

QUANG NGAI RURAL DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM (RUDEP) - PHASE 2

Evaluation Report - an Evaluation of
Demonstration Livestock Demonstrations in
RUDEP Commune in 2003



VIETNAM-AUSTRALIA

Prepared for

AusAID

Australian Embassy
8 Dao Tan Street
Ba Dinh District,
Hanoi, VIET NAM

June 2003

42443858

Prepared by

URS Sustainable Development
in association with Kellogg Brown & Root and
World Wide Project Management Services
Project Managers and Consultants
Adelaide Australia

DONOR AGENCY

AusAID

Australian Embassy

8 Dao Tan Street, Ba Dinh District, Hanoi, Viet Nam

Ph: +84 4 8317754/Ext 175 (Project Officer), Fax: +84 4 8317711

LEAD COUNTERPART AGENCY

Department of Planning and Investment

96 Nguyen Nghiem Street, Quang Ngai Town

Quang Ngai Province, Viet Nam

Ph: +84 55 825701

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT UNIT

No 4 Pham Van Dong Street, Quang Ngai Town

Quang Ngai Province, Viet Nam

Ph: +84 55 816261-6, Fax: +84 55 816260

AUSTRALIAN MANAGING CONTRACTOR


URS Sustainable Development

25 North Terrace

Hackney SA 5069


Ph: +61 8 8366 1000, Fax: +61 8 8366 1001

Program
Manager:


.....
Dee Hartvigsen
International Projects Manager

URS Australia Pty Ltd
25 North Terrace, Hackney
South Australia 5069 Australia
Tel: 61 8 8366 1000
Fax: 61 8 8366 1001

Program
Director:


.....
Ted A'Bear
Vice President
Sustainable Development

Date: June 2003
Reference: 42443858
Status: Final

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	1
2	Objectives of Evaluation	2
3	Introduction on Demonstration Implemented in 2003	3
4	Method of Evaluation	4
5	Results	5
5.1	Result of Cattle Demonstrations	5
5.2	Result of Pig Demos	7
5.3	Result of Chicken Demos	10
6	Common Problems Relating to Demos	13
7	Lessons Learnt	14

TABLES

Table 1: Demonstrations held in communes	3
------------------------------------------------	---

FIGURES

Figure 1: Quantity of farmers paid attention to cattle demonstrations	5
Figure 2: Rate of members participating in training courses on cattle demonstration	5
Figure 3: Rate of participants who knew objectives of demonstrations	6
Figure 4: Rate of people respond to demos techniques	6
Figure 5: Awareness of demos impact to labour	7
Figure 6: Interest level of farmers in pig demos	7
Figure 7: Rate of participants at pig training sessions	8
Figure 8: Awareness of participants regarding objectives of pig demos.....	8
Figure 9: Rate of participants adopting demos techniques	9
Figure 10: People's perception regarding labour in demos	9

Figure 11: Interest level of farmers in chicken demos	10
Figure 12: Rate of participants at chicken demos training sessions.....	10
Figure 13: Knowledge of participants regarding objectives of chicken demos ...	11
Figure 14: Rate of participants adopting chicken demos techniques	11
Figure 15: Concept of labour in chicken demos	12

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Evaluation Forms

Annex 2: Evaluation Results of Communes

1 Introduction

The Quang Ngai Rural Development Program (QNRDP) is the culmination of a series of preparatory studies and workshops which were commissioned by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and commenced in 1997. The aim was to identify the content and approach for a Program which could sustainably address poverty alleviation, increased incomes, increased employment, enhanced equity, improved strategic infrastructure, and environmental protection and improve livelihoods sustainably through increased incomes within the risk framework of poor people by empowering to them in selected communes in Quang Ngai.

2 Objectives of Evaluation

Monitoring and Evaluation is one of four main components of RUDEP which fulfill the Program's reporting responsibilities to AusAID and the Vietnamese government leadership. They need to be informed on whether the Program is being carried out according to the annual plan, contracts and the Program Design Document and is achieving set goals. The various objectives of M&E are outlined as follows:

- Appropriateness monitoring and evaluation determines the extent to which program objectives meet community or natural resource needs. This was done in Phase 1 to ensure that the program objectives are appropriate.
- Effectiveness monitoring and evaluation determines the extent to which program outcomes have achieved the planned objectives. It is also used to determine the impact of a program.
- Cost Effectiveness monitoring and evaluation assesses whether the financial and human resources committed to implementation were well spent, by determining whether the planned outcomes were actually achieved.

Besides many other activities of program, there were demonstrations, which aimed at transference of animal husbandry techniques to people through learning by doing. Thus, evaluation of implemented demonstrations was necessary to learn lessons, contribute to the introduction, and widening of result, help to develop and diversify income generation activities for the poor at program communes.

3 Introduction on Demonstration Implemented in 2003

Basing on result of PC/PA/PS in cycle 1 and 2, in 2003 Program implemented some demonstrations in coordination with DARD to introduce new animal husbandry technique to help poor households improve income. These activities commenced from 06/2003 and finished 12/2003 the number of demonstrations was as followed.

Table 1: Demonstrations held in communes

Commune	Type of demonstration		
	Cattle	Pig	Chicken
Tịnh Thọ	2	2	2
Đức Phong	2	2	2
Sơn Hải	0	4	2
Nghĩa Thọ	2	2	2
Phổ Châu	2	2	2
Hành Phước	2	2	2

4 Method of Evaluation

We evaluated demonstrations by the following method:

- To nearly finished demonstrations, MEGO worked in coordination with DARD staff, DDOs, commune staff, and some program staff. They attended final training session of each demonstration to discuss with members in activity groups about demonstration based on evaluation forms prepared by Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor and MEGO.
- To finished demonstrations, MEGO did evaluation with support of DDOs and commune staff. They went to the field where demonstrations were done or went to each household or invited a group of members in activity group to demonstration households to interview people who participated demonstration activity according to designed form and recorded opinions outside designed form.
- MEGO summarized and synthesized opinions ticked in evaluation forms by members in activity groups including opinions and questions outside the content designed to analyze, report to stakeholders, learn lessons from demonstrations implemented in order to improve demonstration activities to make them appropriate to people in following years.

