. The MTR mission is concerned that training of MTs and SMs should be seen as the major output of the project *on par* with the training of LLWs in importance. However it is still commendable that so many female MTs were identified in Pakistan and underwent some pedagogic exposure. Follow up trainings of MTs is suggested in future project design with a clear rationale and desired intention to establish a cadre of well rounded and skilled vets.

General Approach. CELDAC's approach has been systematic, pragmatic and rigorous. The prospect of meeting the original training targets will be met or even exceeded.

Credit. Testing linkages with MFI providers did not pick up pace as it might have been. And credit may work better if it is provided to individuals through community groups and which, if the opportunity lends itself, the LLWS could form, thereby supporting an LLW local network.

⁹ For more details see the Public Private Dialogue: <http://publicprivatedialogue.com/> an initiative supported by the World Bank, DFID, IFC, OECD and GTZ. Also see an article produced for UNDP on Capacity Building and PPP at: the <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/undp-capacity.html>

5.1. Baseline Survey

Both Components of the project did not start implementation with a Baseline Survey commissioned by the project. Instead, the IPs in both cases used existing in-house data to assist them in developing a strategy for community and LLW selection.

Whilst the Baseline Survey in both Provinces came late in the day (Component A March 2008; Component B January 2009), the surveys themselves are of high quality and can still be useful in the future. Nevertheless, greater efficiency could have been achieved had one Baseline Survey been undertaken for both States ensuring that questionnaires and presentation of the baseline data and findings were directly comparable.

5.2. Project Funds

5.2.1. Fund allocation

It is worth recording that Component A and Component B were not equal in financial value terms. This is most likely a function of the amount of available counter-part contribution as much as it is of the geography of the target areas in which both Components were operating. Table 1, below shows a few characteristics of fund allocation between the two Components and percentage of contribution. These numbers reflect the original budget designed with some analysis taking into account current spends.

Interesting to note is the variation between the two components. Whilst Component A was to cost nearly 80% of the total budget, Component B was set to cost 20%. Contributions from Nestlé are nearly three times that of EFL. Table 1 also shows the impact of a possible under-spend of funds for Component A as a percentage of the total component budget of as much as USD 800 000.

Table 1: Comparison of Fund Allocation

Item	Component A	Component B	CELDAC Total
Total Amount Originally Allocated – Component Budgets	4 773 800	1 302 600	6 076 400
Percentage allocation between A and B of total budget	79%	21%	
If under spend by USD 800 000 by Component A:	75%	-	
UNDP Budget	3 979 400	1 020 600	5 000 000
Percentage allocation between A and B of UNDP budget	80%	20%	
Direct Cash contribution (Nestlé)	168 000	-	
Direct In-kind contribution (Nestlé first and then EFL)	626 400	282 000	
Total (Nestlé and then EFL)	794 400	282 000	1 076 400
Percentage allocation between A and B of total budget	13%	5%	
If under spend then:	15%	-	
Percentage allocation between A and B of Component budget	17%	22%	
If under spend then:	20%	-	

5.2.2. Proportionality (input: output)

Examination of the number of MTs and LLWs trained shows that financial costs appear high and therefore “Input: Output” results indicate disproportional investment to return. However, factors such as social mobilisation and community development, remoteness of villages and where potential LLWs live as well as geographic terrain all point to relatively high cost of delivery. The project was not implemented in a centralised location where economies of scale could be taken advantage of, but instead a mobile training outreach system was put in place. This approach is inevitably very expensive but necessary given the time and work needed to engage and seek consent from target communities. Traditionally rural women have not been allowed to travel long distances and especially not for periods of between 4 and 6 weeks. In summary, the costs seem high for the output but these are understandable given the nature of location and training approach adopted.

5.3. *Work plan with respect to outputs*

Component A got off to a good start and relatively on time. Activities were planned and training service providers identified. Component B on the other hand did not commence quite as planned. Indeed there was a delay of some 13 or 14 months before project activities commenced. In part this was due to slow disbursement from UNDP of financial commitments but also due to the learning process that had to be undertaken by the IP in Sindh. This was neutralised by the benefit that Component B received from the investment made under Component A with respect to the training programme for MTs and LLWs developed by UVAS. With a few modifications for the Sindh environment on the ground activities, identification, training and follow up were able to be launched and delivered.

Important also to mention however was the effort to establish the line of credit but one which never materialised. Although some work had been undertaken to meet micro-finance institutions, a credit window for LLWs or SBEs simply did not happen. The reason for this is perhaps due to the premature nature of the facility but equally important if not more so, awareness and absence of demand which, on examination and investigation by the MTR, appears to be the case amongst the anticipated borrowers.

5.4. *Quality of Reports and Timeliness*

The MTR reviewed management documentation produced by both Component A and B during the course of the mission. The MTR was disappointed by the quality of presentation and analytical content. On the whole, both sets of reports are somewhat confusing and misleading to the reader. Many elements are simply irrelevant and calculations of achievement or project impact incorrect. Examples include those on the number of animals treated as a sign of impact (e.g. Page 21 Annual Progress Report 2008 Component B or Page 8-9 of Annual Progress Report 2008 for Component A).

Whilst these Management Reports were delivered in a timely fashion their usefulness is rather limited for management by the Steering Committee, GSP or monitoring purposes.

Few reports were commissioned by CELDAC other than the Baseline Survey for both components. Both surveys were however of good quality and standard even though not entirely consistent with each other in approach.

5.5. Hand Over Arrangements for equipment

The relationship between the IPs and UNDP are determined by the MOU in place for each partner. Interestingly the two MOUs are not consistent with respect to the issue of equipment and hand-over of these at the end of the project. Whilst the MOU signed between UNDP and Nestlé clearly shows that all equipment purchased using UNDP project funds reverts to Nestlé, for Component B, equipment reverts back to UNDP. It would make sense if these arrangements were made consistent but adjusted in appropriateness i.e. equipment should return to UNDP for deployment elsewhere in the portfolio of projects and programmes being implemented¹⁰.

5.6. Financial Disbursement

A simple comparison summary table (Table 2) of Component A and B shows some interesting, if not striking, differences with respect to “value for money”: A comment column is presented alongside the analysis by the MTR on the item under consideration.

Table 2: Comparison Table of Component A to Component B

Comparison Item	Component A: Nestlé	Component B: EFL	Comment
Component Value according to the PRODOC	USD 4 773 800	USD 1 302 600	Total = USD 6 076 400 (original)
Effective start date	August 2006	July 2007	Significant differences in the start date shows learning process taking place as relationship between UNDP and the private sector partners.
Contribution by Partner	USD 168 000 (direct) + USD 626 400 (in-kind)	USD 0 (direct) + USD 282 000 (in-kind)	The value of these contributions is based on the partner's own valuation.
Number of Target LLWs	2 400	1 200	Total = 3 600
Cost calculation per LLW (USD) per Component based on original budget	USD 1 989	USD 1 086	Although there is a degree of remoteness in Punjab the issue of cost per LLW being twice the cost in Sindh is still significant.
Basic cost calculation per LLW without contribution from each Partner (USD)	USD 1 658	USD 850	Even without factoring in the contribution of the partners the cost of identification and training LLWs remains twice as much in Punjab as it is in Sindh

¹⁰ This is a point which was clarified by Nestlé to the degree it is understood in discussions at the Workshop on the Aide Memoire whereby equipment purchased using UNDP funds will revert back to UNDP.

Average cost per LLW with respect to total project value	1 687		The average cost per LLW seems extremely high.
Likely under spend?	USD 800 000	USD 0	The MTE was informed that the budget for Punjab would be under spent by just under USD 1 million.
Funds received from UNDP	<p>USD 1 830 000 (to date) plus USD 470 000 (to end of September 2009)</p> <p>= Total USD 2 270 000 Plus USD 794 000 (from Nestlé)</p> <p>Average cost per LLW therefore is USD 928</p>		Despite the anticipated under spend in Component A the average cost per LLW remains high.
PMU staff (strength - includes all PMU plus MTs, SMs, drivers etc)	75	40	Interestingly the staff levels between the two components seem proportional.
Number of MTs trained	Ca. 40	Ca 20	This is as one would expect because the number of LLWs trained was double that in Punjab over Sindh. Staff turnover of MTs meant that CELDAC trained more than the number originally intended.
Vehicles	18	12	UNDP purchased vehicles on behalf of each component.
Training of MT and development of LLW Guideline Manual	Developed MOU with UVAS but agreed to pay ca USD 6 000 for training MTs including follow-up examination/certification of LLWs. Also development of MT refresher guideline and LLW guideline manual.	Contract with Directorate of Animal Husbandry - DAH, Karachi to develop MT training/ LLW examination. PMU adapted the UVAS LLW manual with support from the DAH.	Different approaches show differing skill abilities from within the PMU.
Baseline Survey	Produced March 2008 (taking nearly 10 months to produce (ca. USD 40 000)	Produced January 2009 having started mid-2008 (ca. USD 40 000)	In both cases the Baseline Survey came very late but could be useful in the future.
Staff Profile of each PMU	Mainly staff seconded from Implementing Partner. NPD and NPM salaries paid for by Nestlé.	Mainly recruited from the development sector. NPD salary paid for from the EFL.	Highlights the different approach and experience level of each Implementing Partner.

6. Impact

The MTR found CELDAC to be a pioneering and promising intervention to improve the social and economic status of rural women in resource poor households. Despite a number of start-up delays this opening observation should give optimism to the implementation partners. Overall the project was judged to have made a commendable and positive impact on several domains in both project areas.

The results show a positive impact on human and financial assets, social capital and empowerment of target groups. Impact is seen as:

“The changes in the lives of the intended beneficiaries, as they and their partners perceive it at the time of the review, to which this intervention has contributed”.

Impact also shows the extent to which project outcomes represent advancement towards the realisation of overall project objectives. This includes aspects of physical results, outcome of project activities and effects on project beneficiaries.

CELDAC has impacted on:

- The rural women at the individual level in terms of their personal empowerment;
- Household level seen as livelihood security, income diversification;
- Community level through livestock services;
- Animal Health and livestock production; and
- Networking opportunities.

Table 3 provides a summary overview of the number of women who received training by CELDAC as well as number of villages as of the time of the MTR. These numbers are approximate however as training is ongoing. The number of MTs trained is also somewhat of a moving target because of degree of staff turnover experienced.

Table 3: Summary of Number of Women Trained by CELDAC up until 31 March 2009*

Item	Nestlé in Punjab	EFL in Sindh	Total
MTs trained	20	17 (7 of which are vets and 10 SMs) – but actually trained more due to staff turn-over	37 (target 54)
MTs available with CELDAC	13		
Social Mobilisers trained	24		
Rural women trained as LLWs	2 580 (ca. 1 500 working as LLWs)	1 161 (but identified 1 388)	3 741 (target 3 600)
Average number of LLWs trained per batch	20	25 to 30	ca. 24
Organised training batches	ca. 129	Ca. 43	ca. 172
Trained women working as LLWs	ca. 1 500	ca. 1 000	ca. 2 500
Working as SBEs	1 217	1 144	2 361
Working as VMCs	115	17	132
Villages covered by CELDAC	1 201	594	1 795 (target 1 720)

*Source: Based on presentation and other material supplied by each PMU.

6.1 *Individual level (personal empowerment)*

Given that women are significant contributors to livestock farming, dominating on the whole livestock management in Pakistan, the MTR Mission is of the view that the project to date has impacted positively on the lives of community women by giving them an economic and social “opportunity” to grow without leaving their locality. The training of rural women as LLWs represents a courageous and bold intervention and has showcased that women can be accepted as trustworthy and reliable service providers for basic animal health care in the community. CELDAC has been successful in creating a space for women being seen as a legitimate “workforce” in the livestock and dairy sector challenging the stereotypical image of only “Males” providing such services. CELDAC has been instrumental in helping to develop recognition among the community of the significant involvement of women in livestock farming and their contribution towards livestock production.

