

I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1. PROJECT TITLE: **RURAL DEVELOPMENT - VIHIGA**

APPENDIX ATTACHED
 YES NO

2. PROJECT NO. (M.O. 1025.2): **615-11-810-147**

3. RECIPIENT (specify):
 COUNTRY: **KENYA**
 REGIONAL INTERREGIONAL

4. LIFE OF PROJECT
 BEGINS FY: **1971**
 ENDS FY: **1976**

5. SUBMISSION
 ORIGINAL
 REV. NO. **3 1/30/73**
 Supplement **DATE**
 CONTR./PASA NO.

II. FUNDING (\$000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

A. FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR	B. TOTAL \$	C. PERSONNEL		D. PARTICIPANTS		E. COMMODITIES \$	F. OTHER COSTS \$	G. PASA/CONTR.		H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATE: \$ US (U.S. OWNED)		
		(1) \$	(2) MM	(1) \$	(2) MM			(1) \$	(2) MM	(1) U.S. GRANT LOAN	(2) COOP COUNTRY	
											(A) JOINT	(B) BUDGET
1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY	469	20	6	0	0	56	132	251	20			91
2. OPEN FY 73	447	43	12	0	0	6	183	215	54			83
3. BUDGET FY 74	522	51	12	6	4	0	109	273	60			97
4. BUDGET +1 FY 75	404	35	12	0	0	0	166	203	60			75
5. BUDGET +2 FY 76	319	40	12	6	4	0	169	109	60			77
6. BUDGET +3 FY												
7. ALL SUBQ. FY												
8. GRAND TOTAL	2,163	169		12	8	62	845	1,060	254			421

9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

(A) NAME OF DONOR: UNICEF, FAO, IDA, SIDA	(B) KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES: technical advisors plus commodity equipment and local currency support for VIHIGA sub-projects	(C) AMOUNT: \$1,859,000
--	---	--------------------------------

III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

1. DRAFTER: <i>Clinton L. Doygett</i>	TITLE: Vihiga Project Officer	DATE: 1/30/72
2. CLEARANCE OFFICER: <i>[Signature]</i>	TITLE: Acting Director	DATE: 1/30/73

IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

*see Rev 5 app 6 3/1/75
ZAF*

2. CLEARANCES

BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE	BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE

3. APPROVAL AAS OR OFFICE DIRECTORS SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____	4. APPROVAL A/AID (See M.O. 1025.1 VI C) SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____
TITLE: _____	ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) 5 DATE 1/30/73
 ORIGINAL REVISIONPAGE 2 of 104 PAGESTABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Face Sheet	1
I. Introduction	4
II. Rationale	6
A. Why Rural Development	6
B. Why Vihiga	7
III. Dialogue	10
A. Scope	10
B. Sector Relationships	11
C. Logical Framework	12
D. AID Role	14
E. Sub-Projects	15
F. Evaluation	17
G. Local Currency	17
H. Technical Assistance	18
I. Contract Costs	18
J. Participant Training	18
K. Relation to Other AID Activities	19
L. Future Implications	19
IV. US Inputs	21
A. FAMU Contract	21
B. Other Technicians	21
C. Participants	25
D. Commodities	26
E. Other Costs	26
V. Vihiga Matrix	29
VI. Vihiga Logical Framework	30
A. Project Goal	30
B. Project Purpose	30
C. Project Outputs	33
D. Project Inputs	33
VII. Course of Action	40
VIII. Sub-Projects	48
A. <u>US Supported</u>	
Maize Credit	48
Cattle Dips	53

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	Supplement to (Number) 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 3 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------------	---------------------

Table of Contents (Cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
Vegetables	56
Tea	59
Extension	62
Rural Industries	64
Village Polytechnics	67
Roads	70
Rural Health	
B. Other	
Family Planning	73
Stockist Inputs Credit (FAO)	76
Fertilizer Demonstrations (FAO)	78
Grade Cattle (IDA)	80
Artificial Insemination (SIDA)	82
Land Adjudication	84
Piggy Bank	85
Cooperatives	87
Rural Water (SIDA)	89
Environmental Water (UNICEF)	91
Community Development	93
Social Services Training	95
Adult Literacy	97
Women's Group Activities	99
Day Care Centers	101
Rural Electrification	103
Telephones	104

Tables

1	Budget for Vihiga SRDP Pilot Area, FY 1971 - FY 1976	22
2	US Costs for the Vihiga Project (Project No. 147)	23
3	FAKU Contract Expenditures and Obligations, FY 1972 - FY 1976	24
4	Output Indicators: Production and Administration	34

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number)		DATE	PAGE <u>4</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	1/30/73	

I. Introduction

1. This supplement to PROP Revision No.3 is intended primarily to be responsive to AID/Washington comments, It is an effort to be informative rather than to follow a format.
2. The main things requested by AID/W are the following:
 - a. More emphasis on the Vihiga aspects of the program.
 - b. A Vihiga Matrix and Logical Framework focussed directly on Vihiga inputs, outputs, and purpose rather than on the Kenyan Special Rural Development Program (SRDP) as a whole.
 - c. A more detailed analysis of past and future US inputs.
3. Most readers regarded the Rationale Section to be the most informative part of Revision No.3. Therefore it has been moved up to Part II of the present supplement. Also more emphasis has been placed on the Vihiga aspects of program rationale.
4. In Part III a dialogue technique is introduced in an effort to enhance communications. A number of fundamental questions were raised by AID/W with reference to PROP Revision No.3. USAID has sought to provide direct answers to all of them in order to eliminate misunderstandings and confusion and thus to set the stage of the specifics presented in this supplement.
5. In view of the special interest in US inputs, a separate section is devoted to this subject early in the paper (Part IV).
6. In the Vihiga Matrix and Logical Framework (Parts V and VI), purpose and outputs are, as requested, reduced to a lower order of generality so that they reflect exclusively the activity taking place in the Vihiga pilot areas. Thus, End of Project Status is described in terms of discrete sub-projects completed and replicated, physical development of Vihiga, and organizational achievements at the Vihiga Division level only. At this level of generality, physical projects and physical results are of substantial importance as they constitute the main action. However, the Goal of "a broad national capability" remains the same as in the main body of PROP Revision No.3. The Vihiga sub-program achieves its viability in combination with the other seven parts of the Special Rural Development Program, i.e. the other five pilot areas plus District-level activities and Nairobi-level support activities.
7. The Course of Action section (Part VII) traces past and future actions relating to the Vihiga sub-program as a whole from the preparation of the initial Vihiga SRDP Outline Plan in January 1970 to the final audits, evaluations, and reimbursement actions in June 1976.
8. Part VIII presents for each experimented Vihiga sub-project a statement of purpose, a general description, an evaluation of progress to date, a listing of indicators for future evaluations, budget calculations, and the proposed course of action through June 1976. An effort is made to show how each of the sub-projects relates to the Vihiga purpose and to the national goal. Special attention is devoted to the role of US inputs.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	Supplement to (Number) 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 5 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------	---------------------

9. In this present supplementary paper to Revision No.3, USAID is requesting FY 1973 funding approval in the amount of \$447,000 and approval in principle for continuing support of the Vihiga project through its terminal date of June 30, 1976 at an estimated additional cost of \$1,252,000 for the period from FY 1974 through FY 1976. Revision No.3 remains valid as an expression of our long range thinking regarding U.S. assistance to overall Kenyan rural development, but substantive approval is requested only for the discrete Vihiga project as amplified herein.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number) <u>3</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>6</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	-----------------------------------

II. Rationale

A. Why Rural Development

1. Priority Accorded by GOX

Support for Kenyan efforts in the Rural Development sector was selected over possible alternative uses of limited U.S. personnel and funds in Kenya because the Kenyans have given this sector top priority in their 1970-74 and 1974-78 Plans and because USAID believes that the Kenyan strategy is one that can be effectively assisted by U.S. personnel and experience. Rural development is regarded by the Kenyans as the basic strategy for national development. Sectoral chapters in the 1974-78 Plan will all be keyed to the basic Rural Development chapter.

The Kenyan emphasis on Rural Development stems from concern regarding the economic, political, and social problems that have arisen as a result of the drift toward urban areas. While it is recognized that this tendency cannot be reversed and that certain direct actions must be taken in the cities, the Plans nevertheless seek in every way possible to make the rural areas more attractive through efforts to increase employment and income and to improve social services and physical surroundings.

2. Approach to Smallholder Problems

The smallholder subsistence farmer presents a particular economic and social problem, because of his large numbers, his low income, and his increasing awareness that others enjoy a better life. Thus Kenyan policy seeks ways of bringing these people into the modern cash economy so that they will not require social subsidies and will be active stimulants to economic growth in their communities. The Kenyan objective is nothing less than "the social and economic transformation of all of the people," as measured primarily in terms of income, employment, general well-being, and equitable distribution.

3. Combined Area/Functional Strategy

The GOX strategy for achieving accelerated rural development seeks to combine mutually reinforcing functional and area-based approaches in an effort to achieve both efficient utilization of inputs and equitable distribution of outputs.

The policy in the traditional functional/technical sectors - such as agriculture, health and education - is to achieve the fastest possible quantitative and qualitative improvements by giving priority to the rural areas in all decisions relating to allocations of funds, personnel, and other development resources. Planners and administrators are instructed to "direct an increasing share of the total resources available to the nation towards the rural areas."

