

Urban Agriculture Network (UrbANet)



Appraisal of Community Livestock Worker (CLW) Programme

- Final Report -

Prepared by:

PerfSan Ltd.
P.O Box TL1244
Tamale
Northern Region, Ghana
Office Mobile: +233 (0) 503405731
e-mail:perfsangh@gmail.com

July 12th, 2014

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
1. Executive Summary.....	1
2. Introduction.....	3
2.1 Purpose, Objective and Scope of Appraisal.....	3
2.2 The Appraisal Process.....	4
3. The Strategic Context.....	4
3.1 Programme Area and Beneficiaries.....	6
3.2 Institutional Arrangements.....	6
4. Key Findings and Observations.....	7
5. Constraints and Opportunities.....	9
5.1 Successes.....	10
5.2 Challenges.....	12
6. Social impact and Poverty Reduction.....	12
7. Key Conclusions.....	13
8. Recommendations and Lessons.....	14
8.1 Recommendations.....	14
8.2 Lessons.....	15
References.....	16
Appendixes.....	17
i. Checklist for field discussions with CLWs.....	17
ii. List of trained CLWs.....	19

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AEA	Agriculture Extension Agent
CLW	Community Livestock Worker
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
FASDEP	Food & Agricultural Sector Development Policy
GAs	Government Agents
LRP	Local Rights Programme
LRPCs	Local Rights Programme Communities
LSP	Livelihood Support Programme
MADU	Metropolitan Agriculture Development Unit
MMDAs	Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies
MoFA	Ministry of Food and Agriculture
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
ToR	Terms of Reference
UrbANet	Urban Agriculture Network
VSD	Veterinary Services Department

1. Executive Summary

Livestock production is an important feature of Ghana's agriculture, and contributing largely towards meeting food needs and generating cash incomes. It provides a safety net for the farmer in the Northern Region in general and Tamale Metropolis as well as the Sagnarigu District in particular as it serves as a major source of income for the farmer.

This report presents the findings of an appraisal of the Community Livestock Worker (CLW) programme which has been implemented under the livelihood support programme of the Urban Agriculture Network (UrbANet) with support from ActionAid Ghana under the Local Rights Programme. The assessment considers the nature of the strategy and approach of the concept as well as the implementation of the activities as take-off intervention to help increase household incomes of farmers at the rural and peri-urban communities on the programme.

Returns for the programme have been measured in terms of increased livestock production and productivity as a result of immediate access to animal health care services even in the face of inadequate extension service agents; however, maintaining this increase requires constant updating of knowledge in the practice of the Community Livestock Worker. The need for strengthening of collaborations and continuous monitoring and collaboration are critical for the sustainability of the programme.

Some noted findings of the appraisal on these initiatives which is aimed at supporting livestock farmer to provide extensionists role to the wider community livestock farmers have been;

- *Functionality of the CLWs at the community level.*

The community livestock workers continue to be functional in the provision of animal health care services, however, about 30% are very much involved and rendering the needed services to local livestock farmers within their

communities as well as to farmers in communities nearby who ask for their support.

Some of the CLWs have strived to keep their own flocks of animals and the benefits are stimulating them to continue to be active as livestock workers. This effort has made them refresh themselves with the knowledge they acquired through the various training sessions with the veterinary services department. They have even developed their skills to the level of delivering small ruminants (sheep and goats) in labour.

- *Institutional relations with Relevant Agencies.*

In terms of long-term sustainability of the intervention, the CLW programme recognises the key role of relevant institutions and agencies in providing specialist advice and services (by decentralized departments) to livestock farmers. With decentralised system of government being practiced, collaborations and linkages are primarily at Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs) level. Ideally linkages need to be built during project development period in other that the CLW programme intervention can be sustained in the event that UrbANet/ActionAid Ghana partnership support is no longer active in the area. Establishing and maintaining partnerships is critical in the sustainable development of society. The CLWs have endeavoured to keep a cordial relationship with institutions and agents that have tried in one way or another to introduce development interventions to their communities. Very close rapport exist between the extension service staff of veterinary services department which has been attributed to the championing role of the CLWs in acting as liaison for their communities.