CELDAC has had a positive impact on its primary defined beneficiary target group, poor women, with limited education, in rural areas, creating livelihood and income-generation opportunities delivered through capacity building. The training of LLWs undoubtedly has had a positive impact on the knowledge and skills of these women and therefore in the quality of animal health care services provided to the communities at their doorsteps. LLWs commonly perceived CELDAC having brought about a change in their identity through raised social status and said that:

“The change is that I am seen for myself, I have my own identity, which makes me self-confident and empowers me within my household and the community”. (Interview with an LLW from Sindh).

CELDAC has initiated the change process for women to see themselves as providing reliable extension services, in their autonomy in decision making, and their perception of their role in the household. LLWS see themselves as “change agents” impacting on mobilising demand for training more women as LLWS.

Investment in training of LLWs has “paid off” with good economic returns seen at the individual level. The majority of LLWs are seen to be earning a living with an average income ranging from about Rs.1 500 per month to Rs. 3 000 per month from services provided for animal care, sale of medicines and nutritional supplements such as “Vanda”, and the collection and sale of milk on behalf of dairies. This is a real impact given that women had no income previously. Socially, training has changed the lives of LLWs as reflected in raised self-esteem and status change within the household and community at large. Beneficial impact on women’s income and their earning power is seen to show signs of a positive impact on their personal empowerment. However, the change in the quality of relationship of the LLWs and the family and the community is not easy to quantify and whether they are able to sustain such income levels only time will tell.

Overall, the MTR Mission confirms of those villages which were randomly visited by the team (and which represent a small percentage of the total ca. 1 700 villages or communities where CELDAC has worked); the project has had a positive impact on the “empowerment of the women”. However, despite the current positive economic impact on participating communities and households, the durability and sustainability of the project’s achievements will only ensure enduring impact. Prospects for this durability will rely on future project strategies focusing on institutionalisation and anchoring of human assets created i.e. the LLWs through this intervention. In order

to ensure sustainability, trained LLWs will need follow-up refresher courses and need to be integrated within existing public and/or private sector institutional frameworks.

6.2. Household level (livelihood security, income diversification)

CELDAC has boosted the status of the target rural women within their households and strengthened their role in household decision-making, even if minimally. Interactions with the LLWs showed that they were beginning to be consulted in household matters. The income as well as the prestige attached with being trained as an LLW was identified as a driver for this behavioural change.

There can be no doubt that many families in the participating villages are benefiting from the CELDAC activities i.e. LLWs as service providers for basic animal health care, village milk collectors (VMCs) and small business entrepreneurs (SBEs) through additional household income. The MTR mission felt that with continued impact ability of poor households to manage their livestock resources and improve their well being would be possible. However, the socio-economic change of beneficiaries' by virtue of their entrepreneurial activities is still at too early a stage for the MTR to judge adequately in terms of their economic viability and future sustainability.

Responses from LLWs, SBEs and VMCs indicated that their earnings were generally being redirected in establishing their entrepreneurial activities or being used individually with some going towards household expenditure. But, it is still too early to gauge with any defining manner CELDAC's impact on nutritional intake and food security at this stage. Only time will tell whether there has been a significant financial contribution to ensuring household nutritional intake and food security but the prospects are good. If the earnings and incomes of the rural women trained as LLWs continue, the likelihood of these earnings being used for household food intake is indicated.

It is also still too early to define real behavioural changes in the community, but CELDAC has initiated the process. In the long term, with sustained impact, it is likely that CELDAC would impact on changing gender roles in the community.

6.3 Community level (livestock services)

CELDAC has impacted on the availability and provision of extension services in the target communities. Through CELDAC reliable basic animal health care services have been brought to the community doorstep. Availability of these services has filled a much needed gap which would not only make these services hitherto unavailable, but also accessible and delivered at affordable prices. Previously villagers had to travel long distances and pay high fees for many of these services, especially as the transport cost of conveying buffalos/cattle is high. Doorstep availability of these services has had a significant impact on the community's acceptance and use.

The MTR mission is of the opinion that although the community has begun to use the services of the LLWs provided at their doorsteps, there is still a long way to go for the LLWs to establish themselves as long-term service providers. Community approval and participation in the nomination of the LLWs for training reflects their acceptance and signals their intention to use the services of the LLWs but at this stage it may be too early to make an accurate assessment of the future trends, once project support

is phased out. More time is needed for the LLWs to gain business skills and confidence to establish themselves in their communities.

In terms of the objective of empowering the target community at large, it is also somewhat early to gauge sustained impact.

Many external factors will have an effect on the degree to which the project can hope to reach its development objective of:

*“Enhanced income and employment generation of rural women through livestock skills development, improved livelihoods and food security at the household and community level”.*¹¹

6.4 Livestock Production and Animal Health

Although the project rightly aimed at meeting the animal health needs of the rural community, its exact impact on milk production and animal health is difficult to assess at this point. With respect to increased animal production, the MTR is not in a position to verify this precisely. Monitoring data seen by the MTR presents the number of treatments/consultations by LLWs and uses this as a proxy for impact not on livestock health but rather the economic success of women. Although production figures (for example milk yield per milk producing animal) were collected by each Component, these were not adequate to establish a specific impact.. Where IPs have assisted in the setting up of VMCs, milk production seems to have increased..

6.5 Networking Opportunities

The MTR found that CELDAC impact on mobilising networking opportunities remained weaker than other project activities. Whilst CELDAC has given a “voice” to LLWs individually through which they may communicate to other LLWs, stakeholders including their community, local government, private sector institutions (Dairy Companies) and private vets in their search for employment the networks remain undeveloped and unaware of this potential for collaboration with LLWs. There is however, no guarantee that LLWs will be successful in networking even if available, this as it depends on their character and skill. Although some LLWs have been “picked-up” by the Nestlé, Engro and other dairy companies as VMCs, the numbers are low. Some LLWs have established businesses and linkages with the pharmaceutical companies for delivery of medicines in their community although are yet to formalise linkages with the state, private or community entities to ensure sustained impact. The importance of forming such linkages is a necessary step in this direction.

¹¹ PRODOC, page 10.

7. Sustainability

7.1. Indications of project continuation

The MTR mission is of the view that CELDAC has undeniably been successful in building a cadre of trained rural women generating income through delivery of primary animal health services in their community at affordable prices as well as through business entrepreneurs and village milk collectors. However, the mission feels that these changes may not continue once the project support is phased out as planned in September 2009. The Mission found that a large number of the trained rural women had started as LLWs or SBEs or VMCs not more than a year ago and others even less and thus were not yet established firmly in their businesses and in their communities. Income and employment needs to be supported through institutionalised collateral-free credit and saving facilities. The LLWs need more training to be adequately equipped, especially in business and financial management skills to aid them in the operation of their businesses. In particular the LLWs still need to understand market mechanisms and build their capacity to receive and manage credit, which is essential for sustainability and continuation of activities beyond the life of the project. Without the institutional anchorage of these LLWs and building long-term credibility in the community as well as experiencing credit mechanisms, the impact made so far may not carry on. Despite positive results to date the issue of sustainability of services remains a concern.

7.2. Project Replicability

The MTR found that impact of CELDAC project was largely confined to the target communities in each of the two project sites-in Punjab and in Sindh respectively. There was no indication or information on the outreach of the project or spill over to other areas outside the defined target communities. The LLW experience, being yet in its infancy did not provide an opportunity to the LLWs to unleash their networking potential to other villages. Given that CELDAC concept was not spread to other communities or tested as a model/best practice and was still in process of firmly being established, the MTR mission feels that it is difficult to make an assessment of its replicability at this point. More sustainable results and awareness and understanding of CELDAC approaches would lead to more conclusive replication assessments. Generally simple to understand approaches that are low risk, affordable and improve upon existing approaches are accepted easily.

CELDAC's networking strengths were not as evident as were linkages with other projects, although it did have reasonable communication products such as videos, mass media and TV.

7.3. Sustainability at Community and Individual Levels

According to the MTR of the UNDP "Gender Support Programme" the sustainability criterion "involves making a judgement that the net benefits generated by the project will be maintained beyond the life of the project". Judgement can be made on how well the beneficiaries have included the changed practices within their everyday life, how institutional changes are embedded in organisational structures and programmes and how policy and attitudinal changes are absorbed by those affected by the project. The sustainability criterion includes:

- Government commitment;
- Institutional support;
- Social support;
- Technical soundness;
- Commitment of other stakeholders;
- Economic viability;
- Financial viability;
- Environmental impact;
- Resilience to exogenous factors; and
- Replication.

Drawing from these criterion then the lessons from the CELDAC pilot phase clearly indicate that to date sustainability of the impact of CELDAC is not assured. The need for institutional anchorage and integration of MTs and LLWs to ensure sustainability of any future intervention is undeniable. In order to approach the question of durability and sustainability of project achievements effectively, action should begin now. This means the development of an exit strategy is suggested.

Prospects for this durability will rely on future project strategies focusing on institutionalisation and anchoring of the human assets created i.e. the LLWs through this intervention. In order to ensure sustainability, trained LLWs will need follow-up refresher courses especially focussing on equipping LLWs with the desired business, financial and managerial skills and be integrated within existing public and/or private sector institutional frameworks.

7.3.1. The Community Level

The MTR mission feels that given the absence of any institutionalised links established with LLWs at the community level the objectives of the project will be difficult to sustain. Formulation and subsequent design omitted to fully centralise community opinion, potential demand and need for affordable livestock services. “Acceptance” by the community of the LLWs is not a reflection by itself of the sustainability of change, only willingness that this could be possible. What is important is seeing evidence of services being purchased and “buy-in” by the community beyond the life of the project.

An area of concern for the MTE Mission is the degree of sustainability in the changes being foreseen and whether these “drivers” can be sustained. The MTE Mission believes that currently the process is still not entrenched in the community, and albeit the community’s participation and support to the LLWs, long-term buy-in and ownership by the community still has to be achieved. For sustainability purposes a transfer of “ownership” needs to take place from project to beneficiaries.

Testing linkages with MFI providers did not pick up pace as it might have been. Credit may work better if it is provided to individuals through community groups and which, if the opportunity lends itself, the LLWs could form, thereby creating an LLW local network.

7.3.2. The Individual Level

The MTR mission found that although the LLWs exhibit excitement in their new roles as providers of extension services in their community, the sustained activity of these LLWs if left, largely, to their own devices. Given that a large majority of the LLWs are

younger females, chances of their getting married and moving out of this community could not be ruled out entirely. CELDAC has established that female community members are willing to take up new roles as livestock service providers and livestock related businesswomen, but would need community approval and support in order to continue in their work. Female community based animal health workers (i.e. LLWs) have the potential to become an alternative for doing skilled work and be accepted as a legitimate member of the country's "workforce" in rural areas, be it as demand driven 'self-employed' provider of services or as 'employee' of a public, private or community entity, but not without their "anchoring" into public or private sector programmes.

7.4. Role of Stakeholders

Government, development agencies and private sector entities should give special consideration to building upon the results achieved through CELDAC by continued support to up-scaling of community based female livestock extension services in the dairy rich areas of Pakistan but focusing on Punjab and Sindh in the immediate next phase. For durable results and sustained impact of activities Government support is vital and should be integrated into any proposed concept. Providing an enabling and supporting environment through policy support and institutional anchorage is part of Government's commitment to reducing poverty through capacity building of women for livestock extension services.

