

# **REPORT**

## **Study of post-crisis methodology HI/ANS Rural Development projects**

### **BOSNIA**

Aida Behrem

HI / CIEDEL  
© July 2001

## INTRODUCTION

This report studies the methodology utilised by HI/ANS in the implementation of a dairy project after the crisis in Bosnia.

This study is part of the four studies carried out in the context of the ECHO/F3E study on methodological approaches in post-crisis rehabilitation-development projects.

The present report follows the set-up as defined by C Mestre for the Rwanda case. The reader will find:

1. Description of the project's context
2. A comparison of the intended project and the reality covering
  - objectives
  - intended activities
  - real results
  - actors involved
3. The perception of the HI/ANS approach by the principal groups of actors involved and the strategies they have developed
4. A synthesis and recommendations in terms of methodology
5. Annexure
  - list of actors interviewed
  - list of documents studied
  - list of abbreviations used in this document

## REMARKS FOR EASY COMPREHENSION

1. Abbreviations used in this document are listed in the annexure.
2. Letters and figures refer to various resources. "doc J", refers to document J. These are listed in the annexure
3. "A12a refers to Actor n° 12. The list of actors and their codes are given in the annexure.

## SITUATION AT THE OUTSET OF THE PROJECT (JUNE 96)

BiH has suffered tremendous damage since the war broke out in 1992 around 250 000 people were killed and 1.5 million of the 3.8 million estimated to be currently living in BA are internal refugees or displaced persons. While the project was identified at the end of 1995, annual per capital income had fallen to an estimated USD 500 from USD 1900 in 1990 industrial inputs was about 5 % of 1990 output. Eighty percent of the population was partly or fully dependent on humanitarian aid.

A year later some significant improvements had been made, although poverty is still widespread and economic recovery will take time, as well as infrastructure reconstruction. The Dayton-Paris Agreement has managed to stop the war, but there is still high uncertainty regarding the future of civil cohabitation.

In pre-war 1991, total annual production was 852 million liters. Annual average consumption per capita was 110.9 liters fresh milk, 6.3 liters yogurt, 7.4 kg cheese, 0.6 kg butter and 3.6 kg cream. Current consumption figures are not available.

In the pre-war period (till 1992) state farms, with 4% of total number of cattle and with 1-2% of total number of cows in milk, produced 3-4% of total milk production and provided about 25% of necessary milk for processing. Small private farms were characterized by low level of market milk production and usually that production was consumed on-farm. More than 80% of the total number of private farms had one or two cows per farm. Only 6-7% of total private milk production was sold to the dairy processing industry. There was big difference between state and private farms regarding milk production intensity, composition of breeds and use of modern technologies. So, in 1991 the average milk yield per cow on state farms was 4,693 liters, while on private farms the average yield per cow was only 1,493 liters. Low milk production per cow on

private farms was caused first of all by poor breed composition (domestic, low-producing, indigenous breeds), backward technology and an extensive manner of production (pasture agriculture).

Livestock inventories were significantly reduced by the war. After the war, rebuilding started with several donor programs. In most cases this was limited to supplying breeding stock without farm advice and developing market outlets. Success was therefore mixed. It may take further 5 to 10 years to reach pre-war numbers of dairy cattle in the country.

In 2000, about 30 dairy plants existed with a theoretical capacity of 200 million liters of milk per year (135 million in FBiH and 65 million in RS).

Today, capacity utilization is only about 25%.

A large quantity of liquid milk is presently imported (UHT in cartons). While some milk enters the country officially, there seems to be a large volume that enters illegally. The order of magnitude is unknown, but business insiders estimate the loss at about 18 million DM of potential customs duty.

The most important sources of imported milk for FBiH are Slovenia, Croatia and Hungary, and for RS it is Serbia. The import tariff is 10% on milk and milk products. But directors of dairies complain about gray imports.

The project covers whole area of Una-Sana Canton, particularly the part mostly damaged during the war. The project in general, and the livestock component in particular, was meant to address some of the most urgent needs of the rural population, notably to start reconstituting the family herd, either for self-consumption or in view of establishing a livestock-based micro-enterprise. Also, project would contribute to the Governments effort to reconstitute and rehabilitate milk production and marketing and develop veterinarian service.

## **HI/ANS ACTIVITIES**

From June 96 to February 98, HI/ANS implemented, under ECHO funding, a program called "Revival of rural economy by the increase of milk production in Una-sana Canton". The project area was supposed to cover Velika Kladusa area. Implementation was start in Velika Kladusa area and then is extended to the whole area of Una-sana Canton. The main objective was to create a sufficiently large and stable market for milk produced by dairy farmers in the north of the Canton by supporting dairy farming both upstream and downstream. The project consisted in:

- Encouraging the milk collection by reorganizing milk tank networks
- Supporting the growth of small a private dairy in Velika Kladusa in order to stimulate the local production
- Insuring good sanitary conditions for restarting of milk production by supporting veterinarian services
- Training small producers, whose milk is not collected, to the making a long life cheese in order to develop an alternative outlet to their production.

The immediate objectives of the restocking activities component were to restore and improve the beneficiaries' food security and help them generate additional cash income and employment. The medium-term objective was to lay the basis for beneficiaries' participation in later development interventions aimed at enabling them to generate an acceptable standard of living from smallholder livestock production.

## **METHOD PROPOSED AND IMPLEMENTED**

After a three months study managed by HI/ANS with ECHO funding in the region of Una-sana Canton, allowed to identify problems, potential partners and potential projects.

Four projects was envisaged:

1. Support seed production
2. Technical training
3. Agricultural support in new territory
4. Support animal production

Considering the importance of animal production in Una-sana Canton and potential partnership with small private dairy, HI/ANS decided to support animal production. It was proven that milk production in particular was deeply disorganized, while in the areas of medium mountain, traditionally used for cattle breeding, these activities could constitute a powerful level to revitalize local economy and through that, encourage reconciliation and setting back of refugees and displaced persons.

The proposed method was to follow the prioritized zones, sectors and situation identified by NGO SOLAGRAL and P.Polis (A Veterinarian from a solidarity organization SOS Bosnia). According interviewed actors, the method and activities, which actually implemented were:

1. Donation of material to V.S. and M.P,
2. Exchanges for payment to a social fund without interest over 2 years from the dairy M.P.
3. Provide free technical support through HI/ANS consultants
4. Support mission from outside/internal technicians
5. Training local staff
6. Through the 8 V.S. carry out preventive animal health activities
7. Training of farmers
8. Provide social loan fund
9. Manage project through a board committee involving all actors: V.S./M.P./ANS/farmers

The monitoring and evaluation system was not set up before of from the outset of the project. What had been done was an external evaluation at the end of project. Evaluation presented effectiveness (what done), efficiency (economic M.P.) and revenue farmers.

## **STARTEGIES**

HI/ANS during this project used different strategies:

1. Institutional strengthening (of the animal husbandry chain upstream) through V.S.
2. Economic take-off: transformation of milk
3. Socio-economic strengthening of farmers

## LONG TERM IMPACT OF ACTIVITIES FOR THE VARIOUS ACTORS

**Targeting.** There has been no strict implementation of targeting criteria as designed in the project. ANS, Ministry of agriculture and dairy has publicized the program and drew up list of interested farmers and veterinarian stations, setting the priorities according to local observation of actual needs. The only criteria, which is reported to be, applied everywhere is disorganization and the reduction of outlets for agricultural products

Nevertheless, in the prevailing situation, the system used has proved effective and targeting is satisfactory.