2. Introduction

2.1 Purpose, Objective and Scope of Appraisal

This report presents the findings of an Appraisal of the Community Livestock Worker (CLW) programme which was being implemented under the livelihood support programme (LSP) of the Urban Agriculture Network (UrbANet) with the partnership support by ActionAid Ghana programme for the empowerment of Local Rights Programme III and IV (LRP) communities. The overall objective of the appraisal, according to our Terms of Reference (ToR) is *“to document the key successes, challenges and lessons from the implementation of the project”* with due attention to making *“potential recommendations for strengthening the activities of the community livestock workers.”* The report is intended to inform UrbANet and its financing partner (ActionAid Ghana) the next line of considerations for replication and scale up of the programme in other communities/programme intervention areas for social development.

The report contain reflections and analysis of the quality and depth of the changes (successes, challenges) and lessons that have taken place since the inception of the CLW concept as well as its relevance and the relevance of the method and approach for a full scale launch or other wise of the programme. The report also provides some recommendations for enhancing the effectiveness and some alternative methods and approaches which UrbANet may wish to consider in its future undertakings in their livelihood support activities/interventions at the community level.

The appraisal covers the CLW programme’s life from 2007 to 2014, which includes some information from the UrbANet/ActionAid support through the LRP facilitator’s engagement and alternative livelihood support pilot phase (2003-2006) for revolving livestock production groups which triggered the introduction of the CLW programme to provide limited technical support in the form of animal care.

2.2 The Appraisal Process

The information in the report regarding the key findings and key conclusions as well as the recommendations have been as a result of several days of field visits, observations and stakeholder interviews in the programme intervention communities between June 18th, 2014 and June 30th, 2014. These interactions with the various stakeholders were augmented with a scan of related literature, documents and reports produced by the programme team and their collaborators during the implementation of the field activities.

The multi-stakeholder nature and focus of the programme on the impact group and participating communities have increased the potential of exploiting ways of building synergy to optimize value during the implementation of the intervention.

To verify further on the field information gathered from hindsight from accounts by participants; five (5) CLWs and few farmers who have benefited from the services of the CLWs were selected for in-depth discussions to corroborate the degree to which they have been involved in the process and how they have contributed to making the programme succeed; and to distil relevant lessons more fully in support of replication and scaling.

3. The Strategic Context

The National livestock sector policy framework as in the Food and Agricultural Sector Development Policy (FASDEP) recognizes among others the need for maximum focus on the “production of animal feed, control of animal diseases as well as improved animal husbandry practices” at all levels as the main thrust in order to enhance livestock production and productivity.

The ever increasing gap-by default-in the extension delivery services to farmers remains a challenge for the livestock sector. As a policy measure to address this issue, the policy emphasizes the role of the private sector in the delivery of animal health care services.

Indeed, inadequate Extension Agents of the Veterinary Services Department in the Northern Region and the Tamale Metropolitan area continue to limit

the availability of animal health care services provision to farmers and farming communities exposing them to high vulnerabilities and of animal diseases which in many cases have resulted in the loss of livelihood and incomes of smallholder farmers. Another critical challenge faced by these communities in the Tamale Metropolis and the Region as a whole as an area where farming employs about 70% of the population is inadequate access to Agriculture Extension Agents (AEAs) for crop production and agro-processing from which high nutrient value of animal feed to enhance livestock production and productivity could be realized to further boost livestock farming. The problem of AEA inadequacy affects more the female farmers (livestock and crops) who due to reasons of culture and income challenges given secondary preference after the male farmers have been given access to AEAs.

In order to assist address this challenge UrbANet in partnership with ActionAid Ghana and in collaboration with the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (MoFA) facilitated the Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) programme to make basic veterinary services accessible to communities in selected communities of the Tamale Metropolis and Sagnarigu District. The approach and method employed, focused on the selection of trusted community members by the community people as CLWs who are actively involved in livestock keeping and live within the intervention communities selected from 36 adopted local rights programme communities (LRPCs) by ActionAid Ghana.