5 Results

After three months of evaluation, we gained some results as follows.

5.1 Result of Cattle Demonstrations

The evaluation shows women paid less attention to demonstrations than men, especially in ethnic minority communes. The number of women who knew the demonstrations was limited. (see Table 2 and Annex 2)

Figure 1: Quantity of farmers paid attention to cattle demonstrations






Figure 2: Rate of members participating in training courses on cattle demonstration



The Agro-Extension Center held 4 training courses at each cattle demonstration. Figure 5.1.2 shows that number of farmers attending training courses increased by time. In the first three sessions, the number of female participants was more than male. However, general evaluation indicates that rate of women is still lower than men. In the final training sessions rate of men suddenly increased greatly and the reason for this was not found.

Most people including men and women aware deeply the objectives of demonstration (see Figure 3). They all knew that Agro-Extension Center selected two skinny cows for each demonstration site, and usage of high ration to get benefit of 400,000VND/per cattle after 2 months. Besides objectives designed in the contract, the people were also aware that demonstrations were a method to help them learn new techniques such as: how to take care of cattle, how to feed them simply at shed, method of making shed, mixing food and growing elephant grass to add green food etc.

Figure 3: Rate of participants who knew objectives of demonstrations



According to people's evaluation, the cattle demos were successful and it helped them to learn new animal husbandry techniques but when interviewed, most people showed their hesitation in the adopting of demos techniques. Only 18.8% of them already adopted techniques before the end of demos. Ration costs were over the limited family budget of 51.1 % of people who said they would adopt the techniques after the finalization of demos. These people said they would adopt the techniques whenever they had enough money for food and veterinary care. Some others said they would modify some techniques to make it appropriate to their household conditions. For example, they would use available food in their families such as: rice strain, sweet potatoes leaves, cassava powder, banana trees, and maize powder. (see Figure 4)

Figure 4: Rate of people respond to demos techniques






Figure 5: Awareness of demos impact to labour



According to people, since they used high ration in cattle production for two months, labour was reduced in comparison with traditional method. It did not take time to graze cattle or to cut grass for food in field but their cattle had good meat quality and were accepted by market. People could revolve their capital quickly due to time reduced from six months to two months. This was a significant thing to poor people in order to help them generate more income (see Figure 5)

5.2 Result of Pig Demos


Figure 6: Interest level of farmers in pig demos



Through the survey, we saw that the number of people who did not know the existing of pig demos was large. Especially in the mountainous area, people didn't hear about the demos being implemented in their village. From this situation, we wondered whether the local staff and DARD staff did a good communication to local people or not.

During the evaluation, we found that there was labour division in animal husbandry. Men pay more attention to cattle demos while women were much less.


Figure 7: Rate of participants at pig training sessions



Although women pay more attention to pig demos, the number of men and women attending training sessions were nearly equivalent.

Numbers of participants at training sessions were rather small in comparison with cattle training sessions. In many sessions, DARD staff could not implement the training because there were not enough participants (*See Figure 7*).


Figure 8: Awareness of participants regarding objectives of pig demos



Participants' awareness of objectives of pig demos was rather enough. They all knew that in four months the benefits from raising pig would be about 30,000-200,000 VND/pig after the combination of high ration and veterinary care. Demos not only helped people see the benefit but also give them, especially women a method to reduce labour by which they did not have spend time to cook. Besides, demos help people access new animal husbandry such as selection of breeds, environment surrounding sheds, selection of high ration for quick production. People said raising pigs brought them free time and pig manure could be used to make gas for family cooking.

At the time of evaluation, the market price for lean pig was down said some people. We thus could not show people the benefit of demos. We were surprised to hear from people that different types of veterinary medicine used made the production of pig slow (in Pho Chau commune). (*See Figure 8*)


Figure 9: Rate of participants adopting demos techniques



As in cattle demos, some better-off households did adopt the techniques introduced because methods of feeding were easier than traditional methods. People did not have to cook food and it was easy to control disease. However, some of them answered that they would do nothing because they did not know market and so that they were not confident to invest on the pig while the market was unstable.

Besides, we could see that the number of persons who said they would adopt the techniques was rather large. It counted for 37% of which 14.8% said they would adopt and modify ration to make it appropriate to their conditions. Available food would be mainly used because they could not afford expensive food, and it was not commonly sold at local area such as fishmeal, dried soybean. At the same time, they would select pig breed that was suitable for local conditions. (See Figure 9)

Figure 10: People's perception regarding labour in demos




There were two different perceptions between men and women regarding labour. According to men, pig demos showed that it took more time of their wives to take care of pigs than traditional method. They saw their wives spend more time to feed pigs than before. While women insisted that raising pigs following the demos saved their time from cooking and collecting wood to cook food.

However, men admitted that although their wives spend a lot of time to take care of the animal, they got benefit from demos techniques and saved in comparison a 6-7 month period compared with traditional methods


5.3 Result of Chicken Demos

Figure 11: Interest level of farmers in chicken demos



In comparison with pig and cattle demos, chicken demonstrations were greatly welcomed by women. However, there were many people did not know or not pay attention to demos especially in the mountainous areas. When interviewed, some people said raising chicken brought low benefit and disease was easy to happen. (See Figure 11)


Figure 12: Rate of participants at chicken demos training sessions



Like other demos, in chicken training sessions, number of participants was increasingly crowded. This showed that communication among people had great impact on the attendance of people. The learners would tell the other people about what they learnt by which the others would be encouraged to come to training course.