**Beneficiaries' perception.** The evaluator visited 33 farmers and one group of farmers (14) in Velika Kladusa area. Farmers were randomly selected from three lists of beneficiaries:

- a) Milk producers who sell milk
- b) Milk producers who had direct benefit from HI/ANS action
- c) Milk producers who used training.

All farmers with one exception never hear for HI/ANS action. Most of them hear only for dairy and were contacted by dairy. All farmers interviewed declared that this program has addressed the basic and most urgent needs of distressed populations given the prevailing circumstances.

**Effects on beneficiaries' income.** It was evident from field interviews that no cost-benefit analysis on farmers level. Many beneficiaries' main objective was to reconstitute the households assets stock using all available opportunities. Most of them are part-time farmers; therefore their concern about income-generation from animals is traditionally limited or non-existent, although employment opportunities are currently very slim for most people.

**Specific effects on women.** Most beneficiaries' household heads are part-time farmers and borrowed for a single animal in order to satisfy family needs in terms of milk supply. Their main objective is that, whatever happens in the future, their children will not be left without milk again. The part of project, which disbursement loan, has a direct beneficial effect on families, particularly on mothers of small children.

It is usually the women that look after the animal. When beneficiaries borrow for a single animal (which was the project and dairy policy), farming is not their main or exclusive source of income. As it is usually the husband that seeks off-farm employment, the wife takes care of the farm. Project – financed heifers are therefore a source of employment mainly for women.

Finally, a significant number of project-supplied animals and equipment went to female beneficiaries.

**Specific effects on the environment.** There was no evidence of any project-related detrimental effects on the environment.

**Milk production.** In the pre-war period (until 1999) state farms, with 4% of total number of cattle and with 1-2% of total number of cows in milk, produced 3-4% of total milk production and provided about 25% of necessary milk for processing. Small private farms were characterized by low level of market milk production and usually that production was consumed on-farm. More than 80% of the total number of private farms had one or two cows per farm. Only 6-7% of total private milk production was sold to the dairy processing industry. There was big difference between state and private farms regarding milk production intensity, composition of breeders and use of modern technologies. Low milk production per cow on private farms was caused first of all by poor breed composition (domestic, low-producing, indigenous breeds), backward technology and an extensive manner of production (pasture agriculture). Also, former communist governments based agriculture on many small farms, which obliged farmers to have a second job. Often, they depended on agro-food public industries, to sell their products and also for work. Livestock inventories were significantly reduced by the war, with estimate of loss as high as 70% according to officials of the post-war ministry of agriculture. Also, industries were waiting for governmental information about their future, and especially their potential privatization. Agricultural production became the only source of revenue for

farmers. They had to be food self-sufficient. State model was their only reference. Only a few of them chose other production system, and organize themselves to sell directly their services and productions.

**Veterinary services.** There are several municipalities within the Una-sana canton where veterinary services not readily available or not accessible to the poorer layers of the rural population. The rehabilitation and supply of Municipal Veterinary Stations remains an outstanding issue although is partly being addressed by the HI/ANS. While the mission-taking place, HI/ANS reached an agreement with Ministry of Agriculture and Veterinarian Stations and started financing local veterinary services – including identification and vaccination campaigns.

**Monitoring & Evaluation.** The Monitoring & Evaluation system has not been set up before project startup. Data collecting has been limited to list of beneficiaries who used loan. The officer in charge of Monitoring within the PIU has been appointed three months after project started. The system and person in charge of data follows from beneficiaries to the PIU is not defined. Selected indicators for the monitoring of socio-economic project performance are not clearly identified and used.

## **THE PERCEPTION OF THE HI/ANS APPROACH BY THE PRINCIPAL GROUPS OF ACTORS AND THE STRATEGIES THEY DEVELOPED**

### **1. Perception from local staff**

According to local staff, HI/ANS was a suitable method for post-crisis situation in the time and context, because:

- In context of emergency situation, the ANS project start to rehabilitate local milk production
- These action tried to create milk production and generate income for rural population
- Project was implemented in a near rehabilitation context.
- Considering the importance of animal production and potential partnership with small private dairy ANS decided to support animal production
- ANS is root activity to rehabilitate milk production in north part of Una sana canton
- Parallel with this action ANS helped veterinary services
- The project benefited in the first place to the private dairy and to the public veterinary services
- Indirectly, the project benefited to farmers in the canton, mainly those who sell their milk to the private dairy
- The project based on a strong partnership with a private dairy and V.S. which is very important but not enough to guarantee the sustainability of the process supported

### **2. Perception from IO and local NGOs**

President of OUSP Velika Kladusa sees that HI/ANS used the best method for post-crisis situation. For example, they established social fund and organize farmers around interest in credit. OUSP invest money in seed production, livestock production and small infrastructure rehabilitation of farmer's capacity. The director suggested that HI/ANS method would be successful, if it is done in collaboration with strong partnership with local authority.

The evaluator feels that is because:

1. HI/ANS implemented project in an environmental of high lack of credit and lack of capital
2. HI/ANS was disintegrated with other development activities in region

To have long-term impact HI/ANS project should incorporate sustainable development principles in the plan from the onset, and there should be an strong agreement with the all involved actors.

### **3. Perception from local authority**

Local authorities confirmed that HI/ANS used an effective method for addressing the situation after crisis (war). They believes that the project has globally a positive impact

#### **4. Perception from beneficiaries**

a) Farmers – milk producer

According to them HI/ANS used fallback strategy works but dependence on dairy with out any other chose.

b) Farmers – credit beneficiaries

HI/ANS in this project used active dynamic strategy on the farmer's side but limited fund – so few possibilities.

c) Farmers – Cheese making beneficiaries

According to them HI/ANS used the opportunity strategy.

d) Veterinary Stations

All V.S. are part of the Municipalities. The V.S. received a lot of material support: medicines, equipment, vehicles and some small infrastructure reconstruction. According to them HI/ANS used globally strategy of compliance with for some vets a commitment (South), for other opportunities strategies (Buzim were the majority of the project was invested but no vet activities).

e) Agricultural school

Generally the project was useful and responded to demand. Used strategy of compliance: obtain capital from foreign aid and accept choice of V.S. for the laboratory.

f) Dairy

As a result of HI/ANS project dairy received material and technical support. Material support was in total amount of 320.000 DM. After HI/ANS action dairy increased production. Their strategy was to:

- Obtain free technical how-know via project
- Obtain interest free and uncontrolled loan via HI/ANS
- Obtain HI/ANS support for important and set-up of the machinery

#### **SYNTHESIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS IN TERMS OF METHODOLOGY**

1. The ANS project was one of the rare global projects aiming at long-term development and general economic take-off (E)
2. Thorough identification (2-3 missions) is a good approach and can be necessary, but one has to be careful with the choice if outside experts: prefer NGO with a more global view rather than individual professionals of Solidarity Organisations whom might be too militant or technically narrow.
3. Indeed identifying the whole milk chain as target was positive, but there was a lack of in-depth knowledge of farmer socio-economic conditions. Notably the social structural build-up of the farmer community (according to relative wealth, total income, etc.) and the role of the migrant external income rendering monetary income from milk sales insignificant
4. Focus on a multi-actor approach, rather than a single or limited one. Be sure to identify the weakest actor who “needs” strengthening (farmers) and not only the weakest link in the chain (MP).
5. Using “emergency” donors (ECHO), shortens the possible time-frame of each project (4x6 months is not the same as 2 years) and leads to difficulties to project into the future and to insecurity for all actors. ANS personnel must have been under pressure to “produce” the outcome, forgetting useful advice from support missions (CT, Solagral) on more essential aspects.