Area-based approaches to accelerated rural development in Kenya have been highlighted in recent years by a Special Rural Development Program (S.R.D.P.) in six pilot areas where innovative, experimental, multi-sector programs are being carried out in search of successful, widely replicable new approaches to rural

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 7 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	---------------------

development, involving the application of new methods, new combinations, and new sequences. Initially SRDP has been carried out at the Division level, but plans are now well advanced to move upward to the District level - not only experimentally in selected high-potential districts, but also administratively in every District in Kenya. The area-based aspects of the GOK's approach to rural development are further enhanced by the Growth Center policy relating to selected upcountry towns, and the concept of Physical Planning and Development of the Rural Areas which is intended to "bring about the most equitable distribution of economic, social, and engineering infrastructure."

The interface between the technical/functional approaches and the area-based approaches to rural development in Kenya is continuously evolving. For the present and the foreseeable future the primary action and accountability will remain with the technical/functional ministries. The geographically focused planners and administrators will play a coordinating and catalytic role intended to introduce local realities and generally to enhance both efficiency and equity. Over the long term a gradual shift in authority is envisaged toward area-based entities as they gain in experience and competence.

4. Pilot Area Programs

The rationale for the activities in the individual pilot areas is that they provide the practical experience necessary for developing GOK capabilities to devise and implement meaningful action programs that economically and efficiently meet the development needs of rural people. The policy and funding support provided from Nairobi to the pilot area programs is accelerating the process of establishing the horizontal linkages among all departments which are the crucial ingredient of total operational efficiency.

The program is Kenyan, operated entirely within the existing Kenyan administrative framework. The participation of donors has been called upon partly for funding support but more importantly for discussion, ideas, experience, stimulus and an impersonal, but interested catalytic role. The assignment of one pilot area or another to the individual donors in which to carry out their individual background roles is thus of little basic consequence for the program which is not intended to develop particular pieces of the Kenyan map. Yet USAID did make a conscious choice in recommending U.S. support for the Vihiga pilot program in particular.

B. Vihiga

1. Overall Situation

Vihiga is a significant rural development pilot area because of its population of 300,000, its varied and complex problems, and its basic potential for substantial improvement. Vihiga lends itself exceptionally well to overall experimentation in accelerated interdisciplinary development at the Division level while at the same time providing a versatile testing ground for specific experiments in individual economic and social sectors.

2. Population Pressure

The pressure of population on land, resources, educational facilities,

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION	Supplement to (Number) 3	DATE	1/30/73	PAGE	8	of	104	PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION							

and employment opportunities in Vihiga is a basic core problem which presents a formidable challenge to development staff and which identifies the Vihiga setting as a prototype for similar situations already existing or soon to be faced elsewhere in Kenya and in other developing countries. The root problem has many manifestations which point toward some of the directions which development efforts must take in order to accelerate the growth of rural production, employment, and per capita income.

3. Migrant Labor

Vihiga's primary source of income has been its migrant male labor employed in Nairobi and other population centers outside of Vihiga. Family decision makers since the turn of the century have wisely concluded that the best way to remove pressure from the land is to remove as many people from it as possible, preferably adult males capable of securing wage employment. This policy has made a lot of sense in an area with population density of 1,500 per square mile and with hilly, rocky farms averaging two to three acres in size, often in scattered plots. There was no place to go for the many sons of each small landholder. The only hope was for a classical education which might lead to an outside job, white collar if possible. The successful ones perpetuated the cycle by remitting their earnings back home to pay the school fees of their children or younger siblings.

Any plans for Vihiga's future, from the viewpoint either of individuals or of the Division as a whole, must continue to seek possibilities for outward migration of labor, e.g. to Mumias and Broderick Falls, and must look to these earnings as a major source of income. There are emerging, however, some unfavorable trends which are placing increasingly severe constraints on this traditional solution. The national population explosion has jammed educational facilities of all kinds at all levels. The thin layer of white collar jobs has largely been filled by bright young men with long careers ahead of them. Nairobi already has enough cooks and houseboys. The population of Kathari Valley has gone from zero to 70,000 in three years, and the urban drift generally has led to unemployment, hunger, and sometimes desperation and crime. It is increasingly evident that Vihiga must look more and more toward other solutions for its population problem.

4. Agriculture

Agriculture is the obvious first place to look, and it is quite clear that the people of Vihiga are beginning to place increasing emphasis on this basic source of current subsistence and potential opportunity for substantial cash income. Until very recently agriculture has been badly neglected in Vihiga because of the extremely high priority that has been placed on education. Yet there exists a rather high potential for cash income that could be realized from moderate investment in well known technology and from improved local organization. The stress on education which has hampered agriculture in the past can now form the base for sophisticated modern development. Dramatic increases can be achieved in yields of maize, the area's staple crop, through the application of known and available technology helped along by a variety of efforts in the areas of credit, extension demonstrations, cooperatives, land adjudication, marketing, and overall incentives. Similarly, intensive cultivation of vegetables on Vihiga's small farms offers great potential, once solutions are found to problems of organizing production and marketing. Smallholder tea production by the vegetative propagation method is also known to be a good prospect if funds can somehow be obtained to cover the initial investment. In

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)		DATE	PAGE 9 of 104 PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	1/30/73	

addition, considerable opportunities exist for exploitation of the strong local demand for milk. Substantial increases in Vihiga's grade cattle population can be achieved through improved organization of the financing, procurement, and care of the animals. Possibilities also exist for investment in pig and poultry production after further study.

5. Rural Industry

Productive activities outside the agriculture sector are also obviously essential to build up levels of income and employment and to contribute generally to Vihiga's development. Many possibilities exist for providing tools and supplies to farmers and to process agricultural products. Many of the necessary skills already exist in some form, but there is need for upgrading and redirection. The most pressing requirement is for entrepreneurs to step forward to hire and guide others and to take the necessary risks. Knowledge of accounting and marketing techniques is limited and few local citizens seem able to cope with the various Government regulations that tend to frustrate small enterprises. A further challenge to potential small businesses in the area relates to the sophistication of local demand resulting from the long established familiarity of migrant labor with markets in Kenya's cities and large towns.

6. Infrastructure

The basic economic infrastructure backing up Vihiga's agricultural and industrial development is another important factor to be considered in forward planning. The existing situation relating to such facilities as roads, water supplies, electricity, and telephones represents neither a severe deterrent nor a dynamic stimulant to development in the area. Appropriate improvements during the next few years can make a significant contribution to Vihiga's modernization and growth. Road programs can greatly reduce distances from farms to markets and can improve general access in wet weather. Water programs can improve human health and productivity as well as support grade cattle development. Modest investment in rural electrification can stimulate local industry, facilitate education and communications, and generally improve the standard of living. Telephone connections to Division Headquarters and a few other points can greatly increase the efficiency of local government staff in their development efforts. To the extent possible, it would clearly be desirable for all of these public works activities to be carried out on a labor intensive basis in order to provide employment to people in the area.

7. Family Planning

Finally, there is increasing recognition of the need for direct approaches in the field of family planning as a means of alleviating the problems created by population pressures. Vihiga parents are now facing a severe dilemma. On the one hand, they continue to feel the need for large numbers of children, one or more of whom hopefully will support them in their old age, as no other form of social security is currently in evidence in Kenya. On the other hand, the benefit/cost ratios involved in raising and educating children for the urban job market are declining with changes in the times. In this situation it is possible that motivational and clinical family planning activities can begin to take hold in Vihiga within the general context of a maternal child health program.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)
 ORIGINAL REVISIONDATE
1/30/73

PAGE 10 of 104 PAGES

III. Dialogue

The following dialogue is intended to provide direct responses to all of the questions raised by AID/Washington with regard to PROP Revision Number 3 of October 6, 1972:

A. Scope

AID/W

We are uncertain what the PROP is intended to be. Is it meant to be a departure from the earlier framework?

USAID/K

The PROP is intended to be a departure from the earlier framework in the sense that it covers the full period from FY 1971 through FY 1976 and places the U.S. role in a much more completely described context of a total effort alongside the GOK and other donors. Our role was the same at the time we wrote the earlier versions of the PROP.

AID/W

The PROP goes further than earlier documents in attempting to relate our effort to the Kenya-wide rural development program rather than only to the Vihiga element.

USAID/K

Yes, we made quite an effort to do a more comprehensive job this time. This does not mean that there has been a change in the project or in our role, we simply have more data and experience than we had at the time of earlier writeups. The AID effort is very definitely an integral part of the total Kenya-wide program.

AID/W

Most of the PROP describes the overall Kenyan rural development effort and specific AID inputs.

USAID/K

Yes, the PROP is intended to describe the overall Kenyan rural development effort. However, it doesn't just describe specific AID inputs; it covers all inputs by the GOK, AID, and other donors. AID accounts for 14.8% of the total.

AID/W

The stated purpose is to create a whole new system of rural development program planning and implementation within the Kenya Government.

USAID/K

Yes, that is the ultimate purpose of the GOK and the 16 donors at a cost

of \$19.6 million over a six-year period.

AID/W

This implies a good deal of administrative and organizational development work.

USAID/K

Yes, it does, and this is the main point of the program. The planning, implementation, evaluation, and all other actions relating to the individual sub-projects in the six pilot areas are providing an operational milieu that is giving a real-life focus to the creation of a rural development system in Kenya. It thus becomes possible to conduct the necessary training and organizational activities in something other than a vacuum. ✓

B. Sector Relationships

AID/W

The project's rationale and strategy throughout seem entwined with the Government of Kenya's (GOK's) Agriculture Sector rationale and strategy to such a degree that the reader can't tell one from another. It appears that there is no true beginning or end to this project, and that the effects of the AID project itself cannot be isolated.