However, it is clear that the ultimate success and sustenance of the programme builds on the active participation and support of all stakeholders these being principally the livestock keepers, community based organisations (CBOs), Government authorities, private veterinarians, private sector dairy companies, pharmaceuticals, parastatal entities, communities and the LLWs themselves.

7.5. Community Involvement

The MTR Mission found that provision of animal health services by rural women are more likely to be sustainable where communities have participated in the process from the start. The transfer of community health services to the community requires a comprehensive understanding of these communities, their set-up, leadership, priorities, needs and constraints, which can be achieved through community participation at all levels of project planning. It is also necessary that direct beneficiaries participate in the process so that they can analyse their own problems and determine the best methods for developing their skills.

7.6. Private Sector Players

The MTR Mission feels that having tested broadly that public-private partnerships can work in tackling poverty through skills development of rural women in delivery of primary animal health care services, it is most crucial for the private sector dairy companies, the implementing partners, to pick up and anchor the LLWs as VMCs in their value chain process. Those women who became VMCs are more likely to secure income (and therefore empowered status) if they are "institutionalised" into an existing and well developed privately owned system. CELDAC's outcome of linking milk producers with dairy companies was reflected in women working as VMCs, however this achievement needs to be established on a sustainable and more permanent basis..

8. Lessons Learnt

Lessons learnt from the development of this initiative relate to ownership, coordination and sustainability of the programme, as well as to training, networking, supervision and recognition of the importance of LLWs.

Training: Women, as well as men, need direct access to training and extension information to improve their livestock production activities.

Paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals or community health workers (i.e. the LLWs) offer a vital solution to, and can play an important role in, the effective delivery of animal health services especially to smallholder farmers, particularly in areas where public and private veterinary services are inadequate and expensive. Delivery of work by LLWs in rural areas may be as a demand driven 'self-employed' provider of services or as an 'employee' of the community¹².

Female paraprofessionals. Experience from other projects indicates that auxiliaries and community-based animal health care-workers can be more suited and reliable in delivering veterinary services in marginal, low potential areas than are the public veterinary services or private sector veterinarians. Experience has also shown that they can provide reliable primary animal health services such as disease diagnosis, the treatment of common diseases and vaccination in remote areas where herds are scattered and infrastructure is poor. Community based LLWs also have advantages over other outside extension service providers such as insider knowledge and understanding of local problems and priorities in animal health care as well as having the access to community households. In addition their services cost less as they live within the communities and have lower income expectations and can complement government services in areas that are not covered by them.

The concept of using female community-based animal health workers in rural areas should be further pursued. However, it is important that any future LLW programme complement existing governmental services, and that the concerned authorities be integrated into any proposed concept. The LLW programme should be spread amongst community-based organisations (CBOs), which should be encouraged to invest directly in the training initiative.

Women in dairying households are responsible for most activities related to animal management, including feed, shelter, and some veterinary care. However, developing their capacity is often overlooked. CELDAC set out to train a cadre of women livestock workers despite the stereotypical belief that women cannot be formally trained due to social barriers imposed on them and succeeded in doing so.

It has been shown through CELDAC that female community members are interested in learning new technologies and ideas and are willing to take up new roles as livestock service providers and livestock related business owners, but would need community approval and support. Female community based animal health workers

¹² An example of this has been Southern Highlands Dairy Development Project (SHDDP) a sponsored investment programme in Tanzania which has shown promising returns to training of paraprofessionals with community support. Another examples includes the Mansehra Village Support Project, whereby an NGO trained 205 village women as livestock paraprofessionals (female livestock extension workers), along with 382 male livestock paraprofessionals (livestock extension workers). The study found that it was quite difficult for the women to establish themselves in private ventures, particularly where they had to compete with men

(i.e. LLWs) have the potential to become an alternative for doing skilled work and be accepted as a legitimate member of the country's "workforce" in rural areas, be it as demand driven 'self-employed' provider of services or as 'employee' of a public, private or community entity.

Follow-up activities. Projects such as CELDAC need to go beyond training village women in a non-traditional occupation such as livestock work. Women in conservative societies will have a harder time establishing profitable service ventures in these sectors, particularly if they have to compete with men. Therefore, the MTR suggests that follow-up training among women trainees is vital so as to provide encouragement, help in marketing their services and generally assist them in getting "started", all in a social setting in which their role is non-traditional and socially questioned.

Organisation around a profitable initiative. An important lesson learnt is that organising local farmers around a profitable initiative is possible and can lead to the real achievement within the current context of the Pakistani dairy industry. However, such an initiative requires a comprehensive and initiation of broad measures rather than a focus on production alone. Measures suggested range from encouraging farmers to form groups by providing support in technology transfer, market linkages, and enterprise management.

PPP. It has also been shown that dairy sector development through successful PPP (e.g. partnership between the project, corporations, and a public university) can be established and under clear working arrangements yield positive results.

Design and Formulation. Designing community development interventions must include greater consultation with target communities. These were not detailed very well in the PRODOC. Design and planning should be "bottom-up" focusing on local need-based demand and conditions. This strengthens ownership of the project by the target group. Well defined participatory approaches reflecting long-term strategic considerations should be central for projects of this nature.

Process not Blueprint. Considering the fact that CELDAC is a pilot project, emphasis should be on process as well as experimentation and testing. It was not designed as a "blueprint" project although its implementation so far appears to suggest this. Greater connectivity with other projects, community organisations (e.g. dairy groups, farmer groups, community networks etc) can be important to sustain the demand for LLWs services, provide a market for produce for sale by SBEs and be suppliers of milk to VMCs. Projects such as CELDAC need the flexibility to take the project into a new direction if needed.

Credit. The credit component of CELDAC, although useful, may well come into play as the LLWs become more established and think about expanding their businesses. This side of the project was perhaps optimistic.

Resource utilization. Resource utilization and value of varying contributions need to be fully detailed. Activities which are a partner contribution but with high value should be more transparently shown and expanded.

Both IPs used available UNDP funds in different ways to reach the target beneficiaries although they both faced similar challenges in terms of reaching remote areas, security and delivery. Outreach was good however in both cases.

Consistency. Programmes and projects should have consistency in their delivery mechanism unless explicitly designed to contrast and compare varying implementation modalities. In the case of CELDAC varying modalities were developed. Consistency in the relationship with the IPs needs also to be examined. UNDP should consider revisiting this.

8.1. General Lessons Learnt

8.1.1. Key Constraints

The MTR found it very difficult to measure the real impact of the project either socially or from an animal production system stance, given the absence of baseline or clear on-going monitoring data. This has been fundamental constraint. Given that the project is more socially and gender oriented the changes in the community or local economy at large would inevitably be tricky to measure. Where IPs have assisted the setting up of VMCs however, milk production seems to have increased since the start of VMC activities.

8.1.2. Gaps identified

A number of gaps have been identified by the MTR. These are to do with the continuation of basic animal services being delivered by the LLWs and the future of MTs.

The issue of LLWs continuing to deliver their advice to local animal owners poses a real concern and gap in the unfolding of CELDAC. The absence of institutionalised linkages established for LLWs has meant that LLWs have to rely and survive by themselves. Neither the community nor animal owners employ LLWs permanently. Similarly the state or privately run animal health services have no formal or informal linkages with LLWs.

Implementation linkages with other on-going projects or programmes of either UNDP or other donors has also meant that lessons learnt have not been so easily shared nor for these others to pick up LLWs as a useful input in their own programmes in the future. Currently, MTR is not aware of any LLWs who have been employed in other development or change initiatives.

The second gap is deciding how to make best use of the MTs that were trained. Their skill set now has been enhanced and linkages with other programmes and projects (donor or NGO supported) should be seriously considered.

8.1.3. Opportunities identified

Dairy production. Although milk production systems prevailing in Pakistan were plagued by lower milk yields, they offered immense potential for growth. Changes in animal management and animal feeding practices, especially by small dairy farmers and community-based animal health workers could be instrumental in raising milk yields. However, sustained efforts on the part of government and private sector are needed to improve their animal stocks, management practices, and production technologies.

As dairy income often supplements farming or labour income, most dairying households belong to subsistence or near subsistence categories and could make

the leap into higher production dairy production. Therefore, attempts to enhance production of smallholder dairying through strengthening delivery of extension services by building a cadre of LLWs is not only important for raising milk yield in the country but could also become an effective tool for raising incomes of impoverished rural households. Successful interventions of this type are needed to harness the immense potential on offer and could be one key to alleviating poverty in rural areas.

Awareness Campaigns. Knowledge enhancement of farmers regarding better feed management, through awareness raising activities through media and community camps should be pursued. Private sector companies engaged in milk processing and provincial livestock departments can also be involved in information dissemination.

CELDAC has (both Components A and B) shown that women from remote and traditional communities can be trained and that they can be accepted back into their communities and make a positive difference to the perception that women have no recognised economic role and contribution to production and animal management systems. There is real opportunity to use the cadre of LLWs as a basis to fine-tune and increase the level of sophistication of service delivery to animal owners and cattle-folk and to raise production and output which can contribute to poverty alleviation.

The model appears sound and with some fine-tuning can yield greater results than it has currently. Linkages with market players, development operators and service providers should be encouraged.

9. Recommendations, Actions, Responsibilities and Timeline

After considerable in depth discussion and review the MTR mission has identified the following recommendations and options for the way forward. Identification of a timeline and responsible party is also presented where appropriate and summarised in section 9.1.

The MTR mission is of the following opinion for the remaining duration of the project:

Project Extension/Replication. The MTR mission is of the view that this pilot project should be completed at its scheduled time i.e. September 30, 2009.

CELDAC should not be extended or replicated in its current form beyond September 2009. More of the same will not change the development situation and in any case the CELDAC pilot model has been proven. In the immediate next phase it is recommended that the project be implemented in Punjab and Sindh and the scale of the project to be decided at the time of the project formulation mission.

Planning the Exit. The MTR Mission recommends that in the short run the final planned batches of LLWs receive their basic animal health training. Both PMUs should develop a common strategy for encouraging the set up of a formalised network of LLWs (or SBEs or possibly also VMCs as well).

Institutionalised arrangements that could be “tested” in the last few months of the project include LLWs being temporarily employed by local veterinary private practices, state livestock veterinary extension services, (both if available) pharmaceutical companies or even dairies. LLWs could also be employed by Nestlé and EFL and other institutions including PDDB and PDDC.

MOUs with Nestlé and EFL. The PPP documentation that UNDP has signed (i.e. the MOU) should be revised even at this late stage. Reference is made to the transfer of all equipment to Nestlé for example, but which should be redeployed to other UNDP or Government projects (see footnote 9).

Long Term Recommendations

The MTR mission is of the view that the concept of using community-based animal health workers (i.e. LLWs) in rural areas across the country should be further pursued. Given the importance of livestock development in Pakistan, any future project should continue to strategically remain engaged with the sector. Having established a cadre of LLWs this would be a good platform to build upon. However, the lessons from the CELDAC pilot phase clearly indicate the need for institutional anchorage and integration of MTs and LLWs to ensure sustainability of any future intervention.

Government, development agencies and private sector entities should give special consideration to building upon the results achieved through CELDAC by continued support to up-scaling of community based female livestock extension services in the dairy rich areas of Pakistan but focusing particularly on Punjab and Sindh in the immediate next phase. CELDAC should build upon Government commitment to progress and development of the livestock and dairy sector keeping in mind its

contribution towards poverty reduction as stated recently by the Chief Minister Punjab who is quoted as saying:

“We are working on a strategy to uplift the livestock and dairy development sector as this could help eliminate poverty, generate employment opportunities as well as earn foreign exchange”¹³.

