

**DURAS Documentation workshop,
Vietnam 16-19 January, 2008**

Pig project in Vietnam and Cambodia

DURAS Documentation workshop, Vietnam 16-19 January, 2008.

Pig project in Vietnam and Cambodia

Table 1a. Setting project boundaries

Title	Area/location	Stakeholders	Starting date and duration	Objectives	Strategy/approach	Components
Involvement of different stakeholders in supporting the small producers to serve consumer needs in Vietnam and Cambodia.	Hai Duong Province, Vietnam. Ta Keo province, Cambodia.	Farmers – V, C Farmers organization – V,C Private feed manufacturing company - V Slaughterhouse – V,C Traders – V, C Supermarkets - V Provincial/district animal health services – V,C DOST - V Dept of Human Health - V University – V,C NGOs – V,C	Oct 2005, 24 months.	To enhance smallholder producer access to high-value pig/pig-meat product markets	Action research	a) assessment of market demand b) participatory stakeholder workshops c) pilot activities d) capacity building e)dissemination and recommendations

Table 1b. Project context

Context	Problems	Previous activities
Increased competition in the pig/pork sector, small vs large scale, local vs. imports	Risk of exclusion of small-scale farmers from pig/pork market –high production cost, small production volume (number of head per producer) -difficulties in changing quality of output, high fat, low safety. -local races/breeds, unhygienic practices, difficult to access feeds, farmers knowledge little on techniques and markets	Cambodia – FFS, farmers groups (but farmers lack time to join FFS) No work on pork safety in Cambodia, nor on cross-breed/exotic. Vietnam – farmers co-ops (7), devt of exotic breeds Limited impact; no/little link with market access
Increased demand for quality meat in cities (market surveys – component 1) e.g. lean pig meat		

Table 2. project description

Components	Material	Activities	Main Achievements	Difficulties faced	Unexpected results
<p>a) assessment of market demand</p> <p>b) participatory stakeholder workshops</p> <p>c) pilot activities</p> <p>d) capacity building</p> <p>e) dissemination and recommendations</p>	<p>Regulation documents</p> <p>Documents on processing protocols</p> <p>Certificate by health services of province</p> <p>Documents on production protocols</p> <p>Regulations for federation internal control system</p> <p>Document on slaughtering protocol.</p>	<p>Vietnam</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> establishment of processing unit (management techniques) farmers training on safe pig production (technical sanitary measures) establish procedures for safe pig for farmers development of label for “gio” training of federation staff (administration) evaluation of safety links along chain (salmonella) establish 	<p>Unit in place</p> <p>Output – (gio without borax) appreciated by local and Hanoi consumers.</p> <p>Quality assurance system for gio without borax.</p> <p>Vietnam:</p> <p>200 farmers participated in 10 types of trainings, eg marketing, processing, q.c.</p> <p>1 federation of 10 co-operatives</p> <p>2 safe feed manufacturers</p> <p>7 slaughterhouses</p> <p>10 main collectors</p> <p>2 supermarkets in Hanoi</p> <p>1 sm (hd)</p> <p>2 universities</p>	<p>Farmer reluctant to follow procedures at first.</p> <p>Unsureness about safety of pig meat.</p> <p>Shorter duration of ‘gio’, so difficult to market long distance.</p> <p>Profitability still debated (higher input prices but same selling price).</p> <p>Lack of public regulation on safe pork certificate.</p> <p>Small price difference between ordinary and ‘guaranteed’ pork.</p>	<p>Greater appreciation than expected.</p> <p>Farmer to farmer extension – spontaneous.</p>

		<p>procedures for safe pork (whole chain)</p> <p>Cambodia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farmers Field Schools on sows to farrow and fattening pigs for the communities' members in Takeo • Training for slaughterhouse and processors • Test pig diets • Test and analysis of productivity of piglets and sows. 	<p>2 ARIs</p> <p>Cambodia:</p> <p>2 types of training</p> <p>90 farmers participated in 3 villages</p> <p>3 farmer organisations</p> <p>3 slaughterhouses</p> <p>4 pig traders</p> <p>1 university</p> <p>2 NGOs</p> <p>2 ARIs.</p> <p>Adequate distinction of roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>Facilitated efficient flow of inputs from various stakeholders</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Table 3. Project analysis
(from partnership matrix)

Criteria 1. **Participation**

Indicators	Positive aspects	Negative aspects	Unknown aspects
Number and type of stakeholders involved	<p>Multidisciplinary</p> <p>Nature of project required it</p> <p>Enhances understanding of how to improve coordination of various actors in pig value chain</p> <p>Facilitates farmers access to public services (eg animal health)</p> <p>Strengthen linkages among stakeholders</p> <p>Expands influence of project to more beneficiaries</p>	<p>Requires more money, time effort</p> <p>Risk of losing focus if not properly coordinated</p> <p>Risk of losing independence to implement agreed project design</p> <p>Location</p> <p>Different levels of research focus</p>	
Role of stakeholders in implementation	<p>Nature of project required it</p> <p>Interest</p>	<p>Constraints in funds and time</p>	
Project governance			

Criteria 2. **Knowledge management**

Indicators	Positive aspects	Negative aspects	Unknown aspects
Frequency of inter-stakeholder interaction	Demand from stakeholders Necessary for finding quick solutions to problems Necessary to achieve project deliverables	Location limits cross team interaction	
Implementation arrangement modified as a result of lessons learned	To address requirements of individual stakeholders Different levels of issues being addressed in project sites		
Creation of active network	Strong interest from farmers to get higher incomes and new skills Institutional support Right timing Previous work Supportive legal framework		New initiative Dynamic environment

Criteria 3. **Capacity building**

Indicators	Positive aspects	Negative aspects	Unknown aspects
1) New skills obtained/improved due to project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -relevant training -institutional support -favourable market conditions -good training facilitators -appropriate and effective training methodologies -farmer interest -opportunity to learn new skills, apply research approaches (specifically among research team members). 		
2) research innovation/ technology uptake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -demand from farmers -institutional support -existence of local organisation as conduits 		
3) improvement in research infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -farmers problem solved 		

Criteria 4. **Institutionalisation**

Indicators	Positive aspects	Negative aspects	Unknown aspects
Counterparting	Institutional support Demand driven Share skills and resources	Limited funding/skills	
Integration of project activities in other related organisations	Institutional support Relevant activities	Donor demand Limited time	
Changes on policies of institutions involved	Consultation of commune councils in helping negotiate price Impact of project Strong consumer demand for good quality meat		
Spin-offs	Effective implementation scaled up others Strong interaction of farmers who are involved and not involved.		

Outputs – reccs

Arranged according to stakeholders, how they were involved, and what their objectives were

Vietnam:

Farmer coop – market accessibility, quality mgt, processing

Farmers – reduces production costs, increased income

Provincial agri service – policy on pig prodn, orientation

Min of Ag – new policy on pig prodn

Res inst. –improve capacity bldg

Private company –receive quality product, market accessibility,

Trader- good qual product for market, increased income

Slaughterhouse –

Cambodia:

Farmer organisation –

Farmers

Recommmendations

1. model innovation in small areas
2. improve and diffuse the model. Policy on pig production – national/regional, research (?) Documentation for policy maker, each stakeholder useful
3. strong networking of institutions and market stakeholders (eg farmer link to private company)

Innovations/ideas not finished yet, so will not diffuse or involve more farmers until sure of innovations. Second phase depends on this – can be justified. But why is it not finished? Not part of objectives? Which results achieved? Is it sustainable?