USAID/K

SRDP relates to all sectors, not just agriculture. It seeks to achieve effective interdisciplinary planning and implementation. It tries to make the total development effort more effective by establishing horizontal linkages - mutually reinforcing inter relationships - among physical production activities in agriculture and the other technical sectors. It brings local knowledge, realities, and equity considerations to bear on sector programs. At the lowest level it is true that individual sub-projects usually do take place within the technical sectors, but they are experimental and are not intended to substitute for regular ongoing sector activity. The project started with preparation of the Outline Programme for Vihiga and will end with completion, evaluation and, we hope, replication of the last of 26 sub-projects.

AID/W

Is there a sector analysis behind all this, or did the activity just sort of develop on its own volition like many bureaucratic endeavors before it? Is there a need for sector analysis?

USAID/K

Our PROP Revision No.3 is the closest thing we have to an AID sector analysis. The GOK's sector analysis is set forth in the Kericho Conference (1966) papers, Chapter VI of the 1970-74 Plan, and in a special SRDP study prepared by IDS prior to initiation of the program. The Rural Development Chapter of the new Five Year Plan for 1974-78 will be available shortly. We believe these are sufficient.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION

 ORIGINAL

Supplement to (Number)

 REVISIONDATE
1/30/73

PAGE 12 of 104 PAGES

C. Logical Framework**AID/W**

The entire logical framework looks strange. Creation of an "institutional environment conducive to progress" is a rather ambiguous project purpose. Likewise a Kenyan Staff division level project output of "courageous and effective pressure on superiors to induce them to carry out their responsibilities" seems intangible.

USAID/K

The difficulties involved in measuring progress do not make the purpose and outputs less valid or important. We will seek to evaluate overall progress qualitatively. At a lower level of generality we will be measuring the progress of production-oriented sub-projects on a quantitative basis.

AID/W

Whether or not the new departure can be accepted, can we not reintroduce a much heavier emphasis on physical output and farmer income rather than exclusive attention to the institution, regardless of area? Assuming the focus of USAID efforts is on pilot activities rather than institutional development, we would particularly like this contained in the End of Project Status.

USAID/K

Kenyan field staff and their AID advisors in Vihiga are engaged full time on efforts to increase physical output and farmer income. The emphasis couldn't be any heavier than it is. Twelve sub-projects were underway during FY 1972 and an additional ten are being started during FY 1973. We hope that many of these will be successful and replicable. We also hope that they will contribute effectively to the broader objective of building a Kenyan rural development capability and system.

AID/W

At the local level, the emphasis in the PROP is on carrying out a group of discrete projects.

USAID/K

Yes, this is the active ingredient of the program at that level. This is the focus, the operational milieu. All kinds of activities center around these projects: agendas, meetings, planning papers, farm visits, extension training, CD, technical assistance, follow up, evaluation, loans collections, harvests, purchases, sales, transport, income employment, instructions from Nairobi, Seminars, relationships with donors, etc. etc.

AID/W

Both logic and experience suggest that good projects are more likely to emerge from having more competent people and organizations rather than vice versa.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION
 ORIGINAL REVISION

(Number) 3

DATE
1/30/73

PAGE 13 of 104 PAGES

Unskilled administrators and underdeveloped organizations can make a mess of even the best projects. At least it would appear that there ought to be a better defined and more significant concurrent input at the local level on the organizational development side than is indicated, both for resource delivery and resource utilization purposes.

USAID/K

The strategy of the Kenyan SRDP is to develop organization and projects simultaneously, with each thrust reinforcing the other. Project mistakes have helped shape more effective organization, while the observable limitations on organizational capability have helped determine project feasibility. Another aspect of the situation has been the presence of practical pressures to actually get something done. Indeed, some messes have been made by unskilled administrators and underdeveloped organizations. But a lot is being done on the organizational side as indicated in the Division-level outputs listed on pp. 5-6 of PROP Revision No. 3. The AID-funded technical assistance team has only recently reached full strength. We are expecting them to be most helpful in strengthening field-level organization, and perhaps it will be possible for them to draw upon IA/DA and other AID worldwide experience in rural development organization.

AID/W

A far greater concentration on organization building at the Division (or District) level than the PROP provides for will be needed.

USAID/K

But a major criticism of the PROP in AID/W is its stress on organization building, which is in fact the ultimate purpose of the project as understood by the GOK and the 16 Honore. We have described this in the Purpose and Outputs sections of the PROP pp. 2-11. We have recently completed a PIP which provides further descriptive information on the existing heavy concentration on organization building. (Ref. Part VII of this present supplement document).

AID/W

Possibly some of the problem results from a past tendency to conceive of the project purpose as one of testing various kinds of projects or activities to determine their suitability for broader replication, rather than one of creating an institutional capability for systematic broad-scale rural development program implementation? It appears that the inputs we are providing are more suitable to this former purpose than to the latter. Perhaps what is needed are two projects--one for each purpose.

USAID/K

It is true that the project has this dual purpose, SRDP is undertaking a wide range of experimental projects in the six pilot areas with a view to replicating many of them throughout the rural areas of Kenya. At the same time an organization is being built up that is gaining experience through the administration of SRDP and other development activities in the six pilot areas. We don't feel that this is a problem, however, and we don't think there should be two projects, because the discrete

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	Supplement to _____ (Number)	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 18 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

project elements and the overall organizational aspects are closely interrelated and are all part of a total rural development strategy. Most of our present input is at the Division level in one pilot area. In the PROP we suggested that we might consider joining the GOK and the other donors at a later stage in support of other aspects of the strategy at other levels. Perhaps at that point it would be convenient from the standpoint of AID documentation to separate the project into phases.

D. AID Role

AID/W

Our inputs are only incidentally related to the overall goal and purpose.

USAID/K

We believe that they are directly related. In quantitative terms we account for 14.8% of the inputs being provided by the GOK and the 16 donors. We are part of a total effort and we have been going on the assumption that such collaboration is both AID and overall U.S. policy. We believe that the GOK and donor inputs in toto have a good chance of leading to achievement of the project purpose.

AID/W

The PROP fails to present a clear statement of what AID's inputs are expected to achieve and how AID's inputs relate to Kenya's larger effort.

USAID/K

AID is providing 14.8% of the inputs that are expected to achieve the outputs (pp. 5-9), purpose (pp. 2-4), and goal (p 1) set forth in PROP Revision No.3. We are the prime donor in one of the six pilot areas. We also assist in Nairobi through the work of the Project Officer and the District Development Advisor. The job descriptions of the seven persons provided by AID ~~are~~ given in Attachment 1 to the PROP (Ref. TOAID A-173). Other AID inputs and the resulting outputs are described in Tables 2 and 3 of the PROP and the notes thereto.

AID/W

The PROP needs to be revised to provide a more precise description of AID's specific role in the rural development effort.

USAID/K

AID's specific role is to serve as one of 16 donors in support of a Special Rural Development Program (SRDP) being planned, implemented and evaluated by the Government of Kenya. A major part of our specific role is to advise the Kenyan staff that is concerned in particular with the planning, implementation, and evaluation of SRDP activities in Vihiga. To the extent necessary, appropriate, and palatable our advisory role in Vihiga takes on an operational character in the short run. We also provide a certain amount of commodity and local currency support to individual experimental activities in Vihiga as spelled out in the notes to Tables 2 and 3 of the

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number)		DATE	PAGE	of	PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	1/30/73	15		104

PROP. We regard the experimental activities to be important and we intend for them to be successful and replicable. However, our role as part of the Kenyan total national effort is more important than our specific share of the work in Vihiga. The combination of all Kenyan and donor inputs can achieve the outputs, purpose, and goal of the project. A few isolated successes in Vihiga would be of little value without the mutually reinforcing interactions of all the inputs that will lead to the establishment of an effectively functioning system of rural development in Kenya and the replication of experimental results on a large scale.

AID/E

It is questionable whether putting a team in Vihiga to help develop agriculture and small scale industries is the best way for us to contribute to the project purpose.

USAID/K

We have no choice. This is the particular way in which we have been asked to join with the GOK and the other 15 donors in the total effort to achieve the project purpose. We must rely on others to do their part. Of course, a great deal of communication and collaboration goes on. Mutual reinforcement is absolutely essential to the total success of this project. As regards the action in Vihiga itself, there is quite a bit ongoing or planned in fields other than agriculture and rural industries.

AID/E

One could argue that Eric Crawford is the most valuable input we are providing and yet he seems to have been included more by accident than design.

USAID/K

But this statement involves defining host country requests as "accidents" and AID plans for the host country as "designs". Mr. Crawford is indeed very valuable and we are delighted that the U.S. has been able to be responsive in this case. Crawford is a U.S. input at the Nairobi level. The GOK and the 16 donors are providing many inputs at the Nairobi, Provincial, District, and Division levels and below. We agree that Crawford is one of the most valuable of these, but there are many others at many levels.

AID/W

Has the Technical Assistance Bureau (TAB) been brought into project development, and are TAB resources likely to be useful during the course of the project?

USAID/K

TAB has funded and recruited a Program Analyst, Mr. Peter Weisel, who has been on board in Vihiga since October 3, 1972.

