

## CARD Project Evaluation Summary Sheet

<b>Project Number and Name:</b> 002/004VIE-Better Breeds of Common Carp ( <i>Cyprinus carpio L.</i> ) for Small-scale Fish Farmers			
<b>Vietnamese Institution(s):</b> Research Institute for Aquaculture No.1			
<b>Australian Partner Institution(s):</b> Charles Darwin University			
<b>Date Approved:</b> December 04		<b>Date Commenced:</b> 8 March, 2005	
<b>Date Completed:</b> 8 June, 2007			
<b>Project budget (A\$)</b>	Total: 355,752	From: AusAID: 207,832	
		Australian Institution: 87,000	
		Vietnamese Institution: 60,920	
<b>Project Abstract</b>			
<p>Increased inland fish production is a high priority for the Government of Vietnam particularly in the context of rural development in relation to food security, poverty alleviation and income generation. This includes the continued development of genetically improved fish breeds, the effective dissemination of these breeds from central research institutes to provincial hatcheries for distributions to small scale farmers and further development of research capacity in genetics in relation to selective breeding and brood-stock management. This project focuses on common carp, the most important cultured inland fish species in Vietnam, especially in remote rural regions and for ethnic communities. The project will document and evaluate common carp genetic resources and breeding practices and is designed to help deliver less expensive and higher quality seed stock (fry and fingerlings) to small scale fish farmers, and to undertake on-farm demonstrations of using genetically improved fish breeds. The project will also contribute to capacity building and training in fish genetics, brood stock management and genetic improvement techniques.</p>			
<b>Objectives</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To document current fish breeding and brood-stock management practices in relation to the selection and maintenance of genetically improved common carp breeds at the institutional, hatchery (provincial and private) and small-scale farm levels; to assess knowledge levels relating to fish breeds and selection of seed stock by small scale farmers</li> <li>2. To determine genotypic and phenotypic diversity among common carp genetic resources (breeds), both wild and domesticated, available for aquaculture within Vietnam and examine the success of dissemination of genetically improved breeds to small scale farmers</li> <li>3. To increase success and efficiency of common carp breeding, broodstock management and seed stock production by small scale farmers and hatchery personnel</li> <li>4. To increase capacity of young researchers and technicians to contribute to research and development in the fields of genetics of broodstock management, molecular genetics and fish genetic improvement</li> <li>5. To demonstrate to farmers, on farm, the advantages of using genetically improved breeds of carp</li> </ol>			
<b>Milestones Completed:</b>		<b>Y/N</b>	<b>Y/N</b>
MS1. CARD contract signed		Y	
MS2. Scientific report of fish breeding stock practices and improvement strategies.		Y	MS5. 1 <sup>st</sup> Six-monthly report Y
MS3. Capacity Development Report		Y	MS6. 2 <sup>nd</sup> Six-monthly report Y
MS4. Report on uptake of improved breeds of Carp		Y	MS7. 3 <sup>rd</sup> Six-monthly report Y MS8. Project Completion report Y
<b>Reports Produced:</b>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scientific report of fish breeding stock practices and improvement strategies (July 2007)</li> <li>2. Capacity Development Report (July 2007)</li> <li>3. Report on uptake of improved breeds of Carp (Oct. 2007)</li> <li>4. 1<sup>st</sup> Six-monthly report (Feb 2006)</li> <li>5. 2<sup>nd</sup> Six-monthly report (Mar. 2006)</li> </ol>			

6. 3rd Six-monthly report (Sep. 2006)		
7. Project Completion report (Nov. 2007)		
<b>Evaluation Team:</b> 1. <i>Mr. Nguyen Viet Hai</i> (Team Leader), Science Technology and Environment Department 2. <i>Mr. Do Van Nam</i> , Science Technology and Environment Department 3. <i>Mr. Nguyen Duc Cuong</i> , Science Technology and Environment Department 4. <i>Mr. Nguyen Van Kien</i> , CARD M&E Coordinator	<b>Date of Evaluation:</b> September 2008	<b>Project Completion Evaluation (PCIE)</b>

<b>Evaluation Summary</b>	<b>Score a/</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Relevance	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objective of the project is relevant to MARD's policy (Fishery Breed Development Program by 2010 under Decision 112/2004/QĐ-TTg dated 23/6/2004 by the Prime Minister);</li> <li>The project objective remains relevant to smallholder farmers, managers, and researchers.</li> <li>The project objective is relevant to the CARD Program goal</li> </ul>
Impact	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Farmers are the beneficiaries because they are provided with good carp breeds, equipped with better techniques so they now have higher productivity. There is a potential for their incomes to increase.</li> <li>Experience to date shows that the adoption of improved breeds is limited to farmers close to research centres, there has been mixing of genetic stock in breeding centres and limited participation of the private sector in genetic improvement and distribution of improved stock</li> <li>Researchers' and managers' knowledge is now improved and they have opportunities to higher education and better jobs;</li> <li>The economic impact is yet to be proven, but appears to have potential provided the availability and distribution of improved stock is increased.</li> </ul>
Effectiveness	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project objectives were achieved, as presented above.</li> <li>The project outputs contributed to the achievement of the objectives: increase knowledge and awareness of farmers and produce more and better carp breeds for farmers; improve the knowledge and skill of researchers has been achieved.</li> <li>Application of knowledge at the farmer level has not been well demonstrated and it appears at this stage the primary beneficiaries are researchers with improved skills</li> </ul>
Efficiency	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The outcomes of the project meet or slightly exceed the expectations given the budget. This is particularly true for research institute staff.</li> <li>Almost all project indicators have been delivered with high quality technical reports (especially Milestone 2), suitable for publication delivered by the project team,</li> <li>The management of the project is good.</li> <li>The project budget, human resources and equipment were fully and appropriately utilised.</li> <li>Project organisation and implementation was well scheduled.</li> </ul>
Sustainability	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not many farmers want to up scale</li> <li>The financial benefits have not been clearly identified and because of this the</li> </ul>

		<p>incentives for farmers to adopt are unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability of the government breeding centres is questioned. While the skills and technology is available the responsiveness to industry needs and the strict requirements for breeding to avoid mixing of genes could be improved.</li> </ul>
<b>Average Score</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doubts about adoption by farmers, concerns about quality assurance and distribution of improved breeding stock and the drivers for change appear likely to impact on the impact potential for improved productivity by farmers.</li> </ul>

**Overall Assessment b/: Satisfactory**

**Major Problems Identified:**

- Project reports were sufficient in numbers however they are very brief, some results are not quantified
- Data related to the impacts and results of demonstrations on beneficiaries was not collected;
- The project progress was not in accordance with the plan for subjective and objective reasons;
- Environment, social and gender issues were not addressed sufficiently.

**Lessons Learned:**

- Farmers should have been given training in keeping track of their production (cost/benefit analysis, or even a simple balance sheet), this will help to evaluate the economic impact of the project.
- Partners could be non-Australian.

**Recommendations:**

- The project should propose a plan for the development of the common carp.
- The proposal for a phase 2 is relevant, unfortunately, CARD Program does not provide more funding for project, MARD should consider this proposal.

a/ 1 = worst 5 = best    b/ Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately Satisfactory, Un-satisfactory