The rate of female participants at training course was much more than male. It accounted for 64% (See Figure 12)

Figure 13: Knowledge of participants regarding objectives of chicken demos



The majority of participants clearly knew that the demos of 30-50 chickens with high ration and appropriate investment would bring benefit at 300.000-800.000 VND after 6 months. Besides, people said demos helped them learn techniques and experience for adoption in their households in an effective manner and low risk (see *Figure 13*).

Figure 14: Rate of participants adopting chicken demos techniques




It was different from pig and cattle demos. The number of people who did not adopt chicken demos techniques was rather large. It accounted for 17.6%. The reason was that demo chickens grew slowly so that people could not revolve their funds quickly. And could not afford enough labour just for raising chicken. However, some farmers already adopted techniques before the ending of demos because according to them, demos provided people with new techniques that could control disease of chicken which were sensitive to disease. None of the participants adopted and modified techniques.

The rate of participants adopting techniques after the ending of demos was rather high. It accounted for 26.95 of which 15.9% said they would adopt and modify because industrial food for chicken was over their household's finance. They would replace with available food such as maize, rice grain, rice, sweet potatoes leaves, and water morning glory

leaves. And also because of this reason, 16% of them said they would adopt whenever they had enough capital to invest on food and veterinary service. (See Figure 14)

Figure 15: Concept of labour in chicken demos



Most of female interviewees answered that raising chickens following demos took them more time than before. Before now, they only let chicken free in the garden and sometimes feed them with redundant vegetables and mash, mostly without care. If the animals died, it was normal thing considered as risk. According to new method, they had to spend more time from incubation, vaccination to buying food and feeding them at least 4 times per day. However, not only because of these difficulties did they refuse to adopt techniques. Although it took them much time, they had healthy chickens and the death rate was low so that they could get high benefit. (See Figure 15)

6 Common Problems Relating to Demos

- Few farmers attended training courses.
- Not only one person in one household attended the training course from the beginning until the end. Learners did not always communicate to other members in their families. So that the techniques were not acknowledged comprehensively
- Training played more emphasis on theory. Especially, many women did not distinguish objective of vaccination and usage of injection needle.
- Materials were still complex and hard for people to understand, especially to ethnic minority farmers.
- Local staff lacked of enthusiasm and did not make people believe in them. For example, the household leader of DEMO (Vo Van Buong, in Hung Long village) went to Phu Nong, Hoa Nhon, and Binh Dinh Province to find skinny cattle and according to farmers these cattle met criteria but the commune vet staff (Nguyen Minh Chung) said that the cattle found by farmer did not meet criteria. Then the para-vet introduced him another two cattle which according to him met criteria. This farmer was very surprised to hear that because he had passed a long road from his village to Binh Dinh Province just try to find a good couple of cattle and so that he decided to find out the real reason for that. He talked with the owner of animals introduced by the para-vet and found that there was a differential price. The fact was that price of 2 cattle introduced by para-vet is VND 1 million higher than the real price of the seller. The higher price would later lower the profit of activity. So people would like Program take consideration to the problem.
- Some people said that techniques introduced in training courses did not change labour in comparison with traditional methods.
- Farmers complained demos rations were over their means. According to many households they could not adopt the ration because they did not have enough money.
- At the time of evaluation, market price for meat was very low. It was difficult for people to sell their animal and get high benefit. This was problem of all farmers. It also brought Agri-Extension staff difficulty when they persuaded people to adopt demos result because people did not see the benefits from activities.

7 Lessons Learnt

1. Organization Method:
 - a. More people around demos place should be propagated and encouraged to participate in demos activities.
 - b. Each household should be encouraged to appoint just one person to attend all training sessions from the beginning until the end to avoid lack of techniques trained.
 - c. Traffic conditions were not easy in mountainous communes so that demos should not be focused in one place. It should be implemented widespread in hamlets.
2. Training method:
 - a. To mountainous communes, training method should be visual.
 - b. Much time should be spent on practice rather than theory.
 - c. Materials written for people should have many illustration pictures that are familiar with their daily lives.
 - d. Trainers should directly help demos households select and buy breeds.
 - e. There should be gender view when working with people.
3. Techniques:
 - a. Guidance on many ways to select animals, can use local available breed.
 - b. Way to estimate animal weight to facilitate the supervision of growth and to avoid price-force down by dealers.
 - c. Introduce farmers many ways to mix food, can use available food in households such as maize, rice grain, cassava, sweet potatoes.
4. Veterinary care: more guidance on methods of controlling disease for and unsafe of vaccine.
5. Market:
 - a. Need to provide more market information through newspapers, television, and pamphlet. etc
 - b. Organize study tours to the following places:
 - Seller of food for animal
 - Seller of breed
 - Buyer of products

Annex 1

Evaluation Forms

Annex 1: Evaluation Forms

Cattle Demos Evaluation Forms

Pilot evaluation of cattle growing demonstration

Structured interview

1. Did you know that there was a cattle growing demonstration conducted in
village by the RUDEP? Yes _{1.1} No _{1.2}

2. (a) -Did you attend any demonstrations?

Yes _{2.1} No _{2.2}

(b)-If yes, how many field days did you attend?_{2.1.1}

What was the demonstration trying to show?

Provide a net profit of VND 400,000 per cattle in 1 to 2 months with low risk. _{3.1}

More rapid production of cattle through the use of a high quality ration. _{3.2}

Other _____ _{3.3}

Other _____ _{3.4}

What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

Nothing _{4.1}

(Why:.....
.....)

Already adopted as demonstrated. _{4.2}

(Why:.....
.....)