6. Too much concentration of efforts on Vet Station hardware.
7. Too much concentration of efforts on MP equipment and technical know-how, forgetting the managerial and economic skills necessary locally to make these fructify.
8. Forgetting the farmers although reminded by two support missions. The OUSP farmer organisation is recent.
9. Preventive approach in animal health through vets was positive in theory. The actual outcome is only positive in the South. This underlines the importance of rigorous identification of the implementation zone and the capacities of the actors there present to manage to improved infrastructure. Also, why stop at 5,000 ear-markers for 23,000 cows?
10. The “lease” system with MP and reimbursement through the Social Fund is difficult and needs very good skills and mechanisms in:
  - economics and accounting
  - partnership and contractualisation
  - mutual obligations and control on commitments
11. The management of the Social Fund was not defined in a clear enough manner and not clearly focused on direct farmer support (70,000 DM loan to MP out of Social Fund represents 28 cows, more than the actual number of cows financed)
12. The indirect training approach is indeed more suitable (TOT), but one should be sure that the mechanism / organisation is in place to make farmers benefit through organised follow-up.
13. There is need for a stronger and more precise (quantified) agreement (juridical binding) between all actors.
14. Ensure balance of power and representation of all actors in the coordinating committee.
15. External final evaluation was very good. The problem is it's too late in the process to change anything. Midway external evaluation is necessary (especially for a big project of 6.8 MFF).
16. Define relevant indicators (also on farmer level) before the project starts and ensure a working monitoring and evaluation system.



## ANNEXURES

### Study of the Post-crisis methodology of ANS – Bosnia case

#### List of documents

Code	Document	Date
A	Rapport de mission – JM Brun	12/96
B	Rapport de mission – H. bernard et Ph Villeval	9/97
C	Rapport de fin de mission – B Pacquereau	1/98
D	Rapport de fin de mission – C Gaudichau	7/98
E	Evaluation du programme de relance de la filière lait – D Viallet nov/déc 98	6/99
F	Case study – Milk Factory Bosnia – Ph Villeval	3/01
G	Summary of interviews Lyon – A Behrain	4/01
H	Documentary study – A Behrain	4/01
I	Certificate of donation HI/Cantonal Min Agric – I Mulalic	23/4/97
J	Fiche de synthèse oct 97	10/97
K	Demande de contribution ECHO 3° phase	6/97
L	ANS to ECHO changement d'allocation de vet kits	4/12/97
M	Convention HI/Canton Min Agric / Vet Stations / MP first 6 months	9/96
N	Debriefing Benoit Pacquereau	2/98
O	Social Fund Status	5/01
P	Contract ANS/MP	10/99
Q	Rapport de Mission Bosnie – François Parreaux	5/97

AB/NH/14/7/01

#### List of actors

Actor	Name and function	When
A1	Norbert Nicoud, ex-RP ex-Yougoslavia	4/01
A2	Philippe Villeval, CT Rural Dev / Support Mission 9/97	4/01
A3	Hervé Bernard, CT Rural Dev / Support Mission 9/97	4/01
A4	Luciano L, SVP	4/01
A5	Chantal Gaudichau, Project Coordinator 11/96 – 7/98	4/01
A6	Farmers – milk producers to MP dairy (see list A6 for names of 30 farmers met)	08-23/6/01
A6b	Suljanovic Zlajka, milk producer and tank owner V Kladusa	28/6/01
A7	Husein Alijagic, director of Mlijeko produkt dairy	02/07/01
A8	Farmers – beneficiaries of loan fund (see list A8 for names of farmers met)	6/01
A9		
A10	Salko Kuduz, president of the OSUP	4/5/01
A11	Farmers – beneficiaries of cheese making training (see list A11 for names of farmers met)	27/06/01
A11b	??, farmer beneficiary of cheese making training	27/6/01
A12	Six Vet Station directors (see list A12 for names of people met)	6/01
A12b	Edo Softic, Director Vet Station B. Petrovac	27/6/01
A12c	Suleiman Kulainovic, Director Vet Station Kljuc	27/6/01
A13	Indira Mulalic, Representative of Canton Min Agric	04/06/01
A14	Hasan Karacam, actual director BIMP Bihac Governmental Dairy (now privatised)	04/06/01
A15	Remzija Sahinovic, Director School of Agriculture, Buzim	18/6/01
A16		

A17	Representative ECHO Sarajevo	To be done by mail AB via Vincent
A18	Senad ??, Cheese demonstrator trained by ANS	Not found
A19	Paul Polis, vet of SOS Bosnia who advised on the programme	To be done NH

AB/NH/ 140701

**LIST A6 - Farmers – milk producers to MP dairy interviewed**

No.	Surname and Name	Location
1.	Sahinovic Becir	Zaradostovo
2.	Balinovic Dragica	Smrekovac
3.	Pajatezovic Zejna	Rudnik
4.	Sahinovic Rasim	Zaradostovo
5.	Veladzic Samira	Poljina
6.	Osmanagic Meho	Capreg
7.	Coragic Esead	Coragici
8.	Karahodzic Hasib	Drenovac
9.	Mesinovic Smail	Ponikve
10.	Kovacevic Saida	Zboriste
11.	Osmanagic Izeta	Capreg
12.	Cehic Zlata	Capreg
13.	Husidic Hasib	Capreg
14.	Omanovic Ramija	Ponikve
15.	Omanovic Arif	Ponikve
16.	Nuhanovic Nijaz	D.Slapnica
17.	Nasufocvic Ekrem	Crvarevac
18.	Dizdarevic Esad	Poljana
19.	Omeragic Ibro	Drenovac
20.	Mujagic Hamdija	Crvarevac
21.	Dizdarevic Fikret	Podzvizd
22.	Ponjevic Refik	Crvarevac
23.	Ajdinovic Velaga	Crvarevac
24.	Samardzic Asim	Podzvizd
25.	Husic Zineta	Crvarevac
26.	Suljanovic Rahmana	Ponikve
27.	Karahodzic Fata	Drenovac
28.	Smlatic Ramiza	Rajnovac
29.	Omeragic Bajrama	Rajnovac
30.	Latic Hanca	G.Slapnica
<b>14 farmers interviewed in group</b>		
1.	Mustedanagic Minka	Ponikve 3
2.	Mustedanagic Amir	Ponikve 3
3.	Kovacevic Seida	Ponikve 3
4.	Kovacevic Saida	Ponikve 3
5.	Kovacevic Mehmed	Ponikve 3
6.	Mesinovic Smail	Ponikve 3
7.	Omeragic Bejha	Ponikve 3
8.	Rizvic Ajka	Ponikve 3
9.	Omeragic Rekija	Ponikve 3
10.	Karahodzic Ajka	Ponikve 3
11.	Karahodzic Yehira	Ponikve 3
12.	Omeragic Resida	Ponikve 3
13.	Omeragic Hasib	Ponikve 3
14.	Omeragic Sida	Ponikve 3