The programme concept had been designed to facilitate a capacity development programme for participating livestock farmers as volunteers to provide adapted veterinary extension services to other livestock farmers in their vicinity. A total of 24 selected Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) underwent training facilitated by the Metropolitan Agriculture Development Unit (MADU) in basic veterinary clinical skills to enable them undertake basic treatments like de-worming, castration, and treatment of animal wounds. They were also trained in basic records keeping of treatment and support in

the mobilization of other livestock farmers in their respective communities for disease control and prevention activities by the Veterinary Services Department.

3.1 Programme Area and Beneficiaries

The programme was focused on identifying and providing a livelihood support system to local rights programme communities with the goal to improve household incomes and reduce glaring vulnerabilities confronting people in these communities. The appraisal therefore targeted twenty-two (22) individuals selected among the community farmers who have received training and supported with tool kits and bicycles as means of transport to facilitate their movements in the course of delivering services to livestock farmers. As Community Livestock Workers (CLWs), they are also to serve as focal persons of the Veterinary Services Department (VSD) at the community level.

Other target groups included local rights community facilitators and potential livestock farmers with zeal to fully participate as beneficiaries in the implementation of the programme. Also government agents (GA) with the mandate to regularize and support the operations of the CLWs were part of the target while relying on the collaborative support of Non-governmental organizations and civil society organizations.

3.2 Institutional Arrangements

The CLW programme is formulated around a civil society/ rights-based programme logic¹ and structured around facilitators for social change at the community level. An elaborate and highly appreciated system of shared space has been created to foster coordination and synergy between the CLW and Extension Officers of the veterinary services department as an institution of the ministry of food and agriculture (MoFA). This arrangement had made the

Local Rights Communities programme

programme integrative, making CLWs to serve dual purpose; 1) of providing immediate access to basic animal health care services; and 2) as liaison in relaying information of critical animal health cases and disease outbreaks to the veterinary services department. However, interactions from the field clearly indicates weakness in the link of this noble arrangement- neither submission of monthly case treatment reports nor monitoring visits have been effective, except for stipulated vaccinations.

4. Key Findings and Observations

- *Assessment of the existing CLW approach and the overall ability (practices) to influence adaptability by communities.*

The CLW approach in the inception period offered knowledge base support through capacity building and training of volunteer livestock workers to offer daily veterinary services (basic case handling) as animal health care providers. In practice, the livestock worker programme continues to offer services in about 50% of the intervention communities in the Tamale Metropolis and Sagnarigu District. The reason for this moderate gain is attributed to uncertain financing prospects to support CLWs sustain the adaptability of the programme by the communities. This has been the main obstacle for which extra efforts will need to be collectively made for the programme to continue to be active.

However, for the concept to make a real impact and to enhance its relevance, there are a number of issues which will require further reflection. First, with the enthusiasm of the CLWs, it will be useful to work quickly towards scaling up the concept to make the programme intervention more accessible to interested/potential livestock workers and livestock farmers as well; and secondly, while the appraisal team accepts that piloting is an ideal approach, the piloting process could be iterative to include clustering of communities as against CLWs working in single (resident place only) communities.

A paced scaling up therefore should be possible with a view to enhancing access to the model by potential participants to inform adaptation.

- *Assessment of the functionality of the CLWs at the community level.*

The ActionAid Ghana programme's earlier investment in empowering citizens (particularly local-rights community facilitators) and other community groups has left positive and lasting prints which the CLW programme has built upon. The CLW participants interviewed confirmed that the community facilitators have remained assertive and continue to support the process of effecting change and bringing development to the community. The livestock workers continue to be functional in the provision of animal health care services, however, about 30% are very much involved (like in Kpene, Wayamba, Katariga, Dungu, Jonshegu etc.) and rendering the needed services to local livestock farmers within their communities as well as to farmers in communities nearby who ask for their support.

Some of the CLWs have strived to keep their own flocks of animals and the benefits are stimulating them to continue to be active as livestock workers. This effort has made them refresh themselves with the knowledge they acquired through the various training sessions with the veterinary services department. They have even developed their skills to the level of delivering small ruminants (sheep and goats) in labour. The commitment and efforts of Adam Sulemana of Kpene; Fuseini Sagyelidow of Wayamba and Mohammed Ibrahim of Katariga are examples of such cases.