E. Sub-Projects

PROJECT NO.
615-1-810-147

SUBMISSION

 ORIGINAL REVISION

(Number)

DATE
1/30/73

PAGE 16 of 104 PAGES

AID/W

It would be helpful if the activities to which our inputs are making a direct contribution were more fully developed and rationalized.

USAID/K

The development and rationalization of individual project elements has been a major function of the Kenyan field staff since the beginning of the project in July 1970. Very recently our technical assistance has come effectively to bear in assisting these efforts. USAID has for some time been sending materials on these project elements to AID/W. Yet we recognize that all of this has been inadequate and reflects upon one of the major problems that the project is intended to solve, i.e. the lack of Kenyan planning capability, particularly at the local level. At the start, there was great uncertainty as to what should be done. Some things were planned and not started. Other things were started and then substantially modified as experience was gained. Some things have been badly delayed because of bureaucratic and administrative problems, both Kenyan and U.S. However, the possibility now exists for substantial improvement. The matter of precision and quantification of program elements has recently been given a high priority by Kenyan field staff and their AID-funded advisers. The present paper provides sub-project details and an analysis of how each one is intended to contribute toward achievement of project purpose.

AID/W

A good deal of effort was spent towards this during the visit of the FAMU Team last spring, but none of the result seems to have been carried over into the PROP. At that time a series of "mini-PROPs" on most of the activities listed in the notes to Table 2 was prepared by the FAMU Team. If these are not already available in Washington it would be worthwhile to have the Mission send them in so that people here could have a better idea of what these activities consist of and what their potential is for contributing to either or both of the two project purposes identified in the preceding paragraphs.

USAID/K

Vihiga planning activities from the departure of the Team in late May through the completion of the PROP on October 6 were described in some detail in a series of airgrams with attachments sent in to AID/W during the summer months. The FAMU Team did prepare some papers based on a review of USAID files and interviews with Kenyan and USAID staff, but most of them were not "mini-PROPs" i.e. actionable planning documents concurred in by the GOK. For those visiting from campus the papers were largely educational for the writers. For those who have remained in Kenya the papers represented one stage in a longer term planning process which has continued to evolve. Hanrahan's paper on vegetables has been superseded by additional Hanrahan work on vegetables; Holmes's paper on tea has been superseded by additional Holmes work on tea; etc. USAID purposely abided giving the FAMU papers separate status as American planning documents, as we were encouraging the Kenyans to produce their own, which they eventually did in the "Vihiga Replan" presented to the SRDP seminar on August 29, 1972. This too is being revised in a more careful exercise due to be completed in June 1973. The PROP of October 6 drew upon the FAMU papers and everything else that was available relating to the individual program elements. The FAMU field

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION

 ORIGINAL REVISION

(Number)

DATE
1/30/73

PAGE 17 of 104 PAGES

team came into Nairobi for a week to assist the Project Officer in making the calculations that went into the PROP tables. Eric Crawford also assisted. In any event, USAID has sent the FAU Test papers of last May to the Kenya Desk as requested. Our most recent analysis of the 26 sub-projects is set forth in Part VIII of this paper.

F. Evaluation

AID/N

With so many other donors involved, it becomes a rather major activity for the GOK. Have arrangements been made for joint evaluation, or for separate evaluation? Should they be made?

USAID/K

We are in close touch with the other donors and engage in informal program evaluations frequently. We invited representatives of UNDP, SIDA, the UK, NORAD, and the Netherlands to participate in two of our PAR review sessions in December 1972. The Institute for Development Studies is responsible for preparing a formal GOK evaluation of SRDP annually. Donor representatives are invited to a review session when the first draft is submitted. We would like to establish a system of joint GOK/US evaluation for Vihiga if possible. For a comprehensive evaluation of the project to date please refer to the PAR of December 7, 1972 and its supporting documents.

AID/N

We are concerned about the lack of quantitative indicators, and request an effort be made to work up some quantitative verifiers of GOK institutional capacities to support and supplement the qualitative.

USAID/K

We agree that quantitative indicators have been weak thus far. We believe, however, that the quantitative and qualitative evaluation indicators for individual sub-projects set forth in Part VIII of the present supplementary paper represent a substantial improvement.

G. Local Currency

AID/N

Local currency inputs are high. The PROP should explain the source of such currency, and explain its use more carefully. Other costs in the budget are very high and need explanation as well as justification.

USAID/K

Other costs are largely for local currency inputs. The sources are the GOK and donor national budgets. The justification for donor support is that those costs are for experimental activities over and above the GOK's normal expenditures

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u> (Number)	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>18</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

for regular budget and development budget activities. The other prime donors cover 100 percent of these local costs in their pilot areas. USAID has requested in PROP Revision No.3 that AID/W approve U.S. coverage of 35% of these costs in Vihiga. Details were given in the notes to Tables 2 and 3 of the PROP. Additional details are submitted in Parts IV and VIII of the present supplementary document.

H. Technical Assistance

AID/W

Have the programs developed to the point where the responsibility for project outputs can be left to the Kenyan staff (page 5 PROP dtd 10/6/72)?

USAID/K

The Kenyans have repeatedly made it clear to us from the outset that the program is Kenyan and that Kenyans are responsible for it. However, as spelled out in Part IV of this paper, our technical assistance team is playing a very significant supporting role in assuring the success of the 26 sub-projects and in general building the Kenyan staff and the Kenyan development system in Vihiga. We have recommended that technical assistance be continued through June 1976.

I. Contract Costs

AID/W

PASA-Contract figures in the budget are extremely irregular, apparently ranging from \$27,000 to \$77,000 per man-year.

USAID/K

These figures are, of course, for obligations, not expenditures. Advance funding of contracts has been provided for in accordance with AID regulations. A detailed calculation of the relationships between obligations and expenditures under the FAMU contract was given in Table 4 of PROP Revision No.3. The regular staff salary item in expenditure terms is constant through the years. Variations relate largely to the phasing of international travel to and from post. Revised calculations are shown in Part IV, Table 3 of the present paper. USAID and the Kenya Desk have reached agreement in detail on all FAMU contract cost calculations.

J. Participant Training

AID/W

Has adequate attention been given to the participant training element of this project? Pages 8,13, 16 (of PROP dtd 10/6/72) indicate present and future plans in this area are unknown to the USAID.

USAID/K

USAID ideas for analytical observation visits have not been looked upon with favor by AID/W in the past. We would appreciate your comments and suggestions, although most of the actual training required for the project can be accomplished quite well here in Kenya. We are hoping to provide some third country cross fertilization opportunities as stated in Part IV (U.S. Inputs) of this paper.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION

Supplement to (Number) 3

DATE 1/30/73

19

108

PAGE _____ of _____ PAGES

 ORIGINAL REVISION**K. Relation to Other AID Activities**AID/N

How does the project relate to the overall Agency effort in Kenya, and to Agriculture Sector strategies in Kenya, in Africa and in the Agency at large?

USAID/K

The U.S. AID program in Kenya is concentrated in three sectors - Rural Development, Agriculture, and Population. The Vihiga project represents Phase I of our activity in the Rural Development sector. The AID-funded Agricultural Credit project is using the Vihiga Maize Credit sub-project as a primary test for smallholder credit programs to be undertaken throughout rural Kenya. One of the three Provincial level agricultural credit advisors is making a major input to the Vihiga maize sub-project. Similarly the AID-funded Population Dynamics project is using Vihiga as the place to test experiments in motivation and clinical services to be built into the national five-year plan for Family Planning. We believe that some of the results of the SRDP will be of value elsewhere in Africa and the developing world. Indeed, cross-country studies are one of the specific responsibilities of TAB-funded Program Analyst Weisol.

AID/E

Does it have any relationship to the several major lending activities proposed for Kenya in FY 1973 and FY 1974?

USAID/K

It is possible that some of the local currency generated by the proposed FY 1973 Program Loan will be used for rural development. There will be no direct relationship to the proposed capital assistance for livestock development.

L. Future ImplicationsAID/N

Is the PROP laying the groundwork for AID participation in rural development efforts on a larger scale and beyond Vihiga?

USAID/K

Yes, The U.S. AID program in Kenya is concentrated in three sectors: Rural Development, Agriculture, and Population. PROP Revision No.3 was a first effort to look several years ahead in a comprehensive fashion to analyze the potential role of the U.S. in support of Kenya's rural development program. It amounts, in effect, to the best job U.S. AID can do for the present on a rural development sector analysis.

AID/E

We are somewhat concerned that the project may envelop a broader spectrum

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u>		DATE	PAGE <u>20</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	<u>3</u>	

of activities, before adequate assessment of the experimental, pilot activities is made. In particular, does the progress being achieved through experimental programs, i.e., the maize production campaign, extension training, small-holder credit, labor intensive road construction, substantial increases in the output of tea, vegetables, and livestock products, establishment of small rural enterprises, etc., warrant the shift in focus at this time?

USAID/K

The overall Kenyan SRDP includes the six Division-level pilot programs, District-level activities, and support activities at Headquarters and in the Nairobi Ministries. The Division-level programs started before the District-level activities, but the latter are now a firmly established part of the program. We are not aware of any contemplated further changes in or additions to the overall Kenyan S.R.D.P. Thus there is no question of a broader spectrum from the Kenyan point of view. The complete spectrum already exists at Division, District, and support levels. As regards the future role of AID in particular support of this total program design, USAID proposed consideration of providing support to Division-level activities in FY 1975. There is time to think about it. We have assumed that one of USAID's responsibilities is to generate ideas for activities in support of Kenyan rural development, if this is indeed to be one of our sectors of concentration.