**LIST A11 - Farmers – beneficiaries of cheese making training interviewed**

No	Surname and Name	Location
1.	Selman Mujaga	Sanica
2.	Druzic Ismeta	B.Petrovac
3.	Vukobrat Dragica	B.Petrovac
4.	Bolic Munevera	B.Petrovac
5.	Marjanovic dragica	B.Petrovac

**LIST A8 - Farmers – beneficiaries of loan fund interviewed**

No	Surname and Name	Location	Amount (DM)	Purpose
1.	Suljanovic Zlajka	Ponikve 1	2.451	Cow
2.	Mustedanagic Minka	Ponikve 3	32	Equipment for milk production
3.	Mesinovic Smail	Ponikve 3	2.400	Cow
4.	Husidic Samir	Podzvizd	275	Seed production
5.	Batakovic Senad	Barake	367.50	Seed production
6.	Cufurovic Mustafa	Marjanovac	240	Seed production
7.	Delanovic Saban	Gornja Vidovska	150	Seed production
8.	Okanovic Rasima	Trn	392.50	Seed production
9.	Delanovic Ramo	Gornja Vidovska	687	Seed production
10.	Samardzic Fikreta	Podzvizd	2.500	Mini farm
11.	Samardzic Hasim	Podzvizd	239	Seed production

**LIST A12 - Vet Station directors interviewed**

No	Surname and Name	Location
1.	Becirevic Sead	Velika Kladusa
2.	Alagic Zekerijah	Bihac
3.	Mustedanagic Enes	Bosanska Krupa
4.	Softic edhem	Bosanski Petrovac
5.	Kulenovic Sulejman	Kljuc
6.	Kadic Kifil	Buzim

**Abbreviations**

AB	Aida Behrem (Ciedel local researcher)
ANS	Action Nord-Sud
BA	Bosnia and Herzegovina
BP	Bosanski Petrovac (Southeast Bosnia)
CC	Coordinating Committee
HI	Handicap International
MB	Mirvet Beganovic (HI agric programme coordinator, based in VK)
MP	Mlijeko Produkt dairy factory
NH	Nicolas Heeren (Ciedel researcher)
OSUP	Municipal Association of Agricultural Producers (in VK)
VK	Velika Kladusa (North Bosnia)
VS	Veterinary Station (also Vet Stat.)

## THE HI/ANS DAIRY PROJECT IN UNA-SANA CANTON (BOSNIA) 1996-98

(References between brackets refer to sources, either documentary or actors interviewed. See annexure for complete list)

### THE PROJECT

PROJECT OBJECTIVES	INTENDED ACTIVITIES	REAL RESULTS	ACTORS
<b>General objectives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) Help create new milk outlets</li> <li>B) Improve public health</li> <li>C) Create jobs + work capacity as before the war</li> <li>D) Regroup farmers around common/interest</li> <li>E) Reinforce different partners capacities (upstream / v.s. + downstream/MP)</li> <li>F) Socio-economic reconstruction of rural area</li> <li>G) Support to the milk sector</li> <li>H) Actively involve all sector actors</li> </ul> <b>Specific objectives</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A) Infrastructure rehabilitation</li> <li>B) Re-equipment veterinarian services</li> <li>C) Construct a microbiological laboratory</li> <li>D) Cheese making training</li> <li>E) Registration cows + vaccination</li> </ul>	<b>1. Animal health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Rehabilitation 8 Vet. Services in 2 phases (3+5)</li> <li>1.2. Autopsy room + laboratory in Buzim</li> <li>1.3. Stock Medicines + equipment for 8 Vet. Stations</li> <li>1.4. Vehicles 5x</li> <li>1.5. Registration + tuberculation cows in Canton</li> </ul> <b>2. Milk Industry MP – 23 %</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. Technical consultancy</li> <li>2.2. Machinery</li> <li>2.3. Tank rehabilitation</li> </ul> <b>3. Livestock breeders/farmers – 8 %</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1. Hygiene training</li> <li>3.2. Cheese production training</li> <li>3.3. Small credit fund</li> </ul>	<b>1. Animal health – Vet. Stations rehabilitation – 69% of budget</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1.a. Complete rehabilitation of Buzim Vet. Station and of 6 other V.S. (Cazin not done)</li> <li>1.2. Autopsy room + laboratory in Buzim</li> <li>1.3. Donation of 16 sets of medicines and 6 medical kits</li> <li>1.4. Donation of 9 vehicles</li> <li>1.5. Registration + Tuberculation + Vaccination cows against anthrax: 65/85% (doc E) identified of livestock</li> <li>1.6. Technician taken on and trained for service to farmers (but remains in M.P. Dairy)</li> <li>1.7. Vet. Services directors + Ministry of Agriculture visited France</li> </ul> <b>2. Milk Industry MP</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. ANS provided technical support to M.P. (doc J)</li> <li>2.2. ANS “leased” milk transformation equipment TOTAL: 320.000 DM</li> <li>2.3. 95 Tank rehabilitated and 17 new tanks donated (11 for farmers,</li> </ul>	ECHO – Founder  SOLAGRAL – Identification and support missions SOS BOSNIE – idem  ANS: - Stéphane Arnaud – identification mission ANS field staff during project: - Chantal Gaudichau – program coordinator (agronomist) - Benoit Paquereau – cheese specialist + equipment - Lakdhar Zeroual – food industry specialist - Christophe Belperron – infrastructure agricultural school  Ministry Agriculture of Canton Agricultural school Vet. Services of 8 municipalities GTZ – other actor involved in animal husbandry and Vet Station support  M.P. Dairy plant - Husein Alijagic – director M.P. - Technician M.P. – hygiene

		rest for MP)  <b>3. Farmers (marginal)</b> 3.1. Hygiene training via trained technician and demonstrations 3.2. 30 cheese training sessions via trained technician, demo, verify, evaluation 3.3. Credit (123.000 DM, 10 cows + 1 farm) 3.4. Tank Rehabilitation and new tanks	- Demonstrator – cheese production  Farmers: 1. Milk producers 2. Credit beneficiaries 3. Cheese training beneficiaries
--	--	--	--