Adopt soon as demonstrated. _{4.3}

Already adopted modified version (_____). _{4.4}

Adopt modified version soon (_____). _{4.5}

Other _____ _{4.6}

5. If not adopt,
why.....

....._{5.1}

GAS Questionnaire

6. Objective: Demonstrate cattle growing techniques that reduce labour inputs

What is your perception of the labour required to adopt the demonstrated techniques?		
I think the demonstrated cattle growing techniques and needed very much less labour inputs than traditional methods		6.5
I think the demonstrated cattle growing techniques and needed less labour inputs than traditional methods		6.4
I think the demonstrated cattle growing techniques and needed about the same labour inputs as traditional methods		6.3
I think the cattle growing techniques but it required more labour inputs than traditional methods		6.2
I think the cattle growing techniques but it required much more labour inputs than traditional methods		6.1

Man

Woman

Date:

Pig Demos Evaluation Forms

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstration

Structured interview

1. Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in XXXX village by the QNRDP? Yes _{1.1} No _{1.2}

2. (a) -Did you attend any demonstrations? Yes _{2.1} No _{2.2}

(b)-If yes, how many field days did you attend? _{2.1.1}

3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

Provide a net profit between VND30,000 to VND200,000 per pig in 4 to 5 months with low risk. _{3.1}

Reduced risk due to disease control through vaccination. _{3.2}

More rapid production of leaner pigs through the use of a high quality ration. _{3.3}

Reduced labour input, especially for women. _{3.4}

Other _____ _{3.5}

Other _____ _{3.6}

4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

Nothing _{4.1}

(Why:.....
.....)

Already adopted as demonstrated. _{4.2}

(Why:.....
.....)

Adopt soon as demonstrated. _{4.3}

Already adopted modified version (_____). _{4.4}

Adopt modified version soon (_____). _{4.5}

Other _____ _{4.6}

5.If not adopt, why.....

..... _{5.1}

GAS Questionnaire

6.Objective: Demonstrate pig growing techniques that reduce labour inputs

What is your perception of the labour required to adopt the demonstrated techniques?		
I think the demonstrated pig growing techniques and needed very much less labour inputs than traditional methods		6.5
I think the demonstrated pig growing techniques and needed less labour inputs than traditional methods		6.4
I think the demonstrated pig growing techniques and needed about the same labour inputs as traditional methods		6.3
I think the pig growing techniques but it required more labour inputs than traditional methods		6.2
I think the pig growing techniques but it required much more labour inputs than traditional methods		6.1

Man

Woman

Date:

Chicken Demos Evaluation Forms

Pilot evaluation of chicken growing demonstration

Structured interview

1. Did you know that there was a chicken growing demonstration conducted in village by the RUDEP? Yes _{1.1} No _{1.2}

2. (a) -Did you attend any demonstrations?

Yes _{2.1} No _{2.2}

(b)-If yes, how many field days did you attend?_{2.1.1}

3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

Provide a net profit between VND 300,000-VND 800,000/50 chickens in 6 months with low risk.

_{3.1}

Disease control

_{3.2}

Method of raising is keeping chickens in coops

_{3.3}

More production of chickens through the use of supplemental food

_{3.4}

Other _____

_{3.5}

Other _____

_{3.6}

4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

Nothing

_{4.1}

-(Why:.....)
)

Already adopted as demonstrated.

_{4.2}

-(Why:.....
)

- Adopt soon as demonstrated. 4.3
- Already adopted modified version (_____). 4.4
- Adopt modified version soon (_____). 4.5
- Other _____ 4.6

5. If not adopt, why

.....
 5.1

GAS Questionnaire

Objective: Demonstrate chicken growing techniques that reduce labour inputs

What is your perception of the labour required to adopt the demonstrated techniques?		
I think the demonstrated chicken growing techniques and needed very much less labour inputs than traditional methods		6.5
I think the demonstrated chicken growing techniques and needed less labour inputs than traditional methods		6.4
I think the demonstrated chicken growing techniques and needed about the same labour inputs as traditional methods		6.3
I think the chicken growing techniques but it required more labour inputs than traditional methods		6.2
I think the chicken growing techniques but it required much more labour inputs than traditional methods		6.1

Date:

- Man
- Woman


Annex 2

Evaluation Results of Communes

Annex 2: Evaluation Results of Communes

Chicken Evaluation Results of Communes

* Duc Phong Commune:




Place **Duc Phong Lam Thuong**
 Date **10/12/2003**
 Household: **Võ Thị Hợp**

Household:
Pilot evaluation of Chicken growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Duc Phong by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	9	7	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No			0.0%	0.0%
Total	9	7		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1.1 1 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
2 time	3	3	37.5%	50.0%
3 time	2	3	25.0%	50.0%
4 time	3	0	37.5%	0.0%
Total	8	6		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	0	1	0.0%	5.3%
3.2 Keep in cage	4	3	21.1%	15.8%
3.3 Disease control	4	3	21.1%	15.8%
3.4 Quality ration	4	3	21.1%	15.8%
3.5 Other	6	6	31.6%	31.6%
3.6 Other	1	3	5.3%	15.8%
Total	19	19		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	1	0	5.3%	0.0%
4.3 Will adopt later	4	3	21.1%	15.8%
4.4 Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later	2	4	10.5%	21.1%
4.6 Other	1	0	5.3%	0.0%
Total	8	7		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	3	1	15.8%	5.3%
6.2 More labour	0	5	0.0%	26.3%
6.3 Same labour	3	1	15.8%	5.3%
6.4 Less labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	6	7		




*** Pho Chau Commune**

Place Pho Chau Vinh Tuy
Date 15/10/2003
Household: Nguyen Chin & Truong Minh Tung