AID/W

The PROCP identifies Phases I and II of a larger scale program, but is less precise about whether this PROCP covers Phase I or also seeks approval for Phase II activities.

USAID/K

Our intention was to seek approval of Phase I through FY 1976 totalling \$2,236,000. We indicated that the \$660,000 for possible District-level activities was only illustrative. We included it simply as part of the effort to present as comprehensive as possible a picture of ideas. We stated that the GOK had not yet made a policy decision regarding donor participation in general and we indicated that, in any event, no decisions regarding a second phase of the program should be made until a team came out to examine the situation. An exception to this general position was the favorable AID response to the GOK request that Eric Crawford be made available at the Nairobi level to work on Division and District programs generally.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-187	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number) <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 3 21 of 104 PAGES
<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION		

IV. U.S. Inputs

Actual and proposed US inputs into the Vihiga project (No. 147) from FY 1971 through the June 30, 1976 terminal date of the project total \$2,168,000. An additional \$155,000 of AID support for the project is provided from the Population Dynamics project (No. 141), Technical Support, and TAB/Washington. Table 1 presents the total Vihiga SRDP six-year budget of \$4,630,000 from all sources. Table 2 shows Project 147 costs, and Table 3 indicates FAMU contract obligations and expenditures by broad categories.

A. FAMU Contract

Total estimated costs of the FAMU contract for the life of the project are estimated at \$875,000. Basically this provides for a three-man team for an average period of about four years and four months. The composition of the FAMU Team is as follows: Rural Development Advisor/Chief of Party; Agricultural Extension/Farm Management Advisor; and Agricultural Economist/Marketing Analyst.

Program planning also calls for one short term consultant in FY 1973 and three in each of the last three years of the project. These are unspecified and have been included to provide the contractor with the flexibility needed to be responsive to GOX requests for specialized technical assistance to fill gaps that will be identified as the project evolves.

The role of the FAMU Team is to support Kenyan efforts to achieve the objectives described elsewhere in this paper in ways desired by the Kenyans responsible for the project. In practice, the team and its individual members are called upon to perform both advisory and operational functions, sometimes in response to specific Kenyan requests and on other occasions at their own initiative after clearing with the responsible Kenyans.

The Rural Development Advisor, in particular, is broadly concerned with project activities across the board, while giving special attention to the experimental sub-projects that are receiving local currency support from USAID, i.e. maize credit, cattle dips, vegetables, tea, extension, rural health, roads, village polytechnics, and small industries. The Agricultural Extension/Farm Management Advisor is more specifically focussed in the agricultural sector of the project and has been concerned particularly with the extension and maize credit sub-projects. Similarly the Agricultural Economist/Marketing Analyst has focussed on the agricultural sector and has given special attention to mounting the vegetable production and marketing sub-project.

In sum, FAMU has prime responsibility for US assistance at the project site. The Team is expected to take all possible actions, as desired by their Kenyan colleagues to assure success of the 26 sub-projects, to build local development staff, and, above all, to build a development system in Vihiga that is an effective part of an effective national development system. For more detailed descriptions of FAMU roles and relationships please refer to the draft PIO/T dated January 26, 1973 and Attachment 1 of TOAID A-173.

B. Other Technicians

1. District Development Advisor (Cranford)

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)

PAGE
1730/73 ORIGINAL REVISION

PAGE 22 of 104 PAGES

Table 1
Total GCK and Donor
Budget for Vihiga SROP Pilot Area
FY 1971 - FY 1976

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
I. <u>TECHNICIANS</u>	229	94	284	350	284	174	1,415
A. <u>AID Contract</u>	221	40	215	273	203	108	1,060
B. <u>AID Director Hire</u>	0	20	43	51	35	40	189
C. <u>Other</u>	8	34	26	26	26	26	146
Rockefeller Resident Evaluator	8	8	-	-	-	-	16
FAO Fertilizer Advisor	-	26	26	26	26	26	130
II. <u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	0	0	0	6	0	6	12
III. <u>AID COMMODITIES</u>	18	38	6	0	0	0	62
IV. <u>OTHER COSTS</u>	127	421	591	746	593	500	2,978
Office of the Area Coordinator	7	13	12	13	13	13	71
Agricultural Extension	39	37	53	65	52	57	303
Size Credit	-	15	22	56	73	97	263
FAO Stockist Inputs Credit	-	-	4	8	13	14	39
FAO Fertilizer	-	15	16	15	16	15	77
IDA Grade Cattle	19	19	84	84	84	84	374
Cattle Dips	8	8	16	14	4	-	50
SIDA Artificial Insemination	4	11	6	9	7	7	44
Vegetables	-	-	17	17	3	-	37
Land Adjudication	6	6	6	3	-	-	21
SIDA Rural Water	40	27	101	227	129	23	547
UNICEF Environmental Water	-	95	15	36	-	-	146
Community Development	-	23	17	26	26	26	118
Social Services Training	-	-	1	1	1	1	4
Adult Literacy	-	-	4	4	4	4	16
Women's Group Activities	-	-	1	1	1	1	4
Day Care Centers	-	-	5	5	5	5	20
Roads	-	13	59	-	-	-	72
Village Polytechnics	4	10	10	10	10	10	54
Rural Industries	-	129	133	129	129	129	649
Other							
V. <u>OTHER</u>	20	11	97	31	2	2	163
Rural Health	-	11	30	29	-	-	70
Program Analysis	-	-	65	-	-	-	65
Technical Support	20	-	-	-	-	-	20
Trust Fund	-	-	2	2	2	2	8
TOTAL	394	564	978	1,133	679	682	4,630

Table 2US Costs for the Vibica Project (Project No. 147)

(in thousands of dollars):

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
I. <u>TECHNICIANS</u>	221	60	258	224	238	148	1,249
A. <u>Contract</u>	221	40	215	273	203	108	1,060
FAMU	206	-	150	208	203	108	875
Rural Development (Johnson)	8	-	-	-	-	-	8
Rural Industries (Reed)	7	-	-	-	-	-	7
District Development (Crawford)	-	40	-	60	-	-	105
Rural Roads (Bartolo)	-	-	65	-	-	-	65
B. <u>Direct Hire</u>	0	20	43	51	35	40	189
Project Officer	-	20	43	51	35	40	189
II. <u>PARTICIPANTS</u>				6		6	12
Third Country Systems Studies	-	-	-	6	-	6	12
III. <u>COMMODITIES</u>	18	38	6	3	0	0	62
Labor Intensive Roads	-	38	6	-	-	-	44
FAMU Vehicles	18	-	-	-	-	-	18
IV. <u>OTHER COSTS</u>	30	102	183	199	166	165	845
Kenyan SRDP Staff (4)	6	12	12	12	12	12	66
Gasoline	2	4	4	4	5	6	25
Maize Credit	-	15	22	56	73	97	263
Cattle Dips	4	4	8	7	4	-	27
Vegetables	-	-	17	17	3	-	37
Tea	-	-	9	23	23	14	69
Training	2	6	2	3	3	3	19
Roads	-	13	59	-	-	-	72
Partnership for Productivity	-	40	40	64	30	20	194
Other	16	8	10	13	13	13	73
TOTAL	269	200	447	522	404	319	2,168

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION Supplement to
 ORIGINAL REVISIONDATE
1/30/73

PAGE 24 of 104 PAGES

TableFAMU Contract Expenditures
FY 1972-76

(in thousands of dollars)

	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Salaries	33	80	94	97	102	406
Allowances	6	27	28	28	28	117
Travel and Transport	35	17	42	20	42	156
Other Direct Costs	6	17	17	16	17	73
Overhead	20	19	21	23	24	107
Equipment	0	3	4	5	4	16
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	100	163	206	189	217	875
OBLIGATIONS	206*	150	208	203	108	875
PIPELINE	106	93	95	109	-	

*Obligated in FY 71. None in FY 72.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> <u>3</u> (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>25</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

Crawford, as a Peace Corps Volunteer, filled the GOK position of Ministry of Agriculture SRDP linkman. At the end of his tour in December 1971, the GOK strongly desired his return to work on District-level programs. AID responded by funding Crawford through a TransCentury contract for a two year tour starting in May 1972 to help the Ministry of Agriculture with the agricultural aspects of area-based Division-level and District-level programs generally. It is understood (and practiced) that the District Development Advisor will give considerable priority to Vihiga at his own initiative and as needed and requested by USAID. The advisor visits Vihiga frequently, cooperates closely with the Rural Development Advisor and other U.S.-funded field staff, and provides substantial assistance in the form of planning inputs and Nairobi follow-up actions.

2. Rural Roads Engineer (Bartolo)

TransCentury contract technician Bartolo, in association with Ministry of Works personnel, will have major responsibility for carrying out the roads sub-project, the purpose of which is to develop replicable techniques and systems for labor-intensive construction of farm-to-market feeder roads (Ref Part VIII). Seven such roads will be constructed over a two year period by local laborers under the supervision of Mr. Bartolo, who in turn will work under the general direction of the Ministry of Works Provincial Engineer.