- *Assessment of CLW and Institutional relations with Relevant Agencies.*

In terms of long-term sustainability of the intervention, the CLW programme recognises the key role of relevant institutions and agencies in providing specialist advice and services (by decentralized departments) to livestock farmers. With decentralised system of government being practiced,

collaborations and linkages are primarily at Metropolitan, Municipal and District Assemblies (MMDAs) level. Ideally linkages need to be built during project development period in other that the CLW programme intervention can be sustained in the event that UrbANet/ActionAid Ghana partnership support is no longer active in the area. Establishing and maintaining partnerships is critical in the sustainable development of society. The CLWs have endeavoured to keep a cordial relationship with institutions and agents that have tried in one way or another to introduce development interventions to their communities. Very close rapport exist between the extension service staff of veterinary services department which has been attributed to the championing role of the CLWs in acting as liaison for their communities. Constant communication and interactions with veterinary officers through reporting of cases and mobilising community members for livestock vaccinations and other severe animal ailments have created a bond between the CLW and AEA as “sparing partners” in the provision of animal health care services to the people.

5. Constraints and Opportunities

Livestock diseases constitute a major constraint to increased livestock production in the programme area, yet farmers have shown continues interest in the rearing of small ruminants with limited access to animal health care services due to the extension staff to farmer over-stretched gap. The introduction of the CLW programme have therefore created the opportunity for the farmers to access affordable animal health care services in the face of a huge extension to farmer ratio of 1:3472 to increase livestock production and productivity giving credence to the lack of smallholder credit facility for livestock farmers as well as the private sector/CLW as emerging animal health care providers to triumph.

However, in the face of this difference, some successes have been made in the implementation of the activities of the community livestock worker

programme. There have been and still are challenges confronting the programme.

5.1 Successes

The CLW programme has benefited smallholder farmers who have undertaken livestock production as an income generation activity and have adapted good animal husbandry practices. Some community members and even livestock workers have argued that doing livestock production alone is more rewarding than crop farming. A livestock farmer (Afa Salifu) at Dungu indicated that he stopped crop farming about 20 years ago and he lives on the proceeds/incomes from sale of his livestock.

- *CLW programme operationalises immediate community level access to livestock health care services.*

The CLW programme is consistent with a participatory technology transfer approach in which communities and the citizens are active stakeholders and participants, and leading their own animal health care activities in livestock production and productivity to improve on household income levels and social development.

The Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) are making animal health care services accessible and affordable to livestock farmers. These have resulted in the reduction in animal deaths and have made them (farmers) engage actively in building a stronger community resource-base to drive their development.

- *Enhanced participation and empowerment*

The activities of the CLWs have engendered the active involvement of women and men in the livestock rearing activities. Most community members who make use of the support services provided by the CLW programme are financially empowered and are progressively assuming the responsibilities of paying miscellaneous fees and up-keep of their wards in school. There is equity in the delivery of the basic services as both men and women are able to

access health care for their livestock. Rukaya Fuseini, a livestock farmer at Wayamba community reiterated that “she wouldn’t be able to keep animals without the basic veterinary services that is provided by the community’s livestock worker”

- *CLWs enhancing relations between Communities and Extension Services.*

The added responsibility of the CLWs as focal persons of the veterinary services for seeking information on the status and conditions of livestock at the community level, and also in the mobilization of communities and livestock farmers for periodic vaccinations campaigns.

There is close rapport between the extension service staff of veterinary services department and this relationship has been attributed to the championing role of the CLWs in acting as liaison for their communities. Constant communication and interactions with veterinary officers through reporting (and keeping records) of cases and mobilising community members for livestock vaccinations and other severe animal ailments have created a bond between the CLW and AEA as “sparing partners” in the provision of animal health care services to the people.