For durable results and sustained impact of activities Government support is vital and should be integrated into any proposed concept. However, it is clear that the ultimate success and sustenance of the programme builds on the active participation and support of all stakeholders these being principally livestock keepers, community based organisations (CBOs), Government authorities, private veterinarians, private sector dairy companies, pharmaceuticals, parastatal entities, communities and the LLWs themselves.

Programme Planning and Project Formulation

Design and Formulation. All stakeholders should be involved in programme development and in the design and formulation of a follow-up project to CELDAC from the outset. These include government, private sector dairy companies, parastatal entities, community, organisations from the community (e.g. community associations), NGOs, pharmaceuticals and target beneficiaries. Dialogues and participatory forums should be held with key stakeholders to ensure their participation in the conceptualisation and formulation of the project. The design and planning should be “bottom-up” focusing on local need-based demand and conditions. Well defined participatory approaches reflecting long-term strategic considerations should be central for projects of this nature. Such approaches also ensure stakeholders’ consistent involvement during the course of project implementation.

Responsible party: UNDP/GSP Donors - Timeline: next 6 months.

PRODOC Detail. It is important that any PRODOC is sufficiently detailed and developed demonstrating a consistent logic and thoroughness, showing that activities make a contribution to the purpose and objective of the intervention. Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms alongside built-in flexibility give a chance for any needed adjustment.

Project Phasing. Project planning and design would benefit from an inception phase to revisit the intention and plan of the original PRODOC. Developing an Inception Report within the first few months to confirm the original intention and plan make a real contribution to clarifying, confirming and contributing to improved delivery. Phasing could include inception, implementation and exit strategy. This assists the designers to plan, manage and implement activities to meet the objectives in the time and budget available.

Impacting a Policy Change. Future project design should focus on impacting national livestock policy development and building a supportive policy environment. The importance of the recognition of LLWs by local government authorities should not be underestimated and would assist in increasing project effectiveness.

Complementarity with other projects. The design of future projects should also focus on developing inter-project synergies within GSP as well as with other

¹³ Quote by Chief Minister Punjab “The News”, February 15, 2009

initiatives in the Livestock Sector. These may include using the SMs developed under GSP supported “Women’s Political School Project” in the CELDAC project.

Other projects with which synergies could be explored include:

- *The CIDA supported “Pathways and Purse Strings” (P&P)*, project will be completed in 2011 which aims to integrate about 20 000 women in four provinces into four viable value chains, of which fresh milk collection in Punjab is but one. Through partnership with Haleeb the P&P project will strengthen women’s business involvement in fresh milk collection and raise the income of 6 000 homebound women milk producers;
- Other CIDA supported projects under its Gender Equality Projects (GEP) which could be seen as other potential anchoring points for CELDAC include the *Women’s Employment Concern* and *Working Conditions Project* which has a component to assist women’s groups to improve the quality and quantity of employment through entrepreneurship and market linkages; The Support to Implementation of Gender Reform Action Plans (GRAPs) which could be a useful link for policy reform impacting on LLWs;
- *DFID supported “Punjab Economic Opportunities Programme (PEOP)”*, still to be launched, would be another option to explore. PEOP aims to focus on provision of market based skills and interventions to improve incomes of the poor farmers in the livestock and dairy sector. In addition to opening up avenues for private sector skills providers through Punjab Skills Development Fund, the programme will ensure that 160 000 poor people get employment opportunities through appropriate skills. For the livestock and dairy sector, the programme will introduce modern management practices to improve yield for small farmers, remove market distortions for better pricing to poor people and improve women’s access to livestock assets and livelihood opportunities. The Fund will develop a strong focus on marketable skills for poor men and women in the four selected districts. PEOP will invest half of the programme funds to improve incomes of poor farmers and women through higher yields of milk and meat production and stronger market linkages.

Use of Media. Creating a network of LLWs has been a challenging task within the current social and cultural context of Pakistan. Effective awareness raising programmes using electronic media alongside other channels for the farmers and rural opinion makers should be developed and may help in the networking process. Radio Programmes targeting farmers and especially programmes focussing on significance and value of women’s role in the livestock and dairy sector in Pakistan could be developed. Such campaigns can help to neutralize current cultural and social biases which are an impediment to women receiving livestock related income and their participation in the programme/project planning process. In order to surmount the existing challenges to creating a female workforce in the livestock sector it is vital that the community as a whole be effectively motivated and mobilized to support such programmes, for which the media is seen to be an effective tool.

The following recommendations outline potential institutional anchors:

Parastatal Entities.

a) PDDC, a government financed company established and registered as an independent entity under the Ministry of Industries in 2006 and now placed under the Ministry of Special Initiatives, should be approached to explore the potential uptake of these LLWs. The suggestion follows some initial positive discussions with PDDC.

The trainings of the LLWs can be expanded to include animal production and dairy development issues.

Responsibility: UNDP/GSP - Timeline: Within the next Three months.

b) The Livestock and Dairy Development Board (LDDDB), is another government sponsored entity working to help communities in livestock management and production. UNDP should explore the possibility of anchoring trained LLWs and MTs with them as well.

Responsibility: UNDP/GSP - Timeline: Within the next three months.

c) The Pakistan Dairy Development Association (PDDA) should be approached by UNDP to assist in advocacy of policy changes with the Government to support institutionalisation of the LLWs. The modalities for such an engagement should be worked out within the formulation of new programme activities.

Responsibility: UNDP/GSP - Timeline: Within the next three months.

NGOs. UNDP should conduct meetings with the Rural Support Programmes Network (RSPN), the implementing partner for the Prime Minister's Initiative for Livestock (PMIL), a nationwide project implemented since 2007 in 79 districts countrywide. Under PMIL, Community Livestock Extension Workers (CLEWS) have been trained and are providing services through clinics set up in target communities. The pool of female extension workers created through CELDAC can be anchored in the clinics set up under PMIL in areas where there is geographic overlap. The details of the arrangement should be worked out jointly with Government and RSPN/UNDP representatives.

Responsibility: UNDP/GSP/CELDAC - Timeline: Within the next three months.

Private Sector. Avenues for building upon the PPP experience with Nestlé and EFL should be pursued. These private sector companies may not be the ideal implementing partner in the next phase of the project, as UNDP still is to formulating legal modalities for partnering with the private sector, however, engaging with Nestlé, EFL and other dairy companies in the country is recommended as they can employ LLWs trained under CELDAC as VMCs. The MTR mission suggests that UNDP develop more appropriate modus operandi for working with private sector partners.

Responsibility: UNDP - Timeline: Within the next three to six months.

9.1. Actions, Responsibilities and Timeline

The following table represents a summarised action, responsibilities and timeline for the CELDAC PMUs in particular and for UNDP in general and is based on the recommendations outlined above.

Action	Responsible Agent	Timeline
Design and Formulation – Follow-up	UNDP/GSP Donors	Next 3months
Discussion with Pakistan Dairy Development Company- PDDC	UNDP/GSP	Next 3 months
Discussion with Pakistan Dairy Development – PDDA	UNDP/GSP	Next 3 months
Discussion with Livestock and Dairy	UNDP/GSP/CELDAC	Next 3 months

Development Board – LDDb		
Develop Public Private Partnerships – PPP modalities	UNDP	Next 3 months
Consider institutional linkages NGOs	UNDP/GSP/CELDAC	Next 3 months

Annexes

Annex A: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference-Mid-Term Review Mission:

Community Empowerment through Livestock Development and Credit

Background

Pakistan's livestock sector contributes almost 50 percent to the value addition in the agriculture sector, and almost 11 percent to Pakistan's GDP. Pakistan is currently the fifth largest milk producer in the world. Pakistan's rural women are responsible for 60% to 80% of feeding and milking of cattle.

CELDAC is a three year project (2006-2009) designed to enhance income and employment generation of rural women through livestock skills development, improved livelihoods and food security at the household and community level. It is a component of UNDP's and the Government of Pakistan's overarching Gender Support Programme (GSP). The initiative is being implemented in Punjab and Sindh with two private sector partners from the dairy sector; namely, Nestle Pakistan (Punjab) and Engro Foods Limited (Sindh). The project has an approved budget of USD 6,076,400 million and is supported by UNDP and a pool of GSP cost sharing partners, namely; DFID, SDC and Norway with in-kind contributions from the implementing partners.

The key project outputs are:

1. At least 3600 women self employed and generating extra incomes through livestock extension services and improving nutritional status and food security at the household
2. Income and employment generation of poor livestock households through facilitation to institutionalized collateral free credit and savings facilities.

The Mid-Term Review will evaluate the success of the project, as well as identify issues and recommend course corrections. The review will pave the way for improved project delivery for the remaining project duration and review amendments, (if any) required in project design, implementation and/or institutional anchorage in order to contribute to the creation of systems for sustained capacity building of LLWs /livestock managers.

Objectives of the Review Mission:

The mid-term project Review of CELDAC will analyse project progress against stated objectives. The Mission will also highlight issues and challenges affecting effective and efficient implementation of objectives and recommend course corrections.

Key Focus Areas:

The mission should assess:

Relevance:

- i. Provide an assessment of how well the project focused on the needs and demands of the beneficiaries'.

Effectiveness and Impact:

- ii. Review how the project has accomplished its objectives, affect of the project on beneficiaries, particularly, women. These may include aspects on household Livelihood Security, Income Diversification, women LLWs and their economic progression.
- iii. The performance of the Project so far with particular reference to qualitative and quantitative achievements of objectives and targets as defined in the project documents and work-plans;
- iv. The contribution of the projects towards the achievement of national objectives and CPAP MYFF (Multi-year funding framework) goals vis-à-vis gender equality;

Efficiency:

- v. Assess how the project has utilized the project funding to achieve results?
- vi. Assess the timeline and quality of the reporting followed by the project
- vii. The qualitative and quantitative aspects of management and other inputs (such as equipment, monitoring and review and other technical assistance and budgetary inputs) provided by the projects vis-à-vis achievement of objectives and targets;

Sustainability:

- viii. Consider preliminary indications of the degree to which the project results are likely to be sustainable beyond the project's lifetime, and provide recommendations for strengthening sustainability.
- ix. The appropriateness of the training infrastructure and institutions as well as implementation strategies adopted by the projects (including but not limited to the process of selecting, Master trainers, trainers development of training materials/curricula, dissemination of training tools, appropriateness of training methodologies used (separate for both provinces) and tool kits provided to LLWs;
- x. Indicate if the reproduction/replication of the project or service methodology elsewhere is feasible;

Network /linkages

- xi. The level, degree and appropriateness of participation by the beneficiaries, stakeholders, government and donor partners in the implementation of the project (with particular attention to the development, testing and production of training materials, formulation and planning of projects activities and other technical assistance inputs);
- xii. Any linkages formed as a result of project activities which further advanced project objectives or conversely, any missed opportunities which would have significantly enhanced achievement of objectives/targets;
- xiii. Project's knowledge management strategy and outreach and communications to all stakeholders.

Lessons learnt:

- xiv. Significant lessons learnt that can be drawn from the experience of the project and its results and impact on beneficiaries;
- xv. Identify lessons learned and recommendations for adjustments in project strategies, implementation approaches and management structures to improve project implementation and its impact, even after donor intervention has ended;

Outputs:

The Mission's findings and recommendations will be thoroughly discussed with the UNDP, GSP, Project Partners, project management, donors and the EAD.