3. Project Officer

The Vihiga Project Officer carries out the following functions:

- a. Manages all project relationships for USAID within the Mission and with the host country, contractors, other donors and technical assistance organizations. Functions include planning, organizing, motivating, communicating, coordinating, advising, implementing and evaluating.
- b. Provides the project with personal inputs based upon experience and training including innovative ideas and concepts.
- c. Maintains through regular and timely field visits a detailed and intimate knowledge of all ongoing and projected activities.
- d. Performs Nairobi liaison with the SRDP office and other involved ministerial officials, staff and offices.
- e. Initiates, prepares and coordinates all appropriate program and project documentation including progress and financial reporting in accordance with USAID and GOK policies and procedures.
- f. Insures that U.S. inputs are in consonance with agreed upon GOK/SRDP economic planning and programming.

C. Participants

USAID has prepared a proposal for third country training for four Kenyans in FY 1974 and four more in FY 1976 for the purpose of carrying out analytical comparative rural development system studies in other developing countries. It is

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)		DATE	PAGE 26 of 104 PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	1/30/73	

proposed to select personnel concerned with the Vihiga project at the Division, District, Province, and Nairobi levels to carry out the studies in such places as Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines where comprehensive rural development systems are in effect.

D. Commodities

Vehicles for the U.S. project technicians and equipment for the labor-intensive roads activity were procured in prior years.

E. Other Costs

Other costs are largely for local currency inputs. The justification for US and other donor support is that these costs are for experimental projects over and above the GOK's normal expenditures for regular budget and development activities. The other prime donors cover 100 percent of these local costs in the pilot areas they are supporting. The US has adopted a policy of selecting certain priority items and leaving the rest to be covered by other funding sources as shown in Table 1 and Part VIII. Full descriptions of the experimental projects (3-9 below) are contained in Part VIII.

1. Kenyan SRDP Staff

Four of the 23 SRDP positions established for the Vihiga program have been selected as being appropriate for AID funding support because of their key importance. These include the Area Coordinator, the Assistant Agricultural Officer for Vihiga (West), the Assistant Livestock Officer and the Assistant Community Development Officer. The title of "Assistant" relates to a broader staffing context. In Vihiga they are the people in charge of the sectors they represent and as such are prime daily working associates of the AID-financed field staff. The Area Coordinator, in particular, is the focal point of responsibility for the coordination of project activities and is therefore the first and foremost Kenyan contact of the Rural Development Advisor and other FAO/TransCentury field staff.

2. Gasoline

Gasoline was selected as another top priority item to be supported in view of the crucial importance of providing mobility for the extension staff.

3. Maize Credit (Ref. Part VIII)

US local currency support for the Vihiga maize credit sub-project is being used for loans to individual Vihiga farmers administered by the Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC) for the purchase of hybrid seed, fertilizer, and DDT. It is estimated that new funds plus collections of past loans will make it possible to make loans to 500 farmers in FY 1973, 1,200 in FY 1974; 2,000 in FY 1975 and 3,000 in FY 1976.

4. Cattle Dips (Ref. PART VIII)

Local currency support for the cattle dips program provides for half of the construction costs of 30 dips being constructed in Vihiga from FY 1971 through FY 1974. The other half is contributed in the form of local self-help.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to 3(Number)</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>27</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

5. Vegetables (Ref. Part VIII)

Plans for the vegetables sub-project look to the Horticultural Crops Development Authority (HCDA) as the primary action agent. US inputs of local currency are intended to be used primarily to cover the excess of HCDA costs over initial returns.

6. Tea (Ref. PART VIII)

US local currency support for the tea sub-project is being used for loans to individual Vihiga farmers administered by the Kenya Tea Development Authority (KIDA) for the purchase of nursery construction materials and vegetative propagation units including tea cuttings, polythene sleeves, and tents. It is planned to make loans to 200 farmers in FY 1973, 500 in FY 1974, 500 in FY 1975, and 300 in FY 1976. Each farmer will plant one acre of tea.

7. Training (Ref. Part VIII, Extension)

Training of extension workers and farmers has been the one specific element of the extension program for which US support has been provided. Our interest in extension is much broader than training, however. The FAEU Extension Advisor is concerned with the whole range of extension activities in his day to day work with Kenyan agricultural staff.

8. Roads (Ref. Part VIII)

The local cost input for the roads program includes labor, local supervisory, staff, equipment operations, and construction materials.

9. Partnership for Productivity (Ref. Part VIII, Rural Industries and Village Polytechnics)

The small industries element of the Vihiga project is one of the most important and one of the earliest to be initiated. A project-funded survey was carried out in March-April 1971 and Partnership for Productivity (PPF) was asked to implement the findings on behalf of USAID. PFP was already on the ground and ready to move with a highly economical and practical operation. Since then PFP has been providing loans, technical assistance, management guidance, and training to 26 small enterprises in Vihiga and nearby areas in such fields as silk screen printing of cloth, knitting industries, tanning of leather, and motor mechanics. PFP is also assisting the Keveye Village Polytechnic in Vihiga by contributing teaching time and by generally supporting efforts to expand and diversify the training curriculum and strengthen and improve the teaching staff. USAID signed a Grant Agreement dated March 10, 1972 for \$40,000 which needs to be renewed very shortly in order to permit PFP to continue operations at present levels.

PPF requirements and other donor sources are spelled out in Part VIII. USAID regards this program to have a very high priority. One special item to be noted in PFP budget calculating is the amount of \$3,500 spent on evaluation, including

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-847	SUBMISSION Supplement to <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>28</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	------------------------------------

an: analysis prepared at USAID request in the AID evaluation format.

10. Other

Other local currency costs relate to a variety of expenses incurred mainly by the Project Officer and TDY visitors.

V. VIHIGA DIVISION MATRIX

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX - PROPOSAL WORKSHEET

AID 10253 (7-71)

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Important Assumptions																																																																																																																
<p>A.1. Goal A broad national capability to formulate and execute an efficient, pragmatic, and equitable national economic development program with a conscious emphasis on rural development.</p>	<p>A.2. Measurement of Goal Achievement a. Effective area-based input into the national development system. b. Recognition of social/economic opportunity criteria c. Central government responsiveness d. Evidence of horizontal linkages between sectoral programs. e. Indications of effective pressure from below to force responsive action f. Evidence of an emerging development state of mind.</p>	<p>A.3. (as related to goal) Sustained high-level GOV policy support for the Special Rural Development Program.</p>																																																																																																																
<p>B.1. Purpose To carry out experimental and other projects at the Division level contributing toward national rural development goal achievement: a) by testing new methods, techniques, combinations, sequences etc. as prototypes for replication and b) by providing an operational milieu in which a local staff and system can develop as part of a national staff and system.</p>	<p>B.2. End of Project Status a) Completion of 26 local projects including planning, implementation, and evaluation. b) Replication of successful experiments. c) Accelerated development of Vihiga Division through greater efficiency in the use of resources. d) Development of staff and system as evidenced by improved capability of individual people, the Division Committee, extension service, CD organization, Parliamentary inputs, rural industries organization, citizens committees, rural health organization, Kenya Tea Development Authority, and Agricultural Finance Corporation.</p>	<p>B.3. (as related to purpose) a. Acceptance and implementation by officials and staff of policy guidance, giving priority to SRDP. b. Experimental project inputs will be over and above the regular GOV expenditures for personnel, operations, and infrastructure. c. Judgments relating to the relative degree of success and replicability of agricultural project activities will be tempered by an analysis of trends in weather conditions d. Maintenance of broad national economic and social policies of a nature that would normally be expected to provide incentives and to stimulate rural income and employment</p>																																																																																																																
<p>C.1. Outputs a. Production outputs are sub-projects in Maize Credit, Stockist Inputs Credit, Fertilizer Demonstrations, Grade Cattle, Cattle Dips, Artificial Insemination, Vegetables, Tea Extension, Land Adjudication, Pigs, Poultry, Cooperatives, Rural Water, Environmental Water, Rural Industries, Village Polytechnics, Roads, Rural Health, Community Development, Social Services, Training, Adult Literacy, Women's Activities, Day Care Centers, Rural Electrification, and Telephones. b. Administrative outputs include work experience plans, surveys, budgets, seminars, coordination meetings, implementation reports, phasing forms, and evaluations.</p>	<p>C.2. Output Indicators 12 sub-projects were underway at the end of FY 1972 and the schedule calls for ten more to be added in FY 1973 and four more in FY 1975. Administration indicators through FY 1976 include 130 man years of experience, 5 original or revised plans, 4 economic surveys, 6 annual budgets, 11 seminars, 56 monthly coordination meetings, 56 monthly implementation reviews, 5 annual evaluation reviews, 4 half-year implementation reviews, and 5 overall SRDP evaluations.</p>	<p>C.3. (as related to outputs) a. Positive leadership on the part of senior officers in translating human and physical inputs into organizational outputs. b. Presence of a number of individuals - Kenyan and/or expatriates - in various positions at the Center and in the Field who desire for one reason or another that the program be a success and are willing and able to play a catalytic role to ensure that an actual rural development organization is built from the inputs that have been available. c. Collaboration on the part of non-SRDP personnel with the understanding that support of SRDP efforts will constitute a high priority portion of their regular day work routine.</p>																																																																																																																
<p>D.1. Inputs U.S.: 7 technicians (of which 1 AID/A funded and 1 under Population Dynamics); commodities for labor-intensive roads; other cost (local cost) funding for 4 Kenyan staff members, gasoline, and selected experimental project costs in Vihiga Division and GOV: 23 Division-level staff. Buildings and minor works, maintenance and running, transport, travel and upkeep. Also selected sub-projects. Other Donors: 6 technicians and selected sub-projects.</p>	<p>D.2. Budget/Schedule (\$000)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="6">Fiscal Years</th> <th></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>71</th> <th>72</th> <th>73</th> <th>74</th> <th>75</th> <th>76</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><u>US (This Project)</u></td> <td>269</td> <td>200</td> <td>447</td> <td>529</td> <td>404</td> <td>319</td> <td>2,168</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Personnel</td> <td>0</td> <td>20</td> <td>43</td> <td>51</td> <td>35</td> <td>40</td> <td>189</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Participants</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td>6</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Commodities</td> <td>18</td> <td>38</td> <td>6</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>62</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Costs</td> <td>30</td> <td>102</td> <td>183</td> <td>199</td> <td>166</td> <td>165</td> <td>845</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contract</td> <td>221</td> <td>40</td> <td>215</td> <td>273</td> <td>203</td> <td>108</td> <td>1,060</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>US (Related)</u></td> <td>20</td> <td>11</td> <td>0</td> <td>31</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>163</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>GOV, Other Costs</u></td> <td>34</td> <td>57</td> <td>83</td> <td>97</td> <td>73</td> <td>77</td> <td>421</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Other Donors</u></td> <td>71</td> <td>296</td> <td>351</td> <td>476</td> <td>380</td> <td>284</td> <td>1,858</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Technicians</td> <td>6</td> <td>34</td> <td>20</td> <td>26</td> <td>26</td> <td>26</td> <td>146</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other Costs</td> <td>65</td> <td>262</td> <td>325</td> <td>450</td> <td>354</td> <td>258</td> <td>1,712</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>394</td> <td>564</td> <td>978</td> <td>1133</td> <td>679</td> <td>682</td> <td>4,630</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Fiscal Years								71	72	73	74	75	76	TOTAL	<u>US (This Project)</u>	269	200	447	529	404	319	2,168	Personnel	0	20	43	51	35	40	189	Participants	0	0	0	6	0	6	12	Commodities	18	38	6	0	0	0	62	Other Costs	30	102	183	199	166	165	845	Contract	221	40	215	273	203	108	1,060	<u>US (Related)</u>	20	11	0	31	2	2	163	<u>GOV, Other Costs</u>	34	57	83	97	73	77	421	<u>Other Donors</u>	71	296	351	476	380	284	1,858	Technicians	6	34	20	26	26	26	146	Other Costs	65	262	325	450	354	258	1,712	TOTAL	394	564	978	1133	679	682	4,630	<p>D.3. (as related to inputs) Ready Availability of necessary technical skills for SRDP activities in Kenya or the donor countries, and adequate Kenyan and donor administrative and budgetary capability to recruit and assign appropriate personnel within the time frame required for effective program operation.</p>
	Fiscal Years																																																																																																																	
	71	72	73	74	75	76	TOTAL																																																																																																											
<u>US (This Project)</u>	269	200	447	529	404	319	2,168																																																																																																											
Personnel	0	20	43	51	35	40	189																																																																																																											
Participants	0	0	0	6	0	6	12																																																																																																											
Commodities	18	38	6	0	0	0	62																																																																																																											
Other Costs	30	102	183	199	166	165	845																																																																																																											
Contract	221	40	215	273	203	108	1,060																																																																																																											
<u>US (Related)</u>	20	11	0	31	2	2	163																																																																																																											
<u>GOV, Other Costs</u>	34	57	83	97	73	77	421																																																																																																											
<u>Other Donors</u>	71	296	351	476	380	284	1,858																																																																																																											
Technicians	6	34	20	26	26	26	146																																																																																																											
Other Costs	65	262	325	450	354	258	1,712																																																																																																											
TOTAL	394	564	978	1133	679	682	4,630																																																																																																											

