

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO. 615-11-110-158.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: July 1, 1972 TO Sept. 25, '72	3. COUNTRY Kenya	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 73-2 4p.
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	---------------------	-------------------------------

5. PROJECT TITLE

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI VETERINARY FACULTY

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY <u>72</u> Ends FY <u>78</u>	7. DATE LATEST PROP Dec. 23, 1970	8. DATE LATEST PIP -	9. DATE PRIOR PAR -
-----------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 295,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 372,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ 1,658,000
------------------	----------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME Colorado State University	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. AID/Afr-790
--------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID/W	HOST		
X			Revise the PROP to tighten up statements of Programming Goal, Project Purpose, Outputs and Inputs, and to explain the need for rescheduling of contract team phase-out and the need for an expanded commodity element.	January 31, 1973
X		X	Final version of contractor work plan	October 31, 1972.
		X	Commitment to a definite staff development plan coordinated with phase-out of contract team.	November 30, 1972.

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES	REVISOR OR NEW: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PROP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> PRO AG <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW September 25, 1972
------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Alex Dickie <i>Alex Dickie</i>	MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Clinton L. Doggett <i>Clinton L. Doggett</i> Acting Director
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS**

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X)				
	UNSATISFACTORY		SATISFACTORY			OUT-STANDING		LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
1. Colorado State University			X									X
2.												
3.												

Comment on key factors determining rating

Qualified personnel were recruited and placed by the contractor in a timely fashion as required.

A workplan covering contractor actions was required within 90 days of signing of the contract. The contractor so far is over 9 months delinquent in presenting a final, acceptable workplan.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
		X										X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Qualified candidates for participant training have not been nominated by the University in a timely fashion.

5. COMMODITIES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
			X							X		

Comment on key factors determining rating

Commodity requirements have not been determined far enough in advance by the contract team to allow timely procurement. Funds obligated under waiver at the end of FY 1971 lapsed before sub-obligating documents were prepared.

6. COOPERATING COUNTRY	a. PERSONNEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
	b. OTHER		X								X		X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Regarding personnel, the host institution has not shown a sufficiently strong commitment to date in terms of making available qualified candidates to be trained as replacements for contract team members.

7. OTHER DONORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
					X						X	

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

AID 1020-25 (10-70) PAGE 4 PAR	PROJECT NO. 615-11-110-158	PAR FOR PERIOD: July 1, '71-Sept. 25, '72	COUNTRY Kenya	PAR SERIAL NO. 73-2
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------

**IV. PROJECT PURPOSE**

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged. 2. Same as in PROP?  YES  NO

To assist the University of Nairobi in the further development of its Veterinary Faculty with particular emphasis in clinical studies and improvement of programs in post graduate training and research.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
<p>Twelve US-trained faculty members.</p> <p>Adequate reference library</p> <p>Adequate laboratory facilities.</p> <p>Improved courses of instruction in clinical medicine, parasitology, pharmacology, and microbiology.</p> <p>Emphasis on practical experience in clinical medicine instruction.</p>	<p>Slow progress due to problems in selecting qualified participant candidates.</p> <p>Little real progress aside from acquisition of several basic slide sets and selected periodicals. Action needed.</p> <p>Many basic laboratory devices and supplies available, but not yet sufficient to support high-quality research.</p> <p>Improved course syllabi prepared and adopted. Courses being continuously improved by CSU team members and counterparts.</p> <p>Herd health program instituted which allows students to acquire practical experience in both preventative and curative veterinary medicine.</p>

**V. PROGRAMMING GOAL**

A. Statement of Programming Goal  
To help fill high-level veterinary teaching and research requirements of English-speaking countries in East and Southern Africa.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.  
Yes. Improving the quality of instruction at the University of Nairobi veterinary faculty will allow the training of fully-qualified veterinarians at an East African institution rather than at foreign institutions. The veterinarians graduated after 1977 should have a better balanced grounding in major sub-specialties, be better equipped to conduct practical, problem solving research, and be better trained in practical application than at present.

AID 1020-25(110-70)	PROJECT NO. 615-11-110-158	PAR FOR PERIOD: July, 1971-Sept. 25, '72	COUNTRY Kenya	PAR SERIAL NO. 73-2
---------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

Other donors provide faculty members on the same basis as USAID. Cooperation among the U.S. and other donor personnel has been excellent. No problems require action.

### III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CU- LU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 73		74	75	END OF PROJECT
			TO DATE	TO END	FY	FY	
Trained veterinarians graduated (cumulative)	PLANNED	NA	47	106	161	225	304
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	NA	47				
	REPLANNED						
Participants sent to begin graduate training at American Universities.	PLANNED	NA	2	3	3	4	12
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	NA	1				
	REPLANNED			3	5	4	12
Research projects organized and initiated (cumulative).	PLANNED	NA	5	8	11	14	16
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	NA	3				
	REPLANNED						
Qualified Kenyan Instructors on the Faculty (cumulative).	PLANNED	NA	24	25	28	31	38
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	NA	23				
	REPLANNED						
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		COMMENT:					
1.							
2.		COMMENT:					
3.		COMMENT:					