The Mission will complete and submit a draft final report in both hard and soft copy at the end of the mission. The Mission Leader will finalize the report in the light of comments/suggestions of stakeholders. The key outputs of the Review are:

- 1) Draft Report Template: Submission of a draft report format containing Table of Contents for final report for approval by UNDP.
- 2) An Aide-Memoire (Executive Summary and Key findings) and Presentation:
The consultants will present the key findings and executive summary of the report to the project stakeholders (GSP's cost-sharing partners, EAD and CELDAC) in a consultative workshop.
- 3) Mid-Term Review report: The final Review report should be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The report should respond in detail to the key focus areas described above. A set of specific recommendations formulated for the project; and, identify the necessary actions required to be undertaken, who should undertake those and possible time-lines (if any);
- 4) Presentation: For presenting and discussing the draft final report interactively, the consultants will facilitate a one-day concluding workshop in Islamabad for the project stakeholders as well as representatives from other provinces and any other participants invited by the project.

Consultants:

A team of consultants; one with at least ten years of experience in livelihoods and livestock sector issues and the others with at least eight to ten years of expertise in livelihoods including gender.

Annex B: Evaluation Mission Itinerary (Field) - March-April 2009

Team Members:

- Paul Schoen, Mr. – Economist/Team Leader
- Farwa Zafar, Ms. – Social Development Specialist

Day	Date	Location	Activity	Person/Community
Wed	25-03-09	UK-Pakistan	Travel to Islamabad – Team	
Thurs	26-03-09	Arrival in Islamabad	Travel to Islamabad – Team	
Fri	27-03-09	Islamabad 0830	Briefing with UNDP	Mikiko Tanaka – Deputy Country Director-UNDP Sajid Baloch – GSP Coordinator Saud Bangash – Economist-UNDP Bushra Hassan – UNOPS/GSP
		Islamabad 1230	Meeting at EAD	Md Asif, Jt Sec Khalid Hanif, Desk Officer
		Islamabad 1345	Meeting at UNDP	Sajid Baloch, Programme Coordinator, GSP
		Islamabad 1415	Meeting at UNDP with GSP partners	Swiss Development Cooperation – Mikiko Tanaka-Dep Country Rep -UNDP Rabia Khattak- Strategic Management Unit – UNDP
Sat	28-03-09	Islamabad 1000	Meeting at Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Livestock	Mr. Hamid Ali Khan, Joint Secretary
		Islamabad 1200	Meeting at First Micro-Finance Bank Ltd	Ayesha Baig, Hd Non Finance Service and Development Initiatives
		Islamabad	Preparation of Aide Memoire outline	Team
COMPONENT A: Punjab				
Sun	29-03-09	Islamabad-Lahore	Depart for Lahore	Team
		Lahore 1630-1830	Meeting with PMU Component A	Akmal Saeed, NPM
Mon	30-3-09	Lahore 0930	Presentation and discussion at PMU Lahore	Akmal Saeed, NPM S. Fakhar Ahmed, NPD plus core team of PMU
		Lahore 1130	Discussion with Livestock Farms, Livestock and Dairy Department, MoAL, Punjab	Md Nawas Saeed, Director Ejaz Ahmed, Assistant Director
		Lahore 1300	Meeting with UVAS	Dr Salahuddin, Director Dr Irfan Irshad,

Day	Date	Location	Activity	Person/Community
				External Examiner for CELDAC
		Lahore 1430	Meeting at Livestock and Dairy Development Board	Dr Naveed Niazi, Director
		Lahore 1600	Nestlé Pakistan	Trevor Clayton CEO Nestle NPD Component A NPM Component A
Tues	31-3-09	Lahore 1000	SMEDA office, Lahore	Noureen Anjum
	31-3-09	Chur Munda, District of Sialkot, Pasrur	Field visits: Aadian Village	Dr Maria Mubarak – Follow-up Team Leader Farhat Sanaullah – LLW Father of Sanullah
	31-3-09	Chur Munda, District of Sialkot, Pasrur	Village meeting	Team plus village: Md Beg – farmer/buffalo owner Ashraf Begg – farmer/buffalo owner Bashir Begg – farmer/buffalo owner Md Ashraf – farmer/buffalo owner Ashraf Baque – farmer/buffalo owner
Wed	1-4-09	Enroute and then Nokarian Mughlan Village , Natowal District 0950	Discussion	Ms Qadria Ejaz – LLW Father of Ms Qadria
		Akallahrh Village, Narowal District, Sadhwalla 1200	LLW cluster meeting	Amena Bibi – SBE plus cluster of LLWs Dhablle Walla - Cluster Head
		District Hospital, Narowal 1330	Meeting with state veterinarian	Dr Zahid Rana, Vet Officer Dr Aqeel Sohail, Vet Officer, Breed Improvement
		Village of Doaba, Narowal District 1430	Meeting with VMC	Mrs Sajid Aslam, VMC
		Lahore to Karachi	Travel to Karachi late evening	Team
COMPONENT B: Sindh				
Thur	2-4-09	Karachi 1030	Meeting with Engro Foods Ltd	Sarfaraz Rehman, CEO. EFL Ramzan Buriro, NPD
		Karachi 1230	Meeting with MoAL	Meer Parihir, Secretary Agriculture and Livestock, Government of Sindh Trev Webb, Team Leader of EU Livestock Strengthening Project
		Karachi 1430	Meeting with Livestock	Dr Ghulam Sarwar

Day	Date	Location	Activity	Person/Community
			Department	Shaikh, Director of Animal Husbandry, Sindh
Fri	3-4-09	Karachi to Sukkur	Travel to Sukkur early morning	Team
		Sukkur 0930	Presentation by PMU	PMU Team from EFL
		Village: Unar District: Shikarpur 1245	Meeting with LLWs	Parveza, Roshan, Shahzadi, Amina, Smeena, Samar, Lateefa, Hameeda – LLWs/SBE Dr Shamsa Kanwal – MT Tasleem Dayo – SM
		Unar	Community village meeting	Village of Unar Bakhat Bano - LLW Mrs Gulphar – LLW (from village of Jahnkhan) Dr Talat Qureshi, MT Khadin Hussain Laghari – Livestock owner
Sat	4-4-09	Village Jehan Khan Leghari, District Khairpur Mirs	LLW meeting	Villagers and LLWs
Sat	4-4-09	Village: Jaro Khan Raan, Naushero Feroz District 1215	LLW meeting	Villagers and LLWs
		Ranipur, District Khairpur 1600	Meeting with private veterinarian	Dr Riaz Samaad Solangi – Vet
		Sukkur	Departure for Islamabad via Karachi late evening	Team
Sun	5-4-09	Islamabad	Preparation of draft Aide Memoire and submission	Team
Mon	6-4-09	Islamabad 1500	Meeting with UNDP	Mikiko Tanaka - UNDP Faiza Effendi - UNDP Sajid Baloch – GSP Saud Bangash – Economist-UNDP Shakil Ahmed-Community Dev Specialist-UNDP
Tues	7-4-09	Islamabad 1515	Meeting with EAD	Md Asif, Jt Sec Khalid Hanif, Desk Officer
		Islamabad	Meeting at UNDP	Team
		Islamabad 1700	Meeting at Rural Support Programme Network	Khaleel Ahmed Tetlay – COO
Wed	8-4-09	Pakistan-UK	Travel back to UK for team Leader	Team Leader
Friday	10-4-09	Islamabad	Meeting PDDC	Geoff Walker, CEO
Tuesday	21-04-09	Lahore	Meeting with Chairman Nestle	Yawar Ali
			Meeting with CEO, Nirala/former Chairman PDDC and Member PDDB	Faisal Farooq

Annex C: People Met

Name	Institution	Designation
UNDP		
Mikiko Tanaka	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	Deputy Country Director (Programme)
Faiza Effendi	UNDP Pakistan Islamabad)	ARR, Poverty Reduction and Gender Unit
Sajid Baloch	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	Programme Coordinator – Gender Support Programme
Bushra Hassan	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	M&E Specialist – Gender Support Programme
Cyra Syed	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	Programme Analyst
Saud Bangash	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	Economic Analyst
Shakeel Ahmed	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	Community Development Specialist
Mehreen Khan	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	YPO, Programme Officer
Rana Muhammad Naeem	UNDP Pakistan (Islamabad)	Programme Assistant – Poverty Reduction and Gender Unit
Government Institutions, Companies, Organisations and Authorities		
Muhammad Asif	Economic Affairs Division (Islamabad)	Joint Secretary
Khalid Hanif	Economic Affairs Division (Islamabad)	Section Officer
Dr Naveed Niazi	Livestock and Dairy Development Board (Lahore)	Deputy Project Coordinator
Dr Mohd Nawaz Saeed	Department of Agriculture and Livestock (Lahore)	Former Steering Committee Member for Component 1 /Director of Livestock Farms, Punjab
Noureen Anjum	Small and Medium Enterprise Development Authority (SMEDA) (Lahore)	Management Associate Dairy and Livestock Sector (Punjab)
Meer M Parihar	Livestock and Fisheries Department, Government of Sindh	Secretary, Government of Sindh
Yawar Ali	PDDA; Nestle	Chairman
Geoff Walker	PDDC	CEO
Faisal Farooq	Nirala; PDDC & LDDB	CEO; Chairman & Member
Zahid Rana	District Animal Hospital, Narowal, Punjab	Veterinary Officer
Aqeel Shail	District Animal Hospital, Narowal, Punjab	Veterinary Officer – Breed Improvement
Riaz Ahmed Solangi	Private Practice, Ranipur, Sindh	Veterinarian

International Consultant		
Trev Webb	EC Funded Project: Strengthening Livestock Services in Pakistan (Karachi based)	Team Leader
Training Institutions		
Component A:		
Dr Salauddiin	University of veterinary and Animal Science (Lahore)	Director of Extension Services
Dr Irfan Irshad	University of veterinary and Animal Science (Lahore)	Lecturer/External Examiner to CELDAC
Component B:		
Ghulam Sarwar Shaikh	Animal Husbandry, Livestock and Fisheries Department, Government of Sindh	Director of Animal Husbandry
Micro-Finance Banks		
Ayesha Baig	The First Micro Finance Bank Ltd (Islamabad)	Head Non-Financial Service and Development Initiatives
Component A: NESTLÉ Implemented Component of CELDAC		
Trevor Clayton	Nestlé Pakistan (Lahore)	Managing Director & CEO
S Fakhar Ahmed	Nestlé Pakistan (Lahore)	National Project Director
Akmal Saeed	Nestlé Pakistan (Lahore)	National Project Manager
Dr Sobia Naheed	Nestlé Pakistan (Lahore)	Field Operation Manager
Malik Ghulam Abbas	Nestlé Pakistan (Lahore)	Finance Manager
Maria Mubarak	CELDAC – PMU (Lahore)	Follow-up Team Leader
Shumaila Jamil	CELDAC PMU (Lahore)	Communication Coordinator
Tariq Jamil	CELDAC PMU (Lahore)	Human Resource Manager
Ahmed Jameel Cheema	CELDAC PMU (Lahore)	M & E Specialist
Component B: Engro Foods Ltd Implemented Component of CELDAC		
Sarfaraz Rahman	Engro Foods Ltd	Chief Executive Officer
Ramzan Buriro	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	National Project Director
Riaz Ahmed Shaikh	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	National Project Manager
Naseem Ahmed	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	Office Assistant/Accountant
Gul Muhammad Jiskani	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	Administration and Finance Officer
Hussain Ali Kalwar	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	Human Resources Coordinator
Aftab Ahmed	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator

Shamsa Kanwal	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	Master Trainer (Vet)
Tasleem Dayo	CELDAC – PMU (Sukkur)	Social Mobilizer
Talet Qureshi	CELDAC – Sukkur	Master Trainer (Vet)
Badshahzadi Jogi	CELDAC – Sukkur	Social Mobiliser
Smashad Rahu	CELDAC – Sukkur	Zonal Coordinator
Shabana Kharal	CELDAC – Sukkur	Social Mobilizer
Fakhar Nisa	CELDAC – Sukkur	Master Trainer (Vet)
Lady Livestock Workers, Small Business Entrepreneurs		
<i>Component A: Punjab (three group meetings held – names supplied although there were more)</i>		
Said Islam	Village: Dab, Punjab	LLW and Village Milk Collector
Amana Bib	Village Akallacrh, Sadhuwalla, Naruwal District	LLW and VANDA feed seller
Dhablle Walla	Village Akallacrh, Sadhuwalla, Naruwal District	LLW
Md Begg	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	Farmer and livestock owner
Ashraf Beg	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	Farmer and livestock owner
Bashir Beg	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	Farmer and livestock owner
Md Ashraf	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	Farmer and livestock owner
Ashraf Baque	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	Farmer and livestock owner
Qadria Ejaz	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	LLW and animal medicine
Ejaz (father of Qadria)	Village : Nokarian Mughlan, Naruwal District	Farmer
Firbos Jabeen	Village: Chur Munda, Silkot District Pasrur	LLW
Farhd Sanaullh	Village: Aadian	LLW
Sanullh (Father of Farhd)	Village: Aadian	Farmer
<i>Component B: Sindh (group meetings held)</i>		
Parveza	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW
Roshan	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW
Shahzadi	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW
Amina	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW
Sameena	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW – business partner with Smar
Samar	Village area: Unar. District:	LLW – business partner

	Shikarpur, Sindh	with Sameena
Lateefa	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW
Hameeda	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	LLW – Also operates as cluster head
Village Association	Village area: Unar. District: Shikarpur, Sindh	Village farmers, livestock owners (about 25 in total)
Zaib-u-Nsa	Bahar Lariok, Ahmedpur	LLW
Yasmin	Bahar Lariok, Ahmedpur	LLW
Sheimsuad	Inistara, Ahmedpur	LLW
Phapul	Magreji, Sader Joon Bherttyoon	LLW
Ajeeba	Magreji, Sader Joon Bherttyoon, Sader Joon Bherttyoon	LLW
Hul Bhar	Jhan Khan Lageri, Sader Joon Bherttyoon	LLW
Munwar	Heimad Bhutto, Sader Joon Bherttyoon	LLW
Gul Bano	Abdullah Koswar, Sader Joon Bherttyoon	LLW
Wada Mschoon	Abdullah Koswar, Sader Joon Bherttyoon	LLW
Meeting held at Jahan Khan Legari Village:		
Farzana	Kundo Lockhar, Khalida	LLW
Nurarnet	Kundo Lockhar, Khalida	LLW
Bhubat Bano	Magharmrini, Khalida	LLW
Heshma	Allahwarayo	LLW
Nageevan	Allahwarayo	LLW
Agema	Iiyas Kalhoro	LLW
Afshan	Abbas Kandher	LLW
Umedan	Javo Khan	LLW
Janat	Javo Khan	LLW
Shamshad	Chana	LLW
Shainaz	Kovo Kovo	LLW
Salma	Kovo Kovo	LLW
Samina	Gahi Khan	LLW
Aliya Shah	Gahi Khan	LLW
Parveen	Aliwhan (Mohbatdero)	LLW
	Giaji Khan	LLW

Annex D: References Consulted

- Project Document – CELDAC – UNDP. Ratified by Economic Affairs Division (EAD) 25 August 2006.
- Revised Logframe undated but assumed from middle of 2007.
- Annual Report: Component A and Component B for years 2007-8 & 2008-9
- Guide for Lady Livestock Workers – developed by Component A and B
- Manual for Master Trainers – developed by Component A and B
- Various single documents:
 - Financial Budget and Expenditure for Component A
 - Financial Budget and Expenditure for Component A
 - Baseline Survey for Livestock Sector in 7 Districts of Punjab (2007-08), April 2008, SEBCON for Component A
 - Organigram for Components A and B
 - Presentation material from Components A and B
 - Monitoring and Evaluation Report 2007-2008 for Component B
- MOUs:
 - Between Nestlé and UNDP (2006)
 - Between EFL and UNDP (2006)
 - Between UVAS and Nestlé (2007)
- Mid Term Evaluation – Gender Support Programme, UNDP Pakistan, 2006
- Evaluation of the Women's Political School and Gender Mainstreaming through the Planning and Development Department Projects, UNDP
- Project Document - Gender Support Programme PAK/03/007, July 2003
- Annual Review Report – Gender Support Programme, UNDP March 2007
- Annual Review Report – Gender Support Programme, UNDP March 2008
- Multi-Donor Review of UNDP's Gender Support Programme – Towards a Strategic Approach to Gender Equality in Pakistan, April 2008
- Mid Term Review of the GENPROM Project, UNDP, March 2009
- UNDP Country Programme for Pakistan (2004-2008)
- Delivering as One – One Programme Document, 2008-10, UNDP Pakistan 2009
- UNDAF Pakistan 2004-2008, 2004
- CIDA Gender Equality Projects Profile

Web sites visited:

- Capacity Development and Public Private Partnerships, Peter Morgan, UNDP consultant - <http://www.gdrc.org/uem/undp-capacity.html>
- PEMBINAAN PENINGKATAN PENDAPATAN PETANINELAYAN KECIL (P4K) - <http://www.gdrc.org/icm/country/id-mfi/idmfi-p4k.pdf>
- Agricultural Census Organisation, Pakistan - <http://www.statpak.gov.pk/depts/aco/publications/pakistan-livestock-census2006/lsc2006.html>
- Overseas Development Institute – Economic Growth - <http://www.odi.org.uk/themes/economic-growth/default.asp>
- Wikipedia Encyclopaedia <http://publicprivatedialogue.com/workshop%202008/#PPD%20and%20Gender>
- www.meda.org.pk

Annex E: Summary Curricula Vitae of Evaluators

Curricula Vitae – Team Leader/Economist

1. **Family name:** SCHOEN
2. **First names:** Paul
3. **Date of birth:** 22 July 1966
4. **Nationality:** British
5. **Civil Status:** Married
6. **Education:**

Institution [Date from – Date to]	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained:
Hull University, UK 1985-1988	BA (Hons) South East Asian Studies
LSE, London, UK 1988-1989	MSc (Econ) International Relations
Wye College, University of London, UK 1990-1991	MSc (Econ) Agricultural Economics

6. **Language skills:** Indicate competence on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 – excellent; 5 – basic):

Language	Reading	Speaking	Writing
English (mother tongue)	1	1	1
Spanish	2	2	2
German	3	2	2

8. **Other skills:** (e.g. Computer literacy, etc): Fully computer literate
9. **Present position:** Independent Consultant/Co-Founder/Director of SMARTscore© - professionals for monitoring in 2007.

10. Key qualifications:

- Over 18 years of experience in a broad range of economic development areas. Increasingly undertaking missions for donors including UNDP, DFID, IFAD and EC as Team Leader.
- Expertise includes Macro and Micro-Economic and Financial Sector Analysis. He is particularly strong in project identification, Project Preparation (formulation), appraisal, Monitoring (on-going) and Evaluation, CBA as well as business planning and financial and economic forecasting and logical framework development. He has undertaken well over 50 consultancy missions of which a quarter were evaluation/monitoring.
- He has also undertaken work on Food Security with particular reference to the examination of food security in the agricultural sector covering macro-economic and micro-economic analysis. Other areas include Food Marketing Economics with reference to market performance, structure and conduct as well as pricing policy.
- Consultancy areas have included Policy and Sector and Sub-Sector Analysis including programming and country analysis. Sub-sectors have covered local institutional development, rural development and service support systems (public and private) (e.g. Vietnam - ADP II, Bangladesh - Chars Livelihoods Programme, Nigeria - MPP3) as well as fund development and design, irrigation and water economics, agricultural economics, fisheries, floodplain projects, food crops, livestock and poultry economics, small farm business development and management improvement studies, environmental economics (EIAs).

- Assignments have also included examination of institutions, capacity and capability assessments and institutional strengthening. His work has also covered competitive research grant systems as well as commercialisation of research organisations in East and West Africa for both the World Bank and EC.
- Recently he lead a team to conduct a study on the cost of routine immunization in Nigeria as Health Economist on behalf of EU PRIME (a four month study covering all of the country) and an options study for the continuation of the project post funding from the EC.
- Much of his consultancy and advisory work have included sustainable livelihoods, poverty alleviation, community development and some specialist areas including pastoral development and conflict management.
- Consultancies have also involved Agribusiness Analysis and agribusinesses in several developing countries as well as transition economies of Eastern Europe, Central Asia and South Asia with a view to identifying export potential and building on existing comparative advantages. Various planning and policy tools such as the Policy Analysis Matrix (PAM) including Domestic Resource Costs has been employed.
- He also has a particular interest in Small Island and Developing States (SIDS) and the development of economic/environmental vulnerability indexes (EVIs).
- He has international experience in development projects, either on single assignment or working with, or leading, multidisciplinary teams, at local, regional and international levels in South and South East Asia, South Pacific, Latin America, Caribbean, Africa, Eastern Europe and other transition economies as well as the Mediterranean. He has undertaken work for numerous agencies including DFID, EC, Tacis, Phare, UNDP, IFC, DGIS (Dutch Aid), Agence Française de Développement (AFD), FAO, IFAD, Senter (Dutch Agency), LuxDevelopment and the AfDB.
- Commercially, he has prepared (written, identified teams and prepared financial offers) many hundreds of proposals over the last decade for companies competing for donor organisation funded projects, including agribusiness, sustainable livelihoods, poverty alleviation, water and irrigation and policy formulation, and economic development (on average about five a year). He has been business manager, and Head of Section, for a number consultancy companies with responsibility for Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe and as a result have undertaken many business visits to all the donors in country as well as Headquarters respectively. He continues to receive requests for proposal preparation as an independent consultant.

Curricula Vitae – Social Development Specialist

1. **Family name:** ZAFAR
2. **First names:** Farwa
3. **Nationality:** Pakistani
5. **Education:**

Institution [Date from – Date to]	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained:
School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, New York, 1984	Masters in International Affairs (MIA) with specialization in Economic and Political Development,
Punjab University, Lahore, Pakistan, 1981	Masters in Political Science
Alliance Francaise, Brussels, Belgium, 1979	Diplome Superior in French language
Kinnaird College, Lahore, Pakistan, 1975	Bachelor of Arts-Political Science with Sociology

6. **Language skills:** Indicate competence on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 – excellent; 5 – basic):

Language	Reading	Speaking	Writing
Urdu	1	1	1
English	1	1	1
French	3	4	4

8. **Other skills:** (e.g. Computer literacy, etc): Fully computer literate
9. **Present position:** Independent Consultant – Democracy Specialist
10. **Summary Profile:**

- Specialist in democracy strengthening, a committed professional with demonstrated knowledge of and experienced in a broad range of academic, management and advisory positions in Pakistan and Abroad related to political, parliamentary and social development issues focused on strengthening democracy and democratic institutions. Skilled in liaison and networking with policy planners, related state institutions, political and legislative actors, national and international scholars and analysts, leading international centres of political research, international development institutions, and media.
- A key area of her work has included planning, supervising, & evaluating social sector programmes that seek to reduce the incidence of human poverty/gender inequalities, improve governance systems and processes to promote gender-sensitive, people-centred and sustainable development promoting inclusive governance i.e. governance characterized by the principles of accountability, transparency, participation, access, equity, subsidiarity and the rule of law. Assignments with leading international development organisations include the World Bank, the United Nations including the UN Department for Economic & Social Affairs, UNESCO; UNDP (in New York & Pakistan) having worked with the Bureau for Asia & Pacific, Arab States and Policy Planning and Development; DFID; USAID; EU and JICA. Consultancy areas have included Mid-Term Project Reviews, related field surveys and research, strategy development, and training covering gender, education, governance, health and poverty reduction.
- Another major area of her work has been in the realm of creating a democratic environment by addressing crucial policy issues that affect democracy and promote democratic culture as well as robust political growth in the country. She has worked with independent pro-democracy building think tanks and contributed

to strategic direction setting, conceptual planning, business development as well as implementation of programmes of the institution. Her work has focussed on non-partisan political research - both in the legislative and policy spheres as well as in the public domain; legislative capability-building activities strengthening of elected legislators; electoral process review & monitoring; youth leadership training in politics and democracy; parliament performance watch; political weather surveys; facilitation of cross-party parliamentary group on women's issues and dialogue group on civil-military relations; dialogue between the Muslim World and the West; and promoting regional cooperation through enhancing parliamentary exchanges. With a combination of policy, management and communication expertise she contributed to the growth of the organisation and bridging communication chasm between the public and legislators and the media. She also orchestrated many national and international level conferences, workshops, briefing sessions, roundtables and seminars on vital issues of national/organisational interests.