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	Supplement to (Number) 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 30 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

VI. Revised Logical Framework

A. Project Goal

1. Statement of Goal

The goal toward which the Vihiga sub-program and other elements of the overall Special Rural Development Program are working is a broad national capability to formulate and execute an efficient, pragmatic, and equitable national economic development program with a conscious emphasis on rural development.

2. Measurement of Goal Achievement

a. Effective area-based input into overall and sectoral planning, implementation, and evaluation relating to Kenyan national development.

b. Recognition of equality of social and economic opportunity as a basic criterion for evaluating alternative development policies and programs.

c. Field-oriented, operationally-inclined responsiveness in all central government offices.

d. Increasing evidence that the overall development impact of sectoral programs is being multiplied by the establishment of effective horizontal linkages between them.

e. Indications of increasing drive and capability - intellectually and organizationally - of action agents at middle and low levels to exert the type of effective pressure at higher levels that forces reasonable responsive action and support.

f. Evidence of an emerging development state of mind at all levels.

3. Assumption Related to Goal Achievement

Sustained high-level GOX policy support for the Special Rural Development Program.

B. Project Purpose

1. Statement of Purpose

The purpose of the Vihiga sub-program is to carry out a number of experimental and other projects at the Division level with a view to contributing toward national rural development goal achievement:

a. by testing out new methods, new techniques, new combinations, new sequences, etc., as prototypes for possible eventual replication elsewhere.

b. by providing an operational milieu in which a local staff and a local system can develop as part of a national staff and system.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to ^{number} <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 31 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	----------------------

2. End of Project Status

By the Vihiga sub-program's terminal date of June 30, 1976 it is intended to have planned, implemented, and evaluated some 26 local projects. These are described in detail in Part VIII of this supplemental paper. Some of the projects are experimental, the others are not. Some relate to physical production, others are supporting. Some are already underway, others are still being mounted.

Judgments as to whether or not individual activities have been successful will be based on a variety of indicators such as production, yield, income, employment, cost, and efficiency (Part VIII). The ultimate criterion of success for those activities which are experimental in nature will be the extent of their actual replication.

Overall, although Vihiga development is not the purpose of the project, the degree of the project's success can be measured in part by such macro indicators as overall Vihiga Division production, employment, and income. Presumably the individual activities in the project will lead to increased efficiency in the utilization of total available resources.

With regard to the development of staff and system (point b above), the conditions being sought by June 30, 1976 are the following:

a. An upgraded Vihiga Division administrative organization with adequate staff and motivation to focus on and coordinate development activities of all government entities operating in the Division. The District Officer (administrative head of this lowest-level central government organization) is assisted in day to day planning and follow-up by an Area Coordinator whose full time job is development.

b. An upgraded, development-oriented Vihiga Division Committee which will undertake monthly reviews of development program progress. The committee is chaired by the District Officer (Vihiga Division) and composed of the SRDP Area Coordinator, geographic and technical chiefs, the three local Members of Parliament, municipal officials, leaders of private groups, and foreign technical advisors.

c. A dynamic Vihiga Division agricultural extension service with motivation, know-how, mobility, career status, training opportunities, promotion potential, honest and effectively functioning upward and downward communications channels with the District and the Province, and the respect of farmers.

d. A Vihiga Division Community Development organization made up of well-trained and highly motivated civil servants and local leaders possessed of the capability and the wherewithal to organize, train, stimulate, guide, supply, and supervise self-help groups and other local initiatives in the selection, design, and implementation of effective, development-oriented local activities which are desired by and needed by the local communities and also fit logically into larger development strategies.

e. Effective integration of the three local Members of Parliament into the Division-level program planning and implementation system through participation in Development Committees and other means.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION

 ORIGINAL REVISION

Supplement to (Number)

DATE

1/30/73

PAGE 32 of 104 PAGES

f. A Vihiga Division system of skill training, employment opportunity, and entrepreneurship development based on the Keveya and Maseno Village Polytechnics and working upward in a coordinated fashion toward the Kakamega Rural Industrial Development Center with a view to training rural youth and adults for actual jobs relating to carefully analyzed agricultural/industrial development of the area as a whole.

g. Organization of public-spirited, experienced private citizens in Kakamega and Kisumu to serve as advisors and sponsors of local development, primarily in the industrial sector, but also in related agricultural enterprises.

h. Revitalization of the four existing agricultural cooperatives or some alternative means for giving focus to the enormous development potential of farmer enlightened self-interest and collaborative potential.

i. Combined Ministry of Health and Family Planning Association of Kenya organization to provide effective Maternal Child Health and Family Planning motivational and clinical services based on the eight local self-help health centers and a powerful local demand for health assistance of many kinds including birth control.

j. Local capability in Vihiga for construction and maintenance of rural roads and other minor works; advised, supervised, and supported by the Ministry of Works.

k. Kenya Tea Development Authority organization and technical support for smallholder production and marketing of tea by the vegetative propagation process in Vihiga Division.

l. Agriculture Finance Corporation organization with capability to administer a variety of small loans to small farmers in Vihiga, including loans secured by the crop.

3. Assumptions Related to Purchase

a. Full acceptance and vigorous implementation by GOK officials and staff of the national policy guidance which gives a high priority to the Special Rural Development Program.

b. Experimental project inputs will be over and above the regular GOK expenditures for personnel, operations, and infrastructure. There will be a continuation of the normal upward trend in these regular GOK expenditures with the rise in GNP and national tax revenues. Experiments will become part of the regular budget if proven successful; or dropped if not.

c. Judgments relating to the relative degree of success and replicability of agricultural project activities will be tempered by an analysis of trends in weather conditions.

d. Maintenance of broad national economic and social policies of a nature that would normally be expected to provide incentives and to stimulate rural income and employment.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION Application to
 ORIGINAL REVISION No. 3DATE
1/30/73PAGE 33 of 104 PAGES**C. Project Outputs****1. Outputs**

In accordance with the dual purpose of the Vihiga sub-program - i.e. a) prototype testing and b) building of staff and system - the outputs of the program also take two forms: a) Production and b) Administration.

