

Report Number: ICRR10086

1. Project Data:

OEDID: L2864

Project ID: P006392

Project Name: Livestock Disease Control Project

Country: Brazil
Sector: Livestock

L/C Number: L2864

Partners involved: None

Prepared by: John English, OEDST

Reviewed by: Jock Anderson

Group Manager: Roger Slade

Date Posted: 06/30/1998

2. Project Objectives, Financing, Costs and Components:

The project's objectives were to:

- 1. increase livestock productivity by decreasing production losses resulting from livestock diseases affecting, in particular, cattle, pigs, and poultry in the project area; and
- 2. improve veterinary services in Brazil.

The estimated project cost was US\$108.4 million, with the Bank loan covering US\$51 million. The loan was approved in FY87 and became effective in October, 1987. Implementation was slow, due to financial problems which led to inadequate counterpart funding and to the impact of the new constitution of 1988, which called for decentralization and led to administrative reforms which caused confusion and conflict among agencies. In 1994 the project was restructured to reflect this new situation and to place greater emphasis on state rather than federal level activities. As restructured, the principal components were:

- provision of staff, training and consultancy services to the Departments of Animal Health Protection and of Animal Disease Laboratories;
- 2. improvement of facilities of federal and state laboratories and quarantine stations;
- 3. Institutional development of state veterinary services and promotion of the decentralization of veterinary services towards municipalities and producers associations; and
- 4. decentralizatioon of veterinary services.

3. Achievement of Relevant Objectives:

Disease control achievements included: (i) vaccination coverage for foot and mouth disease (FMD) reached 88.5% nationwide by end-1996; (ii) mortality from FMD fell from 0.71/100,000 in 1986 to 0.06/100.000 in 1996; (iii) the states of Santa Catarina, Rio Grande do Sul, and Parana are officially FMD -free; (iv) these states are also now free of classic swine fever; and (v) Brazil now has a nationwide epidemiological vigilance system incorporating 1800 local animal health offices.

4. Significant Achievements:

See 3. Also the project stimulated the creation of state and local animal health councils, including involvement of producers and other relevant groups, which spearheaded local animal health campaigns.

5. Significant Shortcomings:

As originally designed and appraised the project was not fully feasible, largely because of administrative and institutional changes which followed the adoption of a new federal constitution in 1988, i.e., factors beyond the project itself.

6. Ratings:	Ratings: ICR OED Review		Reason for Disagreement /Comments		
Outcome:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory			

Institutional Dev .:	Substantial	Substantial	
Sustainability:	Likely	Likely	
Bank Performance :	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Borrower Perf .:	Satisfactory	Satisfactory	
Quality of ICR:		Satisfactory	

7. Lessons of Broad Applicability:

The importance of the committment of the highest relevant level of government is underlined. Even if this level is not the major implementor of the project it must provide leadership.

Project organizational structure and lines of communication must be simple and clear, and must be compatible with political realities and the incentive system affecting the performance of public and other agencies.

8. Au	ıdit	Recommended?	\subset	Yes	C	No
-------	------	--------------	-----------	-----	---	----

9. Comments on Quality of ICR:

ICR quality overall is satisfactory. Given the centrality of the restructuring of the project, the provision of ratings for both pre and post-restructuring periods is helpful, as is the assessment of achievements against the performance indicators agreed at restructuing. However, the project cost table is inadequate and does not provide any expenditure breakdown.

OED accepts the difficulty of specifying a plan for future operation under a decentralized federal structure where quasi-public agencies are also involved. However, given the decentralized nature of the system now in operation, it would have been instructive to have reviewed future plans with one or more local (i.e. state or municipal) entities (e.g., the animal health councils) on how they planned to maintain the existing performance levels. This would have been particularly relevant in one of the states which has been certified as FMD or Swine Fever free.

Project Filing

It should be noted that the correspondence files are in a mess, and undoubtedly this did not help the preparation of the ICR. Material is stapled together and is kept loose in the files and not in chronological order. It is difficult to assess how complete the material is, but much correspondence appears to be missing and presumably has been filed in Recife.