- As a senior faculty member, Department of Defence and Strategic Studies, Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad she directed, developed and delivered programmes on Pakistan's foreign & defence policies as well as contributing to policy dialogue on foreign policy and national security issues. She served as Assistant Director, Centre for Pakistan Studies, Southern Asian Institute, Columbia University, New York where she co-directed and managed the Centre's programme including policy research, seminars and conferences focusing on promoting and enhancing Pakistan's image abroad.

Annex F: Case Studies**Its Never Too Late- Profile of a Lady Livestock Worker in Punjab**

Riaz Kausar lives in a rural community, village Mandi, of District Narowal in Punjab. Mother of five children she had to struggle hard to provide them even with basic food everyday. Change came to her life in the shape of CELDAC project which selected her village as one of the target communities for training of rural women in livestock management. Upon learning of the CELDAC project in partnership with Nestle Pakistan, Riaz Kausar participated in the community meeting in her village which convinced her to be a part of the training. Against all odds Riaz finally succeeded in getting her husband to support her participation in the CELDAC one month training programme in her village. Receiving her Certificate upon completion of the training was an unbelievable occasion in Riaz's life. Riaz received a starter kit from the CELDAC which she used to set up her "Animal Health Care Centre". Riaz is now running her centre and deals with on the average four to five cases daily, and has an income of up to Rs. 6000 at times.

A major impact of this activity was the change in the behaviour and attitude of Riaz's husband and in-laws who acknowledged her new role in the community.

Riaz is a much happier woman now and is glad that she can contribute to her own and family's economic uplift.

Struggle Leads to Success – Profile of a Lady Livestock worker in Sindh

This is the story of a Gul Bahar Banu of District Khairpur Mirs- of a women's struggle to improve her life against all odds.

Gul Bahar was always living on loans her husband took in order to exist. This situation changed when she heard of CELDAC in partnership with Engro Foods Limited selected her village as one where rural women would be selected for training as Lady Livestock workers. Gul Bahar had heard of the Lady Health Workers scheme and was eager to learn about this intervention. She felt herself to be a suitable candidate and was successful in being selected from her village to undergo one month training. She now for many months is seen in her village in a white coat carrying her toolkit and providing livestock services at the doorsteps of villagers. She earns up to Rs. 3500 on an average each month by treating the common diseases of livestock, vaccination, drenching, animals and selling mineral powder with nominal profit. She purchases her medicines from another LLW in her village who works as a small business entrepreneur. She feels that she is seen as providing reliable extension services.

Her role in household decision making has increased.

Annex G: Analysis of Revised Project Logframe July 2008¹⁴ (LFA) (amended in 2008)

		OBSERVATIONS BY MTR	
Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)	LEVEL OF ACHIEVEMENT	COMMENT BY MTR
Goal: Enhanced income and employment generation of rural women through livestock skills development, improved livelihoods and food security at the house and community level.			
Program Objective			
Create a cadre of female rural entrepreneurs who are economically empowered to service their communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3600¹⁵ LLWs directly trained in Basic Animal Health and production Services in different districts of Sindh and Punjab. Primary livestock health extension services available to the farmers in the program area. 	PROBABLY BY END OF PROJECT MORE THAN 3 600 LLWs WILL HAVE BEEN TRAINED BUT ORGANISED PRIMARY HEALTH CARE SERVICE CAN BE SAID TO BE IN PLACE YET.	THE TARGET OF 3600 LLWs SEEMS REASONABLE AND EQUATES TO ABOUT 1800 VILLAGES..
Output: 1			
At least 3600 women self employed and generating extra incomes through livestock extension services and improving nutritional status and food security at the household level. Livestock production increased through timely provision of primary animal health and production services by reducing livestock morbidity and mortality rate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3 600 LLW directly trained to deliver livestock extension services in districts where ENGRO Foods and Nestle Pakistan milk collection is operative; At least 60% of the trained LLW started generating extra income by the end of the project period 2006-2009. Basic Animal Health and Production Services provided to at least 1720 villages¹⁶ by the project trained LW. The income of the household increased by Rs. 2 000/month by the trained LLW through extension services and other livestock related enterprise. 	CELDAC IS ON COURSE TO HAVE TRAINED MORE THAN 3 600 LLWs. IN TERMS OF INCOME, LLWs WERE GIVEN A STARTER KIT WHICH COMPRISED ANIMAL HEALTH PRODUCTS READY FOR SALE. IT IS NOT SURPRISING THAT MANY LLWs HAVE INDEED GENERATED AND MANY (ALTHOUGH IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO GIVE A PERCENTAGE) CONTINUE TO	OUTPUT 1 IS VERY AMBITIOUS IN SCOPE COVERING: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FEMALE DEVELOPMENT, EMPLOYMENT INCOME ESTABLISHMENT INCOME INCREASE HEALTH FOOD SECURITY INCREASED ANIMAL PRODUCTION SERVICE DELIVERY REDUCTION IN ANIMAL

¹⁴ This version was developed after a workshop held (with the presence and participation of both Sindh and Punjab components) on 17th July 2008 in Karachi.

¹⁵ Nestle Pakistan to train 2400 LLWs and Engro Foods Limited to train 1200 in respective project areas.

¹⁶ Nestle Pakistan to cover at least 1000 villages and EFL to cover at least 720 villages in respective project areas.

¹⁷ Top 5 performing LLWs get rewards/medals in an annual function.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall Production and Health of livestock improved in the project area against the baseline by the end of project period, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 10 % milk yield increased in the project areas against the baseline by the end of the project period. Livestock mortality and morbidity rate in the project area reduced by 2% by the end of the project period. At least 5% HHs added into CELDAC project network Linkages provided by IPs for sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 100 VMCs (50 for each IP) set up in project area. Incentive mechanisms piloted to encourage women for providing primary livestock health extension services¹⁷ 	<p>SELL AND DELIVER SOME BASIC ANIMAL HEALTH CARE. INCOME FROM HEALTHCARE PROVISION WAS SUPPLEMENTED IN MAJORITY OF CASES BY FROM SALE OF MEDICINE AND ANIMAL FEED SUPPLEMENT.</p> <p>ALTHOUGH PRODUCTION FIGURES WERE COLLECTED BY EACH COMPONENT, THESE WERE NOT ADEQUATE TO ESTABLISH A SPECIFIC IMPACT. BUT WHERE IPs HAVE ASSISTED IN SETTING UP THE VMCs, MILK PRODUCTION SEEMS TO HAVE INCREASED.</p> <p>HHs WERE USING LLWs SERVICE</p> <p>PROBABLY 20 TO 30 VMCs HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED WITH SUPPORT FROM THE TWO IPs.</p>	<p>MORBIDITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MORTALITY <p>THE MONITORING INVOLVED WOULD SIMPLY BE OVERWELMING FOR THIS PROJECT.</p>
Activities:			
1.1 Project Management Office (PMU) and Field Offices (FOs) established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A PMU and Field Offices established on project extension basis in at least 20 districts. PMU and FOs are functional offices equipped with the minimum required facilities 	BOTH IPs SET UP OFFICES INCLUDING SOME OUTREACH OFFICES ALTHOUGH THE USE OF MOBILE TEAMS WAS MORE PREFERABLE.	THIS IS NOT A CORE ITEM OF THE PROJECT.
1.2 Training institute identified and agreed for development of a project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoU signed with the University of Veterinary and Animal Sciences and Directorate of Animal Husbandry, Sindh. 		

responsive training manual including the quality control measures.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training module developed and agreed between CELDAC, UNDP and relevant training institute. 		
1.3 Villages identified and selected for interventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 1 720 villages identified and selected for interventions. • Villages selected meet the project criteria stipulated in the Project Document 		YES VILLAGES WERE SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF BASELINE DATA AVAILABLE TO EACH IP.
1.4 Project teams hired and mobilized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 20 project teams comprising of 3-5 members each on project extension basis. 	YES.	INTERESTINGLY THERE WAS A REASONABLE HIGH TURN OVER RECRUITS SO THE PROJECT ENDED UP ACTUALLY IDENTIFYING AND TRAINING MORE THAN THIS TO KEEP THE STAFF CONTINGENT COMPLETE.
1.5 Project teams trained to deliver quality training.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 22¹⁸ Master Trainers trained through relevant training institute • At least 34¹⁹ Social Mobilizers trained by Consultants. 	YES ACHIEVED	MTs AND SMs TRAINED IN TOT METHODS – TRAINING WAS ONE MONTH AND DELIVERED EARLY.
1.6 Material developed for trainings and tested in the field.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 3 600 folders of training material prepared and distributed among trainees. • Training material was field tested and customised; • Training material and folders used by at least 60% of the trainees 	YES ACHIEVED	A NUMBER OF LLWs INTERVIEWED BY THE MTR WERE CONFUSED OVER THE USE OF THE ACCOUNTING BOOKS USED.
1.7 Trainee tool kits prepared.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least 2 160 successful trainees provided with tool kits 	YES ACHIEVED.	ALL GRADUATES FROM CELDAC WERE PROVIDED “STARTER KITS” – HOWEVER THE TWO IPs DID NOT CONCUR WITH EACH OTHER ABOUT WHAT THE KIT SHOULD CONTAIN BUT THE

¹⁸ Nestle Pakistan to train 12 MTs and EFL to train 10 MTs.

¹⁹ Nestle Pakistan to train 24 SMs and EFL to train 10 SMs.

			VALUE WAS ABOUT EQUAL (RPS 10 000 PER KIT)
1.8 Initial community meetings held in the selected villages.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 1720 Initial community meetings held in the selected villages. 	YES AND PROBABLY MORE.	
1.9 Trainees identified to work as LLW and SBEs/SMEs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 candidate trainees selected from each village. At least 50% of the selected trainees complete the training program 	YES ACHIEVED.	CELDAC FOLLOWED THE APPROACH DETERMINED IN THE PRODOC AND INDEED IT IS LIKELY THAT MORE THAN 50% COMPLETED THE COURSE.
1.10 Training organized for selected trainees (mobile on-site trainings).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4-6 week long training organized for a group of 20-30 trainees in different batches Each team will conduct at least 6 trainings in a year. 	YES COURSES ORGANIZED AND TRAINEES TRAINED IN BATCHES.	
1.11 Certification of trainees in Livestock Management and Basic Animal Health Services through relevant training institute.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3600 trainees receive instructions in livestock management and basic animal husbandry; At least 50% qualify the assessment and are certified. Evaluation and assessment reports of the trainees show knowledge and skill transfer 	YES PRETTY MUCH ACHIEVED	LARGELY A REPETITION OF 1.10.
1.12 Trainees registered as LLW.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 3600 trainees registered as LLW. 	TRAINED LLWs ARE WORKING IN THEIR RURAL COMMUNITIES	
1.13 Linkages developed for project trained women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 60% of inducted trainees are facilitated to be linked with outlets of services provider i.e. Milk collection centres, veterinary pharmaceuticals, fodder /feed and micro credit providers. At least 30% of the registered LLWs are, by the end of the project, permanently engaged²⁰ in ENGRO Foods Limited and Nestle 		THERE APPEAR TO BE SOME COMMUNICATION BETWEEN LLWs AND MARKET PLAYERS I.E. PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES BUT NOT WITH MICRO-CREDIT PROVIDERS. THIS MAY BE BECAUSE THE

²⁰ Either employed or engaged as an established entrepreneur in the direct or assisted value chain of the livestock / milk market and services in the target area.