Household:
Pilot evaluation of Chicken growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Pho Chau by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	5	0	100.0%	#DIV/0!
1.2 No	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	5	0		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1.1 1 time	1	0	20.0%	#DIV/0!
2 time	4	0	80.0%	#DIV/0!
3 time	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
4 time	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	5	0		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	1	0	7.7%	#DIV/0!
3.2 Keep in cage	5	0	38.5%	#DIV/0!
3.3 Disease control	2	0	15.4%	#DIV/0!
3.4 Quality ration	5	0	38.5%	#DIV/0!
3.5 Other	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
3.6 Other	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	13	0		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
4.2 Already adopted	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
4.3 Will adopt later	3	0	23.1%	#DIV/0!
4.4 Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
4.5 Adopt modified later	2	0	15.4%	#DIV/0!
4.6 Other	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	5	0		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
6.2 More labour	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
6.3 Same labour	0	0	0.0%	#DIV/0!
6.4 Less labour	3	0	23.1%	#DIV/0!
6.5 Much less labour	2	0	15.4%	#DIV/0!
Total	5	0		




* Son Hai Commune

Place Son Hai Go Sim-Ca Ranh
 Date 23/10/2003
 Household: Dinh Van Lenh


1. Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Son Hai by the QNRDP?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1	Yes	4	7	80.0%	87.5%
1.2	No	1	1	20.0%	12.5%
	Total	5	8		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1.1	1 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
	2 time	1	0	33.3%	0.0%
	3 time	2	6	66.7%	85.7%
	4 time	0	1	0.0%	14.3%
	Total	3	7		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1	Net profit	1	2	7.7%	8.3%
3.2	Keep in cage	4	7	30.8%	29.2%
3.3	Disease control	4	7	30.8%	29.2%
3.4	Quality ration	4	7	30.8%	29.2%
3.5	Other 1	0	1	0.0%	4.2%
3.6	Other 2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	13	24		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1	Nothing	2	3	15.4%	12.5%
4.2	Already adopted	0	1	0.0%	4.2%
4.3	Will adopt later	0	2	0.0%	8.3%
4.4	Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.5	Adopt modified later	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.6	Other	2	2	15.4%	8.3%
	Total	4	8		



6. QAS on labour impacts


		Frequency		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1	Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2	More labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.3	Same labour	0	2	0.0%	8.3%
6.4	Less labour	0	1	0.0%	4.2%
6.5	Much less labour	4	4	30.8%	16.7%
	Total	4	7		



Place Son Hai LangRa-Ca Ranh
 Date 23/10/2003
 Household: Dinh Van Phuoc


1. Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Son Hai by the QNRDP?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1	Yes	6	12	75.0%	85.7%
1.2	No	2	2	25.0%	14.3%
	Total	8	14		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1.1	1 time	1	2	16.7%	18.2%
	2 time	5	2	83.3%	18.2%
	3 time	0	5	0.0%	45.5%
	4 time	0	2	0.0%	18.2%
	Total	6	11		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1	Net profit	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3.2	Keep in cage	7	7	35.0%	25.0%
3.3	Disease control	6	9	30.0%	32.1%
3.4	Quality ration	6	9	30.0%	32.1%
3.5	Other	1	3	5.0%	10.7%
3.6	Other	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
	Total	20	28		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1	Nothing	2	8	10.0%	28.6%
4.2	Already adopted	1	0	5.0%	0.0%
4.3	Will adopt later	1	3	5.0%	10.7%
4.4	Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.5	Adopt modified later	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.6	Other	3	2	15.0%	7.1%
	Total	7	13		



6. GAS on labour impacts

		Frequency		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1	Much more labour	2	1	10.0%	3.6%
6.2	More labour	0	1	0.0%	3.6%
6.3	Same labour	0	1	0.0%	3.6%
6.4	Less labour	3	1	15.0%	3.6%
6.5	Much less labour	2	5	10.0%	17.9%
	Total	7	9		




* Nghia Tho Commune

Place Hamlet 1, Nghia Tho Commune
Date 16/11/2003
House Phạm Hùng
Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Pho Chau by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	9	2	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	9	2		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1,1 1 time	2	2	22.2%	100.0%
2 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3 time	7	0	77.8%	0.0%
4 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	9	2		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	2	2	7.1%	20.0%
3.2 Keep in cage	7	2	25.0%	20.0%
3.3 Disease control	5	2	17.9%	20.0%
3.4 Quality ration	9	2	32.1%	20.0%
3.5 Other	5	2	17.9%	20.0%
3.6 Other	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	28	10		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	2	0	7.1%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.3 Will adopt later	6	0	21.4%	0.0%
4.4 Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later	1	0	3.6%	0.0%
4.6 Not sure	0	2	0.0%	20.0%
Total	9	2		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	0	2	0.0%	20.0%
6.3 Same labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	2	0	7.1%	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour	7	0	25.0%	0.0%
Total	9	2		




Place Cay Gia, Nuoc Ngon, Ta Men hamlet, Nghia Tho Commune
Date 16/11/2003
Household: Pham Binh
Entered by: Duc

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1 Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Pho Chau by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	8	4	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	4	0	300.0%	#DIV/0!
Total	12	4		




2 Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1 1 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
2 time	5	4	62.5%	100.0%
3 time	2	0	25.0%	0.0%
4 time	1	0	12.5%	0.0%
Total	8	4		




3 What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	8	4	21.1%	25.0%
3.2 Keep in cage	8	4	21.1%	25.0%
3.3 Disease control	7	4	18.4%	25.0%
3.4 Quality ration	8	4	21.1%	25.0%
3.5 Other	7	0	18.4%	0.0%
3.6 Other	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	38	16		




4 What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	1	3	2.6%	18.8%
4.3 Will adopt later	4	1	10.5%	6.3%
4.4 Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.6 Other	3	0	7.9%	0.0%
Total	8	4		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	1	0	2.6%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	3	0	7.9%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour	1	0	2.6%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	0	1	0.0%	6.3%
6.5 Much less labour	3	1	7.9%	6.3%
Total	8	2		