However, support to stimulate CLWs is worth discussing, as some have argued that without incentives to motivate them there will be little action to sustain the gains made, with others insisting that a volunteering spirit is vital to sustaining the programme. Experiences from other interventions show that “if the volunteers are perceived to be receiving too many special advantages (additional incentives), they will be considered as owners of the programme, then the implementation process will stifle.

Continues capacity building and training to up-grade the knowledge and skills of the CLWs will better inspire and encourage them to influence livestock farmers for the sustainability of the intervention.

5.2 Challenges

The appraisal identified some broad areas where challenges exist for in implementation of the CLW.

These are:

- The CLW programme emphasises the treatment of four basic animal health care cases for the trained livestock workers to handle. This limitation in some instances have caused dis-illusionement in the farmer that the CLWs can really provide adequate access to veterinary services that is needed owing to the fact they are not trained to give intra-vainous injections.
- The understanding of ownership of the CLW programme falls short of sustaining the activities of the livestock workers. There have been instances where farmers have declined payment for treatments provided on their livestock, and this have led to the exhuation of drugs in the kit and no money to replenish the kit for contunues treatment of animals in the community. A typical case is Dabogshei where the community livestock worker can not even trace his working tools which was provided to aid perform as a livestock worker.
- The CLW programme approach emphasises on capacity development facilitation, empowerment, and ownership thereby allowing the livestock worker through communities to lead the process. However, in some instances there is apparent misinformation or different expectations from community members on support (capacity development) provided to CLW to be able to deliver services to the communities.. Therefore understanding of ownership is unclear and there is limited appreciation of the concept.

6. Social Impact and Poverty Reduction

The programme promotes increased animal production through increase in productivity and off-take to improve on socio-economic levels of local rights

programme beneficiary communities. Based on findings from the field assessment and on the existing socio-economic context at the communities, farmers who have received services and advice from the CLWs have experienced increases in household incomes through observing the full cycle of livestock rearing (small ruminants) from production, transforming and marketing. The use of participatory and gender inclusion approach in responding to the needs of all owners (both men and women) of small ruminants enhanced the effective implementation of the CLW programme which forms the thrust in the improvement of household incomes.

7. Key Conclusions

Sustainability of the Community Livestock Programme as an extension service intervention by direct community members participation in the implementation of the strategy approach and methods. Two models of selection of livestock workers were identified. Most CLWs are selected by their communities at the beginning of the programme while others were selected after a period of training. This community-based extension worker approach is an initiative that is sustainable and replicable, however, the critical question to ask is the ability of communities and community groups including livestock farmers to support by responding more to the activities of the livestock workers in order to sustain the programme.

Based on field evidence, the appraisal will conclude that;

1. The CLW programme is a catalyst for transforming community livestock production activities of farmers.
2. The CLW programme is generally both more cost-effective and more relevant for equipping community members/participants with the technical foundation required for the world of work in the provision of animal health care.
3. The CLW can vigorously support the increase in household incomes and reduce drastically the poverty levels and food in-security in

vulnerable communities as well as urban poor communities/settlements.

8. Recommendations and Lessons

The stated recommendations and lessons below are informed mainly by field visits, observations and relevant stakeholder interactions in the CLW programme area. These interactions were argued with the review of literature and documents provided by UrbANet and facilitators of the programme. The set of recommendations are presented for consideration by UrbANet/ActionAid Ghana.

8.1 Recommendations

- i. There is a recurrent signal of ownership of the programme where some community livestock owners have accessed animal health care services and decline payment for even drugs used. The need exist for an extensive re-orientation of beneficiary communities on the principles of ownership.
- ii. The team recommends a review of limiting activities of livestock workers to their communities alone. Some animal conditions are communicable and through grazing on common grazing fields render animals prone to these diseases, therefore scaling the activities through clustering of nearby communities (about 3) will help reduce spread of such diseases.
- iii. To rejuvenate and make the livestock worker more functional, there is the need to establish a systematic training programme (new treatment areas e.g IV injections and refresher) and frequent monitoring mechanism to assess CLWs and community participation for sustainability.

- iv. For the relevance of institutional relations to be concretized and give support to the activities of the CLWs, the need to communicate the work of the livestock worker programme on joint radio programmes/discussions should be arranged.