	<p>Pakistan's Milk Collection activities & value chain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognition mechanisms for best performing entrepreneurs developed and implemented by IPs. 		PRODUCTIVITY POTENTIAL IN MANY OF THE AREAS IS TOO LOW FOR EITHER IP TO HAVE TAKEN A COMMERCIAL INTEREST.
1.14 Post training follow up support to the Registered Trained women of the project area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The registered trainees followed up at least for 2 months after registration during the project period for technical support. Registered LLWs proactively seek technical support and collaborate with the project teams in data collection, etc. 	YES BOTH IPs HAD A FOLLOW UP SCHEME.	THE NATURE OF FOLLOW-UP IS NOT SPECIFIED BUT ALSO THERE IS A DANGER OF DEPENDENCY BY THE LLWs ON THE MTs (OR FOLLOW-UP CELDAC STAFF). LITTLE LINKAGE APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BETWEEN LLWs AND EXISTING COMMUNITY, CORPORATE OR PRIVATE SECTOR INSTITUTIONS.
1.15 Basic Cost Benefit Analysis conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Basic cost benefit analysis conducted. 	YES	IN BOTH PROVINCES, THE BASELINE WAS DELVIERED LONG AFTER THE PROJECT STARTED. BOTH IPs HAD TO RELY ON THEIR IN-HOUSE DATA BASES TO SELECT VILLAGES AND COMMUNITIES.
1.16 Mid-Term Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mid Term Evaluation conducted for the project by external consultants. 		THIS IS NOT AN ACTIVITY OF THE PROJECT. IT IS EXTERNAL TO THEIR MANAGEMENT.
1.17 Final evaluation conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final evaluation conducted for the project by external consultants. 		THIS IS NOT AN ACTIVITY OF THE PROJECT. IT IS EXTERNAL TO THEIR MANAGEMENT.
Output:2			

Income and employment generation of poor livestock households through facilitation to institutionalized collateral free credit/savings facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collateral free Micro Finance Credit facilities available in the project area for poor people thorough nominated MFIs. 	NOT ACHIEVED	BASED ON THE LIMITED DEMAND FOR CREDIT BY THE NEWLY TRAINED LLWS, AND COUPLED WITH HIGH INTEREST RATES, THE PROGRAMME ADJUSTED ITS RESULTS AND OUTPUTS WHICH IS REFLECTED IN THE REVISED LFA. THIS REFLECTED A LOWER EXPECTATION FROM THE CREDIT COMPONENT, AS PER THE REALITIES ON THE GROUND.
Activities			
2.1 Facilitate the project trained people and associated farmers in obtaining Micro Finance assistance from donors nominated Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donors have nominated at least two credible Micro Finance Institutions who are present in the project area and are approached by CELDAC with the list of Trained LLWs for micro finance support. At least 2 briefing sessions held by representatives of MFIs in the project. 	THE AIM IN THE REVISED LFA WAS NOT PROVISION OF CREDIT BUT RATHER FACILITATION AND LINKAGES WITH LINES OF CREDIT. NOMINATION OF MFIS AND BRIEFING SESSIONS WITH LLWS, WERE CARRIED OUT.	ALTHOUGH BOTH IPs REPORTED THEIR EFFORTS TO FACILITATE OUTPUT 2, THIS OUTPUT WAS NEVER DETAILED AND DEVELOPED SUFFICIENTLY WELL. MEETINGS WERE HELD WITH A NUMBER OF MICRO-FINANCE BANKS IN ISLAMABAD, PUNJAB AND SINDH BUT THE SCOPE TO LINK DEMAND WITH SUPPLY REMAINED POORLY ARTICULATED AND GENERALLY WEAK IN VISION.

Annex H: Public Private Partnership – Some Thoughts for Developing a Strategy

General Specifics

Public-Private Partnership (PPP) has been used as a way to fulfil public tasks in partnership between the state administration and private enterprises. Often due to a lack of public funds state or public institutional activities are hampered and therefore instead of financing projects alone (often infrastructure), government has turned to cooperate with private sector investors. In the case of CELDAC however, the financial contribution made by the selected implementation partners seemed to be less important for co-financing or investment risk-sharing than did their technical or operational activities in the target States which were seen as critical to the success of the project.

Whilst PPP is clearly evolving there appears to be multiple variations of what PPP is in practice. EU policy for example on competitive tendering of public works and services has forced changes towards a more market-oriented approach to delivering tasks for which the state is responsible. Arguments that state and international bodies are inefficient have led to the conclusions that the commercial sector could be used to achieve more cost-effective provision of public services and that the role of the state as “producer” towards one as “quality assessor” should take place.

Some key characteristics of PPP include:

- The ownership of the project is shared. The heart of a PPP is thus the sharing of risks and profits;
- Compared to providing the service directly, in a PPP the state can concentrate on its core competences. The state does not need to allocate experts of its own for the implementation of the project and is thus less intimately involved; and
- PPPs exhibit a trend away from conventional, tax-based financing approaches towards financing through contributions of individual users (e.g. tolls for motorways).

The discussion of how to develop and manage PPP is becoming more vocal as varying experiences are being analysed and reviewed. An important starting point however is understanding what a PPP is. According to the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) the following definition provides some clue:

“PPPs refer to the collaboration between public entities and private companies to realise public projects and objectives, arranged so that tasks, responsibilities and risks are optimally allocated among the partners. Over the last 20 years, PPPs have been increasingly recognised as a viable option for realising development objectives”²¹

However, experience with PPPs has not all been positive resulting in the following range of views being expressed:

- PPPs are particularly useful for implementing large-scale projects, primarily based on contractual relations between public and private entities, mostly through design–build–finance and operate/maintain (DBFO or DBFM) type contracts;

²¹ ODI, Key Sheet 23 Public Private Partnerships, 2 page document.

- PPPs are an instrument for generating private-sector creativity which may contribute to the cost coverage and thus fast implementation of various socially desirable projects;
- PPPs are a structure in which public and private entities cooperate, preferably in a separate legal entity, which can be applied in various sectors of the economy;
- PPPs do not affect public responsibility. Government stays responsible. Under public responsibility, firms are invited to provide services either to government or directly to the public.

When assessing the potential contribution of PPPs to social and economic development, a strategy is needed for (at a minimum) the policy formulation, project preparation and implementation stages of PPP development. For each stage, initiatives should address all relevant stakeholders. These at the very least should include the following players:

- Sponsoring government entity;
- Local government;
- The local private sector;
- International donor and lending agencies;
- International and national commercial lenders;
- International and national project investors;
- End-users of the project; and
- Other identified stakeholders.

UNDP interestingly, has itself invested in understanding PPPs quite well to the extent that it has set up a Special Unit for South-South Cooperation (SU/SSC) which is designed to expand the understanding of available tools that can promote both infrastructure and social service development²². However, all the listed projects are infrastructure or “big” in nature covering health, power, environment, public buildings, transportation and water. Budgets are very high as one would expect and run into the many millions of USD.

CELDAC may however fit more easily into the what has been termed a “Public Social Private Partnership” (PSPP) model which is not merely an extension of the PPP idea, but a precondition for ensuring that a PPP has a social goal and:

- assures and implements the public aims, agendas and tasks in the sense of community benefit, welfare, etc.;
- adheres to and sustains the agendas and aims of cooperation in the mid- and long-term; and
- plans and suitably applies the necessary conditions and resources (e.g. financing) for sustainable results.

The redefinition from PPP to PSPP means that mid- to long-term solutions can be found that fulfils the functions that a state or donor needs in the interests of the common good or welfare obligations. In addressing the aims and functions of donors in the form of a partnership, the donor side of the partnership gains options for action: firstly through a cooperative form of outsourcing (including financing possibly) and secondly by involving additional partners from private enterprise and social enterprise in doing things which it has responsibility for. Both aspects allow the donor to do its job in a more rounded, professional and sustainable way by bringing in additional finance, expertise and practical resources.

²² See the Special Unit/South-South Cooperation at: <http://www.ncppp.org/undp/index.html>

It appears that certain principles of PPP, or PSPP, need to be understood from the start and put in place early. These include but are not limited to:

- That the partnership is there to deliver value to the public;
- Working together to reduce cost, increase delivery impact and benefit from economies of scale, share experiences and act as a fast track process of positive characteristic change; and
- That there is a need to ensure that MOUs reflect the partnership. There is also the need to ensure that there are no contractual relationship arrangements but that in delivering an initiative each partner has a clearly defined role and that they have responsibilities, obligations and degree of involvement.

A Suggested Contour for PPP in the Future

PPP is about partnership between a public body and a private sector player. The important point is that CELDAC experience forms the basis for future PPPs in the development sector and is a good first step in the evolution of this implementation modality.

Although the relationship and split of responsibilities should be worked out on a case by case basis there appear to be a number of fundamentals which should form any agreement:

- **Collective Ownership:** Any agreement should clearly spell out that the relationship that the partners have with each other and with the project (even, if their financial contribution is not all equal). This should describe the comparative strengths of each partner. Future initiatives should be advertised as Calls-for-Partnership rather than Calls-for-Proposal. This sets a positive feeling from the start and also should give a future partner the opportunity to comment on the initiative and make a contribution to its overall design prior to implementation of ground activities.
- **Project Management and Division of Responsibilities:** Any agreement should clearly spell out the relationship that the partners have with the project. The role of a Lead Partner could be an overseeing function rather than a lead decision-maker. They could be the main channel for project visibility and web-management for example and overall programme scheduling. With respect to the Implementing Partners they should agree what their implementation responsibilities are. These can be ring-fenced in advance.
- **Financial Contribution:** Any agreement should clearly spell out the amounts of investment being made by each partner. In the case of in-kind contribution these should be verified. What one partner values as high, another may value as low and an agreement on this should be reached. Any unspent money should be returned to each partner in proportion to the amount they contributed.
- **Source of financing:** PPP has been used as model to raise money it does not have. The private sector is encouraged to invest and in exchange for this they (the private financier) is given a concession to operate and charge for the use of a road, bridge or sea port (as is often the example) for a specific period time it has built. Case of CEDLDAC is a new kind of PPP in which the services and activities in the market of a private player is what is interesting. Harnessing the private sector interest in social development is important, not just their ability to co-finance.
- **Duration:** It is a good idea to periodically validate and revisit any agreements or MOUs that are in place for example every 12 months.

- **Transparency and Promotion:** All partners to a project should indicate that they are a partner to the whole programme. The importance of PPP, with reference to CELDAC for example, is that each partner should promote the whole programme and not just their part in it. This would be an indication of “working together” and taking responsibility together.



For Further Information

United Nations Development Programme

House 12, Street 17

F-7/2 Islamabad

Pakistan

Web: www.undp.org.pk

Phone: +92-51-8255600

Fax : +92-51- 2655014-15