* Tinh Tho Commune

Place Tinh Tho Commune
Date 21/12/2003
Household: Pham Thi Hanh and Nguyễn Hùng
Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Chicken growing demonstration conducted in Pho Chau by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	3	34	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	0	0	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	3	34		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1,1 1 time	0	4	0.0%	11.4%
2 time	0	1	0.0%	2.9%
3 time	0	7	0.0%	20.0%
4 time	3	23	100.0%	65.7%
Total	3	35		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	3	29	21.4%	18.2%
3.2 Keep in cage	3	34	21.4%	21.4%
3.3 Disease control	2	26	14.3%	16.4%
3.4 Quality ration	3	34	21.4%	21.4%
3.5 Other	2	29	14.3%	18.2%
3.6 Other	1	7	7.1%	4.4%
Total	14	159		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	3	8	21.4%	5.0%
4.3 Will adopt later	0	18	0.0%	11.3%
4.4 Adopted modified	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later	0	2	0.0%	1.3%
4.6 Not sure	0	7	0.0%	4.4%
Total	3	35		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	2	17	14.3%	10.7%
6.3 Same labour	0	2	0.0%	1.3%
6.4 Less labour	0	7	0.0%	4.4%
6.5 Much less labour	1	9	7.1%	5.7%
Total	3	35		



Pig evaluation results of communes


* Hanh Phuoc Commune

Place Hanh Phuoc - Thuan Hoa
 Date 12/10/2003
 Household Tran Ngoc Tan

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in Hanh Phuoc by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	10	13	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No			0.0%	0.0%
Total	10	13		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1,1 1 time			0.0%	0.0%
2 time	1		10.0%	0.0%
3 time	9	3	0.0%	23.1%
4 time		10	90.0%	76.9%
Total	10	13		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	4	3	12.1%	7.7%
3.2 Disease control	10	10	30.3%	25.6%
3.3 Quality ration	10	12	30.3%	30.8%
3.4 Reduced labour	5	12	15.2%	30.8%
3.5 Other 1	4	2	12.1%	5.1%
3.6 Other 2			0.0%	0.0%
Total	33	39		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing			0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted		3	0.0%	7.7%
4.3 Will adopt later	4	5	12.1%	12.8%
4.4 Adopted modified		5	0.0%	12.8%
4.5 Adopt modified later	6		18.2%	0.0%
4.6 Other			0.0%	0.0%
Total	10	13		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour		0	0.0%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	5	1	15.2%	2.6%
6.5 Much less labour	5	12	15.2%	30.8%
Total	10	13		




* Nghia Tho Commune

Place Nghia Tho
 Date 19/10/2003

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in Nghia Tho by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	14	8	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	14	8		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1 1 time	1	0	9.1%	0.0%
2 time	8	5	72.7%	62.5%
3 time	2	3	18.2%	37.5%
4 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	11	8		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	1	0	6.3%	0.0%
3.2 Disease control	1	4	6.3%	33.3%
3.3 Quality ration	14	8	87.5%	66.7%
3.4 Reduced labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3.5 Other 1	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3.6 Other 2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	16	12		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	1	0	6.3%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	2	5	12.5%	41.7%
4.3 Will adopt later	9	2	56.3%	16.7%
4.4 Adopted modified	1	1	6.3%	8.3%
4.5 Adopt modified later	1	0	6.3%	0.0%
4.6 Other	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	14	8		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	4	2	28.6%	25.0%
6.3 Same labour	7	6	50.0%	75.0%
6.4 Less labour	3	0	21.4%	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	14	8		




* Pho Chau Commune

Place Pho Chau - Chau Me
Date 15/10/2003
Household
Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in Pho Chau by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes		9	#DIV/0!	100.0%
1.2 No		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
Total	0	9		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2,1,1 1 time		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
2 time		2	#DIV/0!	22.2%
3 time		1	#DIV/0!	11.1%
4 time		6	#DIV/0!	66.7%
Total	0	9		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit		6	#DIV/0!	15.8%
3.2 Disease control		8	#DIV/0!	21.1%
3.3 Quality ration		9	#DIV/0!	23.7%
3.4 Reduced labour		8	#DIV/0!	21.1%
3.5 Other 1		7	#DIV/0!	18.4%
3.6 Other 2		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
Total	0	38		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing		1	#DIV/0!	2.6%
4.2 Already adopted		3	#DIV/0!	7.9%
4.3 Will adopt later		4	#DIV/0!	10.5%
4.4 Adopted modified		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later		1	#DIV/0!	2.6%
4.6 Other		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
Total	0	9		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
6.2 More labour		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
6.3 Same labour		1	#DIV/0!	2.6%
6.4 Less labour		0	#DIV/0!	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour		8	#DIV/0!	21.1%
Total	0	9		




* Son Hai Commune

Place Son Hai
 Date 28/08/2003
 Household Dinh Thi Tam

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in Son Hai by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	4	8	66.7%	88.9%
1.2 No	2	1	33.3%	11.1%
Total	6	9		




2. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1 Net profit	1	1	12.5%	9.1%
2.2 Disease control	2	1	25.0%	0.0%
2.3 Quality ration	1	1	12.5%	9.1%
2.4 Reduced labour	1	1	12.5%	9.1%
2.5 Other 1	2	2	25.0%	18.2%
2.6 Other 2	1	6	12.5%	54.5%
Total	8	11		




3. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Nothing	1	3	0.0%	27.3%
3.2 Already adopted	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3.3 Will adopt later	3	3	37.5%	27.3%
3.4 Adopted modified	1	1	12.5%	0.0%
3.5 Adopt modified later	1	1	0.0%	9.1%
3.6 Other	1	1	0.0%	9.1%
Total	4	8		



4. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.2 More labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.3 Same labour	1	0	12.5%	0.0%
4.4 Less labour	1	2	12.5%	18.2%
4.5 Much less labour	3	4	37.5%	36.4%
Total	5	6		




*** Tinh Tho Commune**


Place Tinh Tho - Tho Trung
Date 04/10/2003
Household Ly Thi Nhan

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in Tinh Tho by the QNRDP?				
	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	2	5	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No			0.0%	0.0%
Total	2	5		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?				
	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1,1 1 time		1	0.0%	20.0%
2 time	1		50.0%	0.0%
3 time	1	1	50.0%	20.0%
4 time		3	0.0%	60.0%
Total	2	5		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?				
	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	2	2	22.2%	15.4%
3.2 Disease control	2	2	22.2%	15.4%
3.3 Quality ration	2	2	22.2%	15.4%
3.4 Reduced labour	2	3	22.2%	23.1%
3.5 Other 1	1	4	11.1%	30.8%
3.6 Other 2			0.0%	0.0%
Total	9	13		



4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?				
	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing			0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	2	2	22.2%	15.4%
4.3 Will adopt later	1	4	11.1%	30.8%
4.4 Adopted modified	1		11.1%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later			0.0%	0.0%
4.6 Other			0.0%	0.0%
Total	4	6		




6. GAS on labour impacts				
	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	1		11.1%	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour	1	5	11.1%	38.5%
Total	2	5		




Place **Tinh Tho - Tho Bac**
 Date **04/10/2003**
 Household **Do Ngoc Vinh**

Pilot evaluation of pig growing demonstrations


1 Did you know that there was a pig growing demonstration conducted in Tinh Tho by the QNRDP?					
	Number		%		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
1.1	Yes	4	3	100.0%	100.0%
1.2	No			0.0%	0.0%
	Total	4	3		




2 Did you attend any demonstrations?					
	Number		%		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
2.1	1 time		1	0.0%	33.3%
	2 time	1	2	25.0%	66.7%
	3 time	3		75.0%	0.0%
	4 time				
	Total	4	3		



3 What was the demonstration trying to show?					
	Number		%		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
3.1	Net profit	4		22.2%	0.0%
3.2	Disease control	4		22.2%	0.0%
3.3	Quality ration	4		22.2%	0.0%
3.4	Reduced labour	4		22.2%	0.0%
3.5	Other 1	2	3	11.1%	75.0%
3.6	Other 2		1	0.0%	25.0%
	Total	18	4		



4 What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?					
	Number		%		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
4.1	Nothing			0.0%	0.0%
4.2	Already adopted	1		5.6%	0.0%
4.3	Will adopt later	3	3	16.7%	75.0%
4.4	Adopted modified			0.0%	0.0%
4.5	Adopt modified later			0.0%	0.0%
4.6	Other	1		5.6%	0.0%
	Total	5	3		



5 GAS on labour impacts					
	Frequency		%		
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
6.1	Much more labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.2	More labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.3	Same labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.4	Less labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.5	Much less labour	4	3	22.2%	75.0%
	Total	4	3		



Cattle evaluation results of communes


* Duc Phong Commune

Place: **Chau Me, Duc Phong**
 Date: **08/11/2003**

Pilot evaluation of Cattle growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Cattle growing demonstration conducted in Hinh Phuoc by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	7	3	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	3		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1 1 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
2 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3 time	0	2	0.0%	100.0%
4 time	7	0	100.0%	0.0%
6 time			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	7	2		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	7	3	36.8%	33.3%
3.2 Quality ration	6	3	31.6%	33.3%
3.3 Other 1	6	3	31.6%	33.3%
3.4 Other 2	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	19	9		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.3 Will adopt later	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.4 Adopted modified	3	1	15.8%	11.1%
4.5 Adopt modified later	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.6 Other	2	2	10.5%	22.2%
Total	5	3		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	4	0	21.1%	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour	3	3	15.8%	33.3%
Total	7	3		
Not sure	0	0		




* Hanh Phuoc Commune

Place Hanh Phuoc - Hoa Son
Date 10/10/2003
Household Truong Van Ngoc

Pilot evaluation of Cattle growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Cattle growing demonstration conducted in Hanh Phuoc by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	7	10	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	10		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2,1,1 1 time		2	0.0%	20.0%
2 time			0.0%	0.0%
3 time		4	0.0%	40.0%
4 time	2	4	100.0%	40.0%
6 time	5		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
Total	2	10		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	7	3	30.4%	13.6%
3.2 Quality ration	7	10	30.4%	45.5%
3.3 Other 1	7	9	30.4%	40.9%
3.4 Other 2	2		8.7%	0.0%
Total	23	22	0.0%	0.0%




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing			0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted	2	1	8.7%	4.5%
4.3 Will adopt later	3	9	13.0%	40.9%
4.4 Adopted modified	2		8.7%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later			0.0%	0.0%
4.6 Other			0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	10		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	3	5	13.0%	22.7%
6.5 Much less labour	4	5	17.4%	22.7%
Total	7	10		




* Nghia Tho Commune

Place Nghia Tho
 Date 11/10/2003
 Household

Pilot evaluation of Cattle growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Cattle growing demonstration conducted in Nghia Tho by the QNRDP?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1	Yes	18	3	100.0%	100.0%
1.2	No	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total		18	3		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1.1	1 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
	2 time	1	0	5.6%	0.0%
	3 time	0	1	0.0%	33.3%
	4 time	17	2	94.4%	66.7%
Total		18	3		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1	Net profit	3	1	6.6%	20.0%
3.2	Quality ration	17	2	48.6%	40.0%
3.3	Other 1	14	2	40.0%	40.0%
3.4	Other 2	1	0	2.9%	0.0%
Total		35	5		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1	Nothing	0	1	0.0%	20.0%
4.2	Already adopted	4	0	11.4%	0.0%
4.3	Will adopt later	10	2	28.6%	40.0%
4.4	Adopted modified	3	0	8.6%	0.0%
4.5	Adopt modified later	1	0	2.9%	0.0%
4.6	Other	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total		18	3		