<b>Strategies:</b>	1. Institutional strengthening ( <i>of the animal husbandry chain upstream</i> ) through the VS  2. Economic take-off: transformation of milk  3. Socio-economic strengthening of farmers	1 carried out as planned. Results of strategy very weak according to evaluation (E 12/98). No impact (except South of Canton) in 6/01  2 carried out as planned. Results of strategy very positive according to evaluation (E 12/98) Impact much less in 6/01 because of bad investments and bad management by MP (in debited and no more replenishing of the Social Fund)  3. Monetary revenue in 12/98. Strategy leads to results, but total dependency on MP Impact today (6/01) very weak as roughly 66% of the farmers do not sell milk anymore	
<b>Beneficiaries:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- X Milk farmers</li> <li>- One Dairy plant (MP)</li> <li>- 8x Vet. Stations</li> <li>- ca. 250.000 Consumers</li> </ul>	<b>In Dec 98 Results</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 661 milk producers in 12/98</li> <li>- 30 farmers trained in cheese making</li> </ul>	<b>In June 01 Impact</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 66% reduction in milk producers selling to MP (no payment or coupons)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 39 loans to farmers from Social Fund of which 9 cows</li> <li>- One dairy plant re-equipped</li> <li>- 8 vet stations reconstructed and completely re-equipped</li> <li>- Total milk produced 2.4 million litres over two years, or 1 l/day for 3,290 consumers (1,3%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Between 1 and 6 farmer still practicing cheese making</li> <li>- 53 loans to farmers (1 cow more). Social Fund not replenished anymore by MP</li> <li>- Bad management and too many debts</li> <li>- VS in North unused. Lab used 2 days a year! VS in South more active</li> <li>- Milk production decreases with less milk intake from farmers</li> </ul>
<b>Budget:</b>	Budget total: 6.8 MFF Aide direct: 5.5 MFF, of which: 1.Vet. Services: 3.8 MFF (69%) 2.M.P. Dairy: 1.3 MFF (23%) 3.Farmers: 0.4 MFF (8%)	Asked + obtained through ECHO	
<b>Duration: 4 x 6 months</b>	4 X 6 months after various identification missions (HI/ANS, Solagral, SOS Bosnia)	2 years: 1 <sup>st</sup> phase: 6/96 – 1/97 3 <sup>rd</sup> Support Mission SOLAGRAL 12/96 2 <sup>nd</sup> phase: 1/97 – 6/97 Support Mission CT Infra 3 <sup>rd</sup> phase: 7/97 – 12/97 Support Mission CT Dev Rur 9/97 4 <sup>th</sup> phase: 1/98 – 6/98	

## METHODOLOGY

IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY	IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITY	EVALUATION OF ACTIVITY
<b>Intended method</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification mission by an external specialized organization (NGO SOLAGRAL): choice of zone, choice of sector, identification of situation</li> <li>X missions by a veterinarian from a solidarity organization: P.Polis – SOS Bosnia</li> <li>Identification: vet. stations; choice zone Buzim</li> <li>Vet. Stations rehabilitation (assessment initial equipment/ needs + quantities)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Donation of materials to V.S. and M.P.</li> <li>Exchanges for payments to a social fund without interest over 2 years for the dairy M.P.</li> <li>Provide (free) technical support through ANS consultants</li> <li>Support mission from outside/internal technicians</li> <li>Training of local staff</li> <li>Through the 8 V.S. carry out preventive animal health activities</li> <li>Training of farmers</li> <li>Provide social loan fund</li> <li>Manage project through a board committee involving all actors: V.S./M.P./ANS/farmers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External evaluation at the end of project</li> </ul>
<b>Real method used</b>		
<b>IDENTIFICATION OF ACTIVITY</b>	<b>IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTIVITY</b>	<b>EVALUATION OF ACTIVITY</b>
<p>One pre-identification mission by HI / L Loiacono / Le Lorre 8/95</p> <p>Identification mission by ANS Bihac / S Arnaud 2/96 with 4 scenarios.</p> <p>Two missions by SOLAGRAL to define 11/95, 5/96:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The situation (socio-economic)</li> <li>Choice zone: North part of Canton</li> <li>Choice the milk sector</li> </ul> <p>X mission(s) P.Polis (dates?) to define:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Choice of Buzim at major V.S. beneficiary</li> <li>Choice of two other V.S.</li> <li>List of equipment + medicines needed</li> <li>The type of services needed/defined</li> </ul>	<p>Buying material from France &amp; Italy for V.S. and M.P.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vet. Stations: donation 1.2 MFF</li> <li>M.P.: lease of 320.000 DM ( 1 MFF) of equipment</li> <li>X tanks out of total to farmers</li> <li>Y tanks to M.P.</li> </ul> <p>Rehabilitation of V.S. building in Buzim</p> <p>Social fund with 189.000 DM (doc P) from M.P., with 117.000 DM outgoing today</p> <p>Provide 4 (wo) man-years (+?) of technician consultants ANS</p> <p>3 support missions:</p>	<p>12/98 external evaluation by D.Viallet – Agricultural College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Effectiveness/what done</li> <li>Efficiency (economic M.P.)</li> <li>Revenue farmers</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 12/96 SOLAGRAL</li> <li>▪ 5/97 CT infrastructure</li> <li>▪ 9/97 CT rural development</li> </ul> <p>Training to local staff given, but no follow-up</p> <p>Training of Hygiene Trainer (employed by M.P., in exchange for reimbursement into the Social Fund of the value of the cold storage truck)</p> <p>Animal health campaign (VS)</p> <p>Training of farmers indirectly through TOT of local trainers</p> <p>Cord. Committee reduced to V.S., Ministry of Agriculture, ANS experts, Director of M.P.</p> <p>Farmers not represented (not organized) – no one to depend their interests (Ousp not in Cord. Committee)</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> social fund: ANS managed &lt; 98</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> social fund managed by M.P./ANS &gt; 98</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> social fund managed by Ousp in 99</p> <p>Ousp (farmers organization) set up at the end of project (1997)</p> <p>Monitoring &amp; control: follow up</p> <p>During project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ V.S. construct and rehabilitation: ANS+CT infra.</li> <li>▪ M.P. equipment and machinery: ANS</li> <li>▪ Milk produce: M.P.</li> <li>▪ Farmers support: ?</li> <li>▪ Loans: Social fund committee</li> </ul> <p>No indicators (except milk)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wealth/revenue farmers</li> <li>▪ Impact on farmers: V.S./milk production</li> <li>▪ Impact on consumers</li> </ul>	
--	---	--



**The perception of the ANS approach by the principal groups of actors and the strategies they developed - Case of Bosnia**

Perception of actor	Strategies
<p><b>Farmers – milk producers A6</b> who deliver to MP (30 farmers interviewed by AB):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project enabled monetary income, distributed according to number of cows possessed</li> <li>- Benefit from free training, no commitments</li> <li>- Underwent MP strategies</li> <li>- Don't know ANS</li> <li>- Only know MP director</li> </ul> <p>Today</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Two types of farmers: those who continue to deliver, those who stopped.</li> <li>- Socio-eco situation differs (no. of cows, industrial salaries, migrants in Germany)</li> </ul>	<p>Stakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monetary income for family after loss of local State industry</li> <li>- Sale of surplus milk</li> <li>- Increase milk production for more income</li> <li>- Increase livestock through credit</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Own cows (1 to 5 per family)</li> <li>- Milk produced (for calve, local consumption, surplus milk)</li> <li>- Own land for pasture</li> <li>- Know how to take care of animal</li> <li>- Have other agricultural activities</li> <li>- Have other jobs in State / private industry</li> <li>- Have migrant family members in Germany who sent money</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of monetary income since end of the war</li> <li>- No optimal knowledge of animal care</li> <li>- No knowledge about hygiene</li> <li>- Irregular payment of State salaries (if the case)</li> <li>- Lack of credit</li> <li>- Lack of mechanization</li> </ul> <p>Strategy: <b>fall-back strategy works but total dependence on dairy (“no choice”)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Use agriculture as a part-time activity to fall back upon: “social net”(A6/E)</li> <li>- Look for employment elsewhere (local / State factory) (A6/E)</li> <li>- Sell surplus milk to MP or other dairy (BIMP in Bihac)</li> <li>- Transform milk into cheese (South Bosnia)</li> </ul> <p>When faced with stopping of payment by MP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Accept not to be paid (no choice)</li> <li>- Accept coupons (MP store: little choice and 10-15% higher prices)</li> <li>- Stop giving milk to MP</li> </ul>
<p><b>Farmers – credit beneficiaries A8</b> (11 farmers interviewed by AB/5 farmers of 98 loans, 6 of 99 loans)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Fund managed first by ANS (&lt;98), then MP/HI, then OSUP/MP/HI</li> </ul> <p>98 beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They don't know ANS</li> <li>- They only know MP dir.</li> <li>- Credit for buying cows or agric tools</li> <li>- 6/700 farmers in 98 in zone, only 39 loans of which 9 for cows (bigger loan)</li> </ul> <p>99 beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They never met ANS experts</li> <li>- They know HI agric. coordinator MB in</li> </ul>	<p>Stakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtain extra financial support for small and medium economic investments (medium = cow)</li> <li>- More means of production (cow)</li> <li>- More income</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Know-how of animal husbandry</li> <li>- Potential reimbursement possible on milk produced and sold to MP</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of capital</li> <li>- Lack of cows (notably when only owning 1 cow)</li> <li>- MP only milk outlet -&gt; financial dependency</li> </ul> <p>Strategy: <b>active dynamic strategy on the farmers side</b></p>