8.2 Lessons

The appraisal team identified some issues from the activities of the CLW programme for learning to develop a scaling up strategy. They include;

- i. Institution of a credit scheme for drug replenishing of tool kits for CLWs would maximize their effectiveness in providing highly needed veterinary services to improve rural livelihoods.
- ii. With the widening gap of the veterinary extension agent to livestock farmer ratio, the activities of the CLWs and their relationship with the extension agents can be an active model for comprehensive planning to improve the livestock sub-sector.

References

- Arkorful, K. Ayamdoor, E. Nsoh. *Community livestock worker training report. March, 2007.*
- African Union Inter-African Bureau for Animal Research, *Reinforcing Veterinary Governance in Africa. June, 2013*
- GoG. *Food and Agriculture Sector Development Policy (FASDEP) of the Republic of Ghana. August, 2007.*
- Medhat, Sabri M. Kasalu-Coffin, K. Bucher, D. *Livestock Development Appraisal Report. August, 2001.*
- Wellard, Kate. *Knowledge transfer: the role of community extension in increasing food security, 2011*

Appendixes

i. Checklist for field interactions with CLWs

Field Discussions Guide with CLWs

Interviewer.....Date.....Project Area.....

No. of CLWs present: 1. Male....., 2. Female.....

Community	Type of group M/F/mix	Membership			No. of houses in village	Trained CLWs		
		Women	Men	Total		Male	Female	Total
Total								

1. What are CLWs?
 - Duties of CLWs
2. Selection – When were you selected?
 - How were you selected (process)?
 - What criteria were used?
3. Training received as a CLW
4. Activities/services provided
 - Veterinary/Livestock
 - Other services
5. Groups CLWs are working with:
 - Are communitylivestock farmers better off/poor?
 - How often do you meet your livestock farmers?
6. Motivation for being a CLW
 - Support/incentives provided
 - From UrbANet
 - From community/group farmers
7. Costs of being a CLW
 - Time (per week/month)
 - Other expenses

8. Have any CLWs dropped out?
Any Reasons?
9. Impact/benefits of the CLWs (to date)
 - Own farm/livelihood: knowledge gained, how used,
 - Impact on livestock production, food security, household incomes etc.
 - Other impact (community affairs, relations with other organisations; position of women)
 - Impact on other villages
10. CLW interactions with other organisations – What kind of interaction?

Benefits/challenges?
 - Traditional institutions
 - Other organisations in the field (Govt, NGOs etc)
 - CLWs Group – what interaction? Benefits?
11. Challenges faced as a CLW (and how do you try to overcome these)
 - Knowledge/skills
 - Reaching all farmers incl. poorest
 - Resources
12. Do you keep any records?
 - Cases & Treatments
 - Training of livestock farmers
 - Meetings
13. Do you have any questions/comments?

THANK YOU VERY MUCH

ii. List of Trained CLWs

s/n.	Name	Community
1	Fuseini Sugyaldow	Wayamba
2.	Zakaria (Carlos)	Gbambaya
3.	Rukaya Fuseini	Wayamba
4.	Umar M. Rahaman	Dabokpaa
5.	Afa Tailor	Changli
6.	Bawa Inusah	Tuutingli
7.	Ibrahim Tahiru	Jonshegu
8.	Mohammed Ibrahim	Katariga
9.	Amadu Osman	Sugashei
10.	Imoro Alhassan	Sugashei
11.	Yahaya Mahamud	Dungu
12.	Haruna Osman	Dungu
13.	Alhassan Abdulai	Malshagu
14.	Inusah F. Jabila	Malshagu
15.	Alhassan Zakaria	Dabogshei
16.	Osman Amadu	Chanshegu
17.	Abukari Alhassan	Chanshegu
18.	Adam Sulemana	Kpene
19.	Abdulai Latif	Kasalgu
20.	Bielawu alhassan	Banvim
21.	Alhassan Habib	Ngarun
22.	Alhassan Salifu	Nyerizee
23.	Iddrisu Suhiyini	Kulnyavilla
24.	Joe	Yong Dakpemyili