6. GAS on labour impacts

		Frequency		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1	Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2	More labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.3	Same labour	1	1	2.9%	20.0%
6.4	Less labour	9	0	25.7%	0.0%
6.5	Much less labour	8	2	22.9%	40.0%
Total		18	3		




* Pho Chau Commune

Place **Pho Chau - Hung Long**
 Date **15/10/2003**
 Household **Vo Van Buong**

Pilot evaluation of Cattle growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Cattle growing demonstration conducted in Pho Chau by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	7	4	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	4		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1,1 1 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
2 time	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3 time	3	1	0.0%	25.0%
4 time	7	3	100.0%	75.0%
Total	7	4		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
3.2 Quality ration	1	2	9.1%	33.3%
3.3 Other 1	7	4	63.6%	66.7%
3.4 Other 2	3	0	27.3%	0.0%
Total	11	6		




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing	0	1	0.0%	16.7%
4.2 Already adopted	2	0	18.2%	0.0%
4.3 Will adopt later	5	2	45.5%	33.3%
4.4 Adopted modified	1	0	9.1%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
4.6 Other	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	4		



6. GAS on labour impacts

	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	7	4	63.6%	66.7%
6.5 Much less labour	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	4		
Not sure	0	0		




* Tinh Tho Commune

Place Tinh Tho - Tho Bac
 Date 05/10/2003
 Household Pham van Linh

Pilot evaluation of Cattle growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Cattle growing demonstration conducted in Tinh Tho by the QNRDP?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1 Yes	7	11	100.0%	100.0%
1.2 No			0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	11		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1.1 1 time	1	2	14.3%	18.2%
2 time	1	3	14.3%	27.3%
3 time	4	6	57.1%	54.5%
Total	7	11		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1 Net profit	7	11	43.8%	25.6%
3.2 Quality ration	7	11	43.8%	25.6%
3.3 Other 1	2	11	12.5%	25.6%
3.4 Other 2		10	0.0%	23.3%
Total	16	43	0.0%	0.0%




4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?

	Number		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1 Nothing			0.0%	0.0%
4.2 Already adopted		3	0.0%	7.0%
4.3 Will adopt later	7	11	43.8%	25.6%
4.4 Adopted modified			0.0%	0.0%
4.5 Adopt modified later			0.0%	0.0%
4.6 Other			0.0%	0.0%
Total	7	14		



6. GAS on labour impacts


	Frequency		%	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1 Much more labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.2 More labour	1		6.3%	0.0%
6.3 Same labour	2		12.5%	0.0%
6.4 Less labour	2		12.5%	0.0%
6.5 Much less labour	2	11	12.5%	25.6%
Total	7	11		
Not sure	1	3		




Place Tinh Tho - Tho Nam
Date 05/10/2003
Household Do Minh To

Pilot evaluation of Cattle growing demonstrations


1. Did you know that there was a Cattle growing demonstration conducted in Tinh Tho by the QNRDP?					
		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
1.1	Yes	9	11	100.0%	100.0%
1.2	No			0.0%	0.0%
Total		9	11		




2. Did you attend any demonstrations?					
		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
2.1	1 time		1	0.0%	9.1%
	2 time	2	2	22.2%	18.2%
	3 time	3	3	33.3%	27.3%
	4 time	4	5	44.4%	45.5%
Total		9	11		




3. What was the demonstration trying to show?					
		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
3.1	Net profit	6	11	28.6%	28.9%
3.2	Quality ration	9	11	42.9%	28.9%
3.3	Other 1	6	11	28.6%	28.9%
3.4	Other 2		5	0.0%	13.2%
Total		21	38		



4. What do you plan to do in response to the demonstration?					
		Number		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
4.1	Nothing			0.0%	0.0%
4.2	Already adopted			0.0%	0.0%
4.3	Will adopt later	5	10	23.8%	26.3%
4.4	Adopted modified		1	0.0%	2.6%
4.5	Adopt modified later	4		19.0%	0.0%
4.6	Other			0.0%	0.0%
Total		9	11		



6. GAS on labour impacts					
		Frequency		%	
		Men	Women	Men	Women
6.1	Much more labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.2	More labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.3	Same labour			0.0%	0.0%
6.4	Less labour	1	11	4.8%	28.9%
6.5	Much less labour	8		38.1%	0.0%
Total		9	11		



Limitations

URS Australia Pty Ltd (URS) has prepared this report in accordance with the usual care and thoroughness of the consulting profession for the use of the AusAID Quang Ngai Rural Development Program and only those third parties who have been authorised in writing by URS to rely on the report. It is based on generally accepted practices and standards at the time it was prepared. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made as to the professional advice included in this report. It is prepared in accordance with the scope of work and for the purpose outlined in the Program Design Document.

The methodology adopted and sources of information used by URS are outlined in this report. URS has made no independent verification of this information beyond the agreed scope of works and URS assumes no responsibility for any inaccuracies or omissions. No indications were found during our investigations that information contained in this report as provided to URS was false.

This report was prepared during **March 2003** and is based on the conditions encountered and information reviewed at the time of preparation. URS disclaims responsibility for any changes that may have occurred after this time.

This report should be read in full. No responsibility is accepted for use of any part of this report in any other context or for any other purpose or by third parties. This report does not purport to give legal advice. Legal advice can only be given by qualified legal practitioners.