<p>VK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Choice of credit good, all reimbursed</li> <li>- Only 14 loans of which 1 cow and 1 mini-farm and 70,000 DM to MP</li> </ul>	<p><b>(but limited fund so few possibilities)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Take loan and pay back</li> <li>- Good relations with decision makers of loan scheme</li> </ul>
<p><b>Farmers – cheese making beneficiaries A11</b> (doc E, source A12a in BP and 2 farmers interviewed by AB/NH in BP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No list of the 30 female beneficiaries</li> <li>- Almost no possibility to find and interview beneficiaries</li> <li>- One woman on the market sells improved cheese and received equipment. She says she learned it from “English NGO”</li> <li>- She also says she already knew how to make cheese, but improved its techniques</li> <li>- One male farmer made sheep milk cheese (he had 130+75 heads of cheep) for Bihac Sedra Hotel. All sheep became ill and were killed.</li> <li>- A12a says 5-6 farmers are still making cheese</li> <li>- Doc E mentions a report of 25/5/98</li> <li>- Doc E: one trainee is still producing cheese for Bihac hotels in 12/98</li> <li>- Doc E: absence of global accompaniment is cause of failure</li> </ul>	<p>Stake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No wastage of surplus milk through conservation</li> <li>- Spread economic cycles over 3-4 months</li> <li>- Extra income over a longer period</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Own cows and have surplus milk (better when more than 1 cow)</li> <li>- Traditional methods exist in the Southeast of the Canton (“I make cheese since before the war. Which war? The second world war”)</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No know-how of (modern) cheese making techniques</li> <li>- No equipment and no money for equipment</li> <li>- Unsold milk is thrown away</li> </ul> <p>Strategy: <b>“use the opportunity” strategy = opportunistic? Limited continuity or dynamics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Follow training because free and free equipment given</li> <li>- Little continuation because no follow-up and accompaniment</li> </ul>
<p><b>Indira Mulalic – Resp of Canton Min Agric A13</b> (interviewed by AB (4/6/01))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Involved since the beginning of the project, but name not on HI/MinAgric agreement doc M</li> <li>- Present in Coord Comm</li> <li>- Responsible for registration of livestock</li> <li>- Responsible for coordination between Municipal govt, Canton Min Agric and HI</li> <li>- HI never signed an agreement with MinAgric only information of the MinAgric</li> <li>- She never met any of the farmers of the ANS project</li> <li>- The project responds to the global needs, especially Vet Stations and long-term impact can be expected.</li> <li>- She went on the visit to France with the Vet Stations Directors</li> <li>- Believes that the project has globally a positive impact</li> <li>- Confirms the info of the vet Station Directors (see actor A12)</li> </ul>	<p>Stake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Justify its existence</li> <li>- Improve agriculture’s income (to be able to pay Min Agric staff services)</li> <li>- Enable MinAgric to do its work in registration of livestock (theoretically) as it could be necessary for export purposes</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official function is power base</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no means</li> </ul> <p>Strategies: <b>supportive strategy but nothing dynamic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agreement with HI and other actors (MP and Municipal Vet Stations)</li> <li>- Participation in the project through the coordinating committee</li> <li>- Benefits room the trip to France</li> <li>- Min Agric did build a new Animal Health Centre (in Bihac / Spanish Government and local Government money)will “compete” with Buzim VS</li> </ul>
<p><b>Six directors of Vet Stations out of 8 involved – A12</b> (interviewed by AB (X/6/01))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All Vet Stations are part of the Municipalities</li> <li>- The VS received a lot of material support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medicines</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Stakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Own livelihood</li> <li>- Animal health</li> <li>- Preventive action</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official function</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equipment</li> <li>• Car</li> <li>• Reconstruction of building (Buzim (very important), V Kladusa, Cazin (minor), Bihac (minor))</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Buzim VS where the major part of the projects investments took place has a new director (2000?), the old director went to the army and (doc E) did not use any of the equipment except the car.</li> <li>- All are satisfied with the 96-97 ANS action</li> <li>- The medicines are used normally but restocking is only partial.</li> <li>- Normally farmers pay for VS services (before the war and during the project)</li> <li>- No monitoring of restocking by HI/ANS</li> <li>- No obligation (as a return on ANS' investments) of restocking by HI/ANS</li> <li>- Only obligation (by ANS) cow registration, but only 5,000 earmarks were given (doc I) which was not enough.</li> <li>- VS Directors all in the Cord. Committee during the whole project. They were very happy with the Cord. Committee but no continuation after the end of the project (no impact)</li> <li>- Bosanska Krupa VS gives out medicines for free (on Municipality's budget or nearby elections?)</li> <li>- There is a new Cantonal MinAgric Animal Health Centre since a month (not clear how it will affect Buzim's VS potential)</li> <li>- The privatisation of the VS is planned, but Vet Directors don't really know yet how to respond to that process.</li> <li>- (Doc E) in Bihac VS 50% of work is "cats and dogs"</li> <li>- (Doc E) in South of the canton restarted work on preventive medicine (registration and vaccination)</li> <li>- (Doc L) ANS kits to other VS in other cantons, because GTZ did already distribute kits</li> </ul> <p><b>Interview with Edo Softic, BP VS Vet 27/6/01 – A12a</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 96 much material damage and total absence of medicine stock.</li> <li>- 5000 displaced persons</li> <li>- The ANS project = sun</li> <li>- The Vet Stations restocks when medicines are used (in Sarajevo or in the Republik Srpska (cheaper))</li> <li>- car used all the time</li> <li>- GTZ support in parallel to ANS support</li> <li>- Actual salary 500 DM, before the war</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All trained vets (know-how)</li> <li>- Before the war a functioning (but declining (doc E) State vet Service</li> <li>- After project: completely reequipped</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Destruction of vet stations during the war</li> <li>- Irregular payment of salaries (March in June)</li> <li>- Privatisation unclear and a "threat"</li> </ul> <p>Strategies: <b>globally strategy of compliance with for some vets a commitment (South), for other opportunistic strategies (Buzim where the majority of the project was invested but no vet activities)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategy of compliance/acceptance: full acceptance of project (total benefit for vets)</li> <li>- Strategy of commitment in preventive health (South of Canton) and registration (ANS markers not enough, but found money elsewhere to register 96% of the cows)</li> <li>- Opportunistic strategy in the North (much benefit, no action, especially in Buzim)</li> <li>- Double strategy with acceptance aid from GTZ (kits) in 4 VS and ANS obliged to ask ECHO for reallocation</li> <li>- Strategy of change of objective (French "détournement d'objectifs"): use equipment for "cats and dogs" vet work in town</li> </ul>
---	---

