

**AIRGRAM**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

CLASSIFICATION

For each address check one ACTION | INFO

6180617 (6)

*W*

PD-AAA-842-c1

DATE REC'D.

DISTRIBUTION

ACTION

INFO

TO

AID/W TOAID A-53

x

DAR ES SALAAM USAID 27 PM 2 57x

KAMPALA USAID A-9

x

AND  
C & A - BR

FROM

Nairobi

DATE SENT

1-23-70

3p.

SUBJECT

Project Appraisal Report (PAR) for Teacher Education  
in East Africa ; Project Number 618-11-650-617

REFERENCE

FROM EAORA

The three East African country USAIDs generally concur in the substance of the subject PAR proposed by EAORA. EAORA in the final version has made every effort to include as many of the comments and changes suggested by the individual USAIDs as possible without changing the PAR's basic structure. Most USAID comments and criticisms not incorporated in the final version were considered by EAORA to be relevant either for the PROP or for the final TEEA PAR. Several comments also apparently reflected a slightly different interpretation than EAORA's of the meaning of a PAR statement. An illustration of this situation involves PAR page 7A first paragraph which states:

"Implementation in the field deteriorated during the same period because of a shortage of staff in the Chief of Party's office. Field visits were almost completely curtailed. The situation was particularly bad in Kenya and Tanzania because the Country Chairman concept was not working well. The responsibilities of the Country Chairman were not well defined, and many tutors did not even know their Chairman's name. It was also found that Country Chairmen working in their spare time could not provide adequate administrative support to the tutors."

PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES

DRAFTED BY TGMcDonough:cjn	OFFICE EAORA	PHONE NO. 260	DATE 1/22/70	APPROVED BY: James W. Howe, Director
-------------------------------	-----------------	------------------	-----------------	---

ALL AND OTHER CLEARANCES  
EAORA:JGroene

**UNCLASSIFIED**

CLASSIFICATION

(Do not type below this line)

PRINTED 6:00

The USAID/Tanzania comment directed to this paragraph is as follows:

"Tanzania has had and continued to have a country chairman. Dr. Donald Martin was replaced as chairman in September 1969 by Dudley Sims. The country chairman concept did work well except that the contractor had not joined with the AID staff to work out agreed responsibilities nor had they arranged for sufficient time to carry out responsibilities. Dr. Martin worked closely with the CEA in Tanzania and made a significant contribution. This was accomplished by tacit agreement and was apparently not recognized by the contractor since he has not formalized the country chairman's position by a description of duties."

EAORA concluded that the point of these two statements was essentially the same, i.e. the role of the country chairman was not well defined.

The only other substantive USAID comments faulted the PAR for not giving full play to the Harris and Holmes findings. EAORA's reaction to this criticism is contained in the following quote from a letter responding to this point:

"In writing the PAR we followed AID/W directions to retain a distinction between the TEEA PAR and the Harris/Holmes Report (STATE 103720). Specifically AID/W instructed us that Harris and Holmes were not to prepare data for a PAR. With this as a mandate we made a special effort to avoid having our PAR simply reflect the Harris/Holmes Report. In fact circumstances dictated that the Harris/Holmes Report would augment and expand on the PAR. As you know, the draft PAR was completed before Harris and Holmes reached East Africa. When they did arrive, one of the first documents they read was the draft PAR. After reading it they stated that they thought the PAR evaluation was a good one and also that they would use many of the ideas and conclusions contained in it.

Thus we have a situation in which the PAR is included in the Report but the Report is not included in the PAR. This is the way AID/W presumably wanted it to be. I'm inclined to agree. The PAR and the Report serve different purposes and represent different viewpoints. The value of each is enhanced by the other as a separate document and the usefulness of each is not lessened simply because

Nairobi

TOAID A-53

UNCLASSIFIED

3

3

they stand alone. As long as the PAR acknowledges the Report and its recommendations and our airgram response to the Report, I don't see why the PAR should be restructured to include an analysis of the Report."

Thus while the PAR is generally acceptable to all three USAID Missions it is understood that none of the Missions would have written it exactly as it now stands.

MCILVAINE

UNCLASSIFIED