<p>3000DM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- He didn't go to France (trip of Vet Directors and Min Agric)</li> <li>- 816 (96%) cows registered. With the ANS markers only 460 were registered. the rest paid by farmers and municipality.</li> <li>- Impossible to vaccinate all animals</li> <li>- Also new diseases (57 cases of brucellosis)</li> <li>- No dairy in BP, so big problem with milk surplus</li> <li>- 5-6 farmers are still producing cheese after the ANS cheese making training</li> <li>- Privatisation will be problematic</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Remzija Sahinovic, Director of the Buzim Agricultural School – A15</b> (interviewed by AB 18/6/01)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- School closed during the war, but later repaired with foreign aid (some class rooms by ANS / NH)</li> <li>- <b>the laboratory could not be installed in the school and was constructed in the VS. The lab is used two days per year (!)</b></li> <li>- They would like to use it more, but lack of funds for chemicals</li> <li>- <b>Problem in management: the VS receives money from the Municipality and the school from the Min Educ: not clear who will pay for the chemicals</b></li> <li>- He was in the Coordinating Committee: he had the impression that the CC had little impact on the ANS management</li> <li>- Generally the project was useful and responded to the demand</li> <li>- ANS should find a local organisation to look after the project after its completion</li> <li>- He learned about new technologies</li> <li>- The students were not involved in the registration and vaccination campaign</li> <li>- He visited France</li> <li>- For him it's an emergency project (short term) but it is also a long-term development project</li> <li>- The lab contents was defined by the French consultant (P Polis) and the Vet Station.</li> </ul>	<p>Stakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restart the school</li> <li>- Need a functioning structure (building, teachers; equipment, curriculum)</li> <li>- Need students</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official function</li> <li>- Prepare future professionals/technicians with a role in rural development</li> <li>- Trained teachers available</li> <li>- Support from Min educ (salaries and some operational costs)</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of capital</li> <li>- Lack of lab</li> <li>- Lack of chemicals</li> </ul> <p>Strategies: <b>strategy of compliance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtain capital from foreign aid.</li> <li>- Accept choice of VS for the lab.</li> </ul>
<p><b>ANS project leaders – A5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In context of emergency situation, the ANS project start to rehabilitate local milk production</li> <li>- These action tried to create milk production and generate income for rural population</li> <li>- Project was implemented in a near rehabilitation context.</li> </ul>	<p>Stakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Respond to needs / do something</li> <li>- Become an actor in the area</li> <li>- Growth syndrome</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to support organisations/persons (Solagral/P. Polis)</li> <li>- Access to funding (ECHO)</li> <li>- Already present (demining programme? Elsewhere in ex Yugoslavia)</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Considering the importance of animal production and potential partnership with small private dairy ANS decided to support animal production</li> <li>- ANS is root activity to rehabilitate milk production in north part of Una sana canton</li> <li>- Parallel with this action ANS helped veterinary services</li> <li>- The project benefited in the first place to the private dairy and to the public veterinary services</li> <li>- Indirectly, the project benefited to farmers in the canton, mainly those who sell their milk to the private dairy</li> <li>- The project based on a strong partnership with a private dairy and V.S. which is very important but not enough to guarantee the sustainability of the process supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical know-how through CT Dev Rur</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No knowledge of private business functioning</li> <li>- CT has not much time</li> <li>- Founder is emergency ECHO and works through 6 months periods</li> <li>- “nez dans le guidon” (nose in the motor)</li> <li>- no global view of development issues</li> </ul> <p>Strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Result orientated strategy (“stratégie de l’obligation de résultat”) and so not listening to support persons advice</li> <li>- Strategy of “identification” of ANS with the MP Dairy’s interests (forgetting that MP is one actor in a larger chain, where the farmers are the weakest)</li> <li>- Strategy of prevention concerning animal health and so support to Vet Stations (forget to the into account the privatisation process)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Husein Alijagic, director MP dairy – A7</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MP is a small private dairy established 1991 with 5 people in partnership</li> <li>- Before the war MP collected around 5000 l milk every two days (= 75,000 l/month)</li> <li>- During the war dairy collected around 500 l milk</li> <li>- After the war production started on the November 1995 with Mr Alijagic as only owner</li> <li>- Dairy produced only fresh milk in plastic bag and yoghurt; cheese production stopped; monthly collection consists of 10.000 l of milk</li> <li>- 1996 Mr Alijagic heard for ANS action in Una sana canton and applied for help</li> <li>- as a result ANS project dairy received material and technical support; material support in total amount of 320.000 DM</li> <li>- Dairy and ANS signed a agreement and dairy was obligate to reimbursement 66% of received support</li> <li>- After ANS action dairy increased production (10/98-100.000 l/monthly)</li> <li>- This progress is made thanks to ANS project; ANS supported dairy through infrastructure, material support, management and technical advices</li> </ul>	<p>Stakes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Restart his business</li> <li>- Capital needs</li> <li>- Input needs</li> </ul> <p>Resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical knowledge</li> <li>- Dynamic and business spirit</li> <li>- Strategist</li> </ul> <p>Constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not enough capital</li> <li>- No regular milk inputs</li> <li>- Lack of specific technical know-how</li> </ul> <p>Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Obtain free technical know-how via ANS</li> <li>- Obtain interest free and uncontrolled loan via ANS</li> <li>- Obtain ANS support for importation and set-up of the machinery</li> <li>- Only counter-obligation, replenish partly in a Social Fund (which he can use and co-control himself)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Salko Kuduz, President of OUSP Velika Kladusa A10</b></p>	<p>Stakes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monetary income for agricultural producers</li> <li>- Increase agricultural production</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- OUSP established as a central institution for 6 existing agricultural association in Velika Kladusa municipality</li> <li>- ANS with MP created social fund under OUSP</li> <li>- OUSP with received money from MP disbursement 25 loan (total 53 loan but 25 directly from OUSP)</li> <li>- OUSP established to help farmers and increase their income</li> <li>- OUSP beneficiaries: farmers from Una sana canton, agricultural associations and cooperative (zadruga) and MP</li> <li>- OUSP invest money in seed production, livestock production and small infrastructure rehabilitation of farmers capacity</li> <li>- OUSP also provided technical support to farmers</li> <li>- Farmers wrote proposal for loan with help from OUSP</li> <li>- Proposal contain: personal information, description of investment, total amount of investment and guarantees for reimbursement</li> <li>- Management board (OUSP/MP/ANS) make decision related on disbursement loan</li> <li>- Until now OUSP disbursement 53 loan (25 directly) in total value 123.000 DM. This corresponds with roughly 8% of the 661 potential farmers involved with MP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increase livestock through credit</li> </ul> <p>Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Access to support organisations/persons</li> <li>- Access to funding</li> <li>- Already present (6 agricultural associations)</li> </ul> <p>Constraints</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lack of capital</li> <li>- Lack of credit</li> </ul> <p>Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Organise farmers around interest in credit</li> <li>- Agreement with ANS and MP to obtain resources (co-control of Social Fund)</li> <li>- Give loans</li> </ul>
---	---

## SUPPORT MISSIONS RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION / FOLLOW-UP BY ANS STAFF

SOLAGRAL SUPPORT MISSION 12/96 (doc A)	
Recommendations	Implementation / Follow-up
1. Assessment of milk collection 2. Do rapidly a financial analysis of M.P. in order to: a. Possible commitments M.P. b. Capacity to reimburse social fund c. Assess management strengthening needs 3. Training on hygiene & milk quality a. Brochures + vet. Services b. Information meeting in each village with V.S. + tank responsible farmers 4. Organise meetings between farmers responsible for tanks 5. Support the collection of milk in South of Canton – BIMP 6. Identification mission for credit program 7. Investigate possible funding for a rural development coordination function (cantonal level)	1. Done 2. No  3.a) Done with V.S./M.P. 3.b) Done through technician of M.P., not often in villages (E) and very expensive (E)  4. No 5. No 6. ? 7.No

MISSION CT INFRASTRUCTURE 5/97	
1. Sharing of running cost laboratory in V.S. Buzim between municipality/Min.Agric.	1. ?
2. Privatisation of V.S.	2. ?

SUPPORT MISSION CT DEVELOPMENT RURAL 9/97	
1. Management support to M.P. director 2. Training program for M.P. technicians (salary out of social fund) < 10/97 3. Monitoring of medicine stocks and utilization in V.S. 4. Respect and treat carefully with government concerning laboratory in Buzim 5. Farmers should be central in the project. Start again: a. direct aid to farmers b. training c. demonstration d. cheese making training 6. Create farmers group around tanks	1. No 2. ? 3. ? 4. Done, but lab not used in 12/98 (E) 5. Partial a. Social Fund only 53 beneficiaries, of which 12 for bigger loans (cows/mini-farm) b. Hygiene training very minimal (E) and trainer part of MP structure c. ? (Yes for cheese making, not for animal feed or farm techniques improvements) d. Yes but no follow-up. Limited impact (5-6 on 30 in the best of cases) 6. No

### CONCLUSIONS:

- Advices by support missions are rarely followed up.
- This poses the question of the relevance and impact of the support missions,
- but especially the question of the mechanisms in play which prevent implementing actors to sit-back and listen to advice.
- No doubt the “emergency”-character of the donor plays a role in this context.

## IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT RESULTS AND METHOD

BENEFICIARY	PROJECT IMPACT	METHOD
<b>1. Farmers (very limited activities)</b>	<p>1.1. x tanks owned by farmers (17 or 50)</p> <p>1.2. revenue: for farmers but very limited for those (29%) who own only 1-2 cows, but regular until 12/98; Today: farmers dropped out or are paid 3 months late or with coupons</p> <p>1.3. Drops down to 40% in farmer participation in milk delivery to MP are being observed (VK)</p> <p>1.4. 12 farmers have supplementary assets (12 loans for cow) out of 600-700 farmers involved (2%)</p> <p>1.5. 5-6 out of 30 are still making cheese (12.5%)</p> <p><b>1.6. Because of the total dependency on MP Dairy, and the lack of organisation of the farmers (empowerment), the investment management mistakes by MP (debt) reduce greatly the project impact on the farmers in terms of monetary revenue and in terms of access to the loan fund.</b></p>	<p>1. Training marginal</p> <p>2. Loan marginal</p> <p>3. Strategy too dependant on one actor (M.P.) without checks or balances from other actors, notably farmers, nor ANS</p> <p>4. Did not follow up important pro-active recommendations of support missions regarding farmers</p>
<b>2. Municipal veterinarian Stations (reinforce their position and enable them to do their work)</b>	<p>2.1. Buildings, equipment, laboratory constructed but unused</p> <p>2.2. Medicines stock in revolving fund functioning (especially in the South)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Until now V.S. increased their capital</li> <li>- Sustainability risky because less monetary income from farmers (see 1.)</li> <li>- Sustainability risky because of privatisation process (no more Governmental support)</li> </ul> <p>2.3. Animal health preventive work (registration, vaccination) useful/essential but unfinished</p> <p>2.4. Artificial Insemination (AI) has increased and will ultimately lead to improved stock and so better results in terms of milk and meat. But AI does not suffice and depends on the farmers ability to pay (see 1 above)</p>	<p>1. Hardware investment: not useful/marginal → inappropriate need assessment by P.Polis</p> <p>2. Medicine, equipment, cars: very useful → good need assessment by P.Polis</p> <p>3. Preventive approach necessary, but limited efficiency (lack of material)</p> <p>4. Did not look at other husbandry sectors, notably butchery + beef production</p> <p>5. No work by Vet Stations (nor ANS) on other husbandry improvements (feeding, grazing practice, etc.)</p>
<b>3. Milk factory (capitalize the factory with hardware and</b>	<p>3.1. Initially a very strong impact for M.P. (12/98, but today 6/01 risk of bankruptcy because of too much debt against investment loan)</p>	<p>1. Choice to strengthen dairy-link in the milk-chain was good as such</p> <p>2. Choice of one actor obtaining a monopoly position: risky (bad</p>



<b>technician know-how, but no management strengthening)</b>	3.2. Technical support ANS staff to factory is OK (sustainable ?)	<p>choice, already mentioned in J)</p> <p>3. Did not listen to support mission advice on clear need for managerial strengthening</p> <p>4. Technical expertise support ANS is also an investment but has not been treated as such (“donation”) which leads to false competition.</p>
<b>4. ANS</b>	<p>4.1. Has become an important actor in the Bihac arena (5,6 MFF an also a demining programme with 53 HR in partner)</p> <p>4.2. Continues working with OSUP in line with farmer orientated strategies</p> <p>4.3. Is in juridical conflict with MP, but needs too show strength on principles as it will influence other ASN partnerships</p> <p>4.4. Increase knowledge about animal husbandry and dairy production (sustainable on CT level, less sustainable on experts level)</p> <p>4.5. Increases expertise in fundraising with ECHO (sustainable on HQ level)</p> <p>4.6. Increases knowledge about contractualisation with the private commercial sector (MP): capitalised?</p> <p>4.7. Increase knowledge about the juridical system in Bosnia (sustainable?)</p>	<p>1. In terms of objectives, the project aimed at rehabilitation for long term development</p> <p>2. The project focused mainly on one actor (MP) and prevention context (VS) without taking into account the farmers, although reminded several times by the support missions</p> <p>3. In terms of method it was much more inspired by emergency approaches (see ERD chart below) and forced too adhere to ECHO conditions (hardware no software, short timescales of 6 months each, etc.)</p> <p>4. ANS lacked the experience in contractual terms to work with the private commercial sector (MP)</p> <p>5. The privatisation of the Vet Services have not been foreseen by ANS</p>