Production outputs are sub-projects in Maize Credit, Stockist Inputs Credit, Fertilizer Demonstrations, Grade Cattle, Cattle Dips, Artificial Insemination, Vegetables, Tea, Extension, Land Adjudication, Pigs, Poultry, Cooperatives, Rural Water, Environmental Water, Rural Industries, Village Polytechnics, Roads, Rural Health, Community Development, Social Services, Training, Adult Literacy, Womens Group Activities, Day Care Centers, Rural Electrification, and Telephones.

Administrative outputs include work experience, plans, surveys, budgets, seminars, coordination meetings, implementation reports, phasing forms, and evaluations.

2. Output Indicators

Production and Administration indicators are set forth in the table on the next page. Production indicators relate to the numbers and types of sub-projects being implemented as of the end of each fiscal year and Administration indicators relate to the various planning, implementation and evaluation actions to be accomplished by the staff and the system. Details of these indicators as they apply to the individual sub-projects are provided in Part VIII.

3. Assumptions Related to Outputs

a. Positive leadership on the part of senior Provincial, District, and Division officers in efforts to translate human and physical inputs into organizational outputs.

b. Presence of a number of individuals - Kenyan and/or expatriates - in various positions at the Center and in the field who desire for one reason or another that the program be a success and are willing and able to play a catalytic role to ensure that an actual rural development organization is built from the inputs that have been made available.

c. Collaboration on the part of non-SRDP personnel with the understanding that support of SRDP efforts will constitute a high priority portion of the regular day to day work routine for which they will be judged by their superiors, rather than an extraordinary, extraneous, unnoticed, unappreciated, burdensome addition to their existing full-time workloads.

D. Project Inputs**1. Summary of Inputs****a. USAID (Ref. Table 2), PART IV****(1) Technicians**

Seven technicians, of which three under the FAMU contract,

OUTPUT INDICATORS: PRODUCTION AND ADMINISTRATION

TIME PHASED ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Identification of output and specific Targets FY 70 FY 71 FY 72 FY 73 FY 74 FY 75 FY 76 Projected Total

	FY 70	FY 71	FY 72	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	Projected Total
PRODUCTION (number of sub-projects being implemented as of end of FY)		12	12	22	22	24	23	N.A.
Maize Credit	-	1	1	1	1	2	1	
Fertilizer Demonstrations	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Stockist Inputs Credit	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Cattle Dips	-	1	1	1	1	-	-	
Grade Cattle	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Artificial Insemination	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Vegetables	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Tea	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Pigs	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
Poultry	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
Extension	-	1	1	1	1	1	-	
Land Adjudication	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	
Rural Water	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Environmental Water	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Cooperatives	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
Community Development	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Women's Group Activities	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Social Services Training	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Adult Literacy	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Day Care Centers	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Village Polytechnica	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Rural Health	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Rural Industries	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Labor-Intensive Roads	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	
Rural Electrification	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	
Telephones	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	

ADMINISTRATION

Man Years of Development-Oriented SRDP Work Experience - 10 20 25 25 25 25 130

AID 1028-1A (7-71) (NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION) SUBMISSION SUPPLEMENT TO (Number) DATE 1/30/73 PAGE 34 of 0104 PAGES
 PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147
 ORIGINAL REVISION

Table 4 (Cont'd)

Identification of output and specific Targets	TIME PHASED ACCOMPLISHMENTS							Projected Total
	FY 70	FY 71	FY 72	FY 73	FY 74	FY 75	FY 76	
Original and Revised Overall Plans Prepared for Vihiga Division	1	-	-	2	1	1	-	5
Economic Surveys Completed	-	1	-	-	1	1	1	4
Vihiga SRDP Budgets Prepared	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
SRDP Seminars Conducted	1	-	1	3	-	2	2	11
Monthly Division Level SRDP Coordination Meetings Conducted	-	-	10	12	12	12	12	58
Monthly Implementation Reports Prepared	-	-	10	12	12	12	12	58
Annual Phasing Forms Prepared for Individual Program Elements	-	5	5	22	22	24	22	100
Annual Implementation Reviews Prepared	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	5
Annual Evaluation Reviews Prepared	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	5
Half-Year Implementation Reviews Prepared	-	-	-	1	1	1	1	4
Annual Overall SRDP Evaluations Conducted	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	5

PROJECT NUMBER 810-147

SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)

 ORIGINAL REVISION

DATE 1/30/73

PAGE 36

of 104

PAGES

i.e. Rural Development Advisor/Chief of Party, Agricultural Extension Advisor, and Agricultural Economist/Marketing Advisor. Also an AID/W-funded Program Analyst at the project site, a project-funded Roads Engineer at the project site, a project-funded District Planning Officer at the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Rural Development Project Officer at USAID.

(2) Short-Term Advisors

Seventeen in total including seven in FY 1971 to help start up the program, including three Rural Development Advisors, two Rural Industries Advisors, one Community Development Advisor, and one Maize Credit Advisor. The FAMU contract projections provide for one short-term advisor in FY 1973 and three per annum from FY 1974 through FY 1976.

(3) Participants

Third country training for four Kenyans in FY 1974 and four more in FY 1975 for the purpose of carrying out analytical comparative rural development systems studies in other developing countries.

(4) Commodities

and Six vehicles, of which five are funded under the Rural Development Project/one under Population Dynamics. Also \$44,000 for the labor intensive roads program.

(5) Local Currency

Funding in shillings for our Kenyan S.R.D.P. staff members, gasoline for Ministry of Agriculture field staff, and operational support for experimental programs in maize credit, cattle dips, vegetables, tea, training, roads, rural industries, village polytechnics and family planning. The latter is funded from the Population Dynamics project.

b. GOK (Ref. Table 1 Expenditures)

(1) Staff

1 Area Coordinator, 6 Agricultural Assistants, 5 Home Economics Assistants, 1 Senior Animal Health Assistant, 2 Animal Health Assistants, 1 Assistant Community Development Officer, 1 Adult Education Supervisor, 1 Clerical Officer, 2 copy typists, and 3 Drivers.

(2) Support

Part-time support on matters of policy, planning, operations, and evaluation from many GOK offices at national provincial, district, division, location, and sublocation levels from the Office of the President, S.R.D.P. National Staff, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Commerce and Industry, Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services, Ministry of Works, Ministry of Power and Communications, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Kenya Industrial Estate, Kenya Tea Development Authority, Institute for Development Studies, the Provincial

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION Supplement to
 ORIGINAL REVISION No. 3 (Number)DATE
1/30/73PAGE 37 of 104 PAGES

Commissioner of Western Province and his staff, the District Commissioner of Kakamega District and his staff, and the District Officer for Vihiga Division and his staff.

(3) Administrative Costs

Current funding for buildings and minor works, maintenance and running, transportation and travel, and upkeep.

(4) Program Funding

Local currency program funding for community development cooperatives, day care centers, land adjudication, pigs, poultry, telephones, village polytechnics, social services training, adult literacy, and womens activities elements of the program.

c. Other Donors (Ref. Table 1, Part IV)

(1) Technicians

Six Partnership for Productivity rural industries advisors (partially financed by USAID), one FAO fertilizer advisor, and one Rockefeller resident evaluator who has departed.

(2) Local Currency

Other donor operational contributions have included FAO Fertilizer, FAO Stockist Input Credit, World Bank International Development Association (IDA) Grade Cattle, SIDA Artificial Insemination, SIDA Rural Water, UNICEF Environmental Water, and Partnership for Productivity.

2. Schedule of Inputs

a. USAID

(1) Technicians

Ideally all seven of the AID full-time technicians would have been on board shortly after the project was initiated in July 1970. The actual dates of assignment to the project were as follows:

Rural Development Advisor	December 1971
Project Officer	January 1972
Agricultural Extension Advisor	February 1972
Agricultural Economist	May 1972
District Development Officer	May 1972
Program Analyst	October 1972
Roads Engineer	January 1973

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-187	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement</u> <u>18</u> (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 38 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

The damage caused by the delays in assignment was reduced somewhat by the following factors:

a) Project operations without full-time advisors built up Kenyan initiative and confidence.

b) U.S. short-term advisors were assigned in a timely fashion, were of high quality, and were very successful.

c) The Project Officer was on board at USAID at the start of the project in a different capacity and was able to devote about half time to the project.

d) The District Development Officer was performing his present duties from the start of the project as a Peace Corps Volunteer. However, the position was vacant for six months while a TransCentury contract was being negotiated for this same individual.

e) Some of the functions of the present Program Analyst were performed by an Institute for Development Studies (IDS)-based, Rockefeller-funded Area Evaluator who was on board from the start of the project until January 1972, leaving a gap of nine months.

(2) Short-Term Advisors

Short-term Advisors to help start up the program in FY 1971 were provided on a timely basis as follows:

Rural Development Advisor (Harmon)	July 1970
Rural Development Advisor (Dusenberry)	October 1970
Rural Development Advisor (Johnson)	April 1971
Small Industries Advisor (Reed)	February 1971
Small Industries Advisor (Poling)	February 1971
Maize Credit Advisor (Slotten)	April 1971
Community Development Advisor (Langley)	June 1971

One short-term advisor is projected for FY 1973 and three per annum are projected from FY 1974 through FY 1976 without specific titles or dates.

(3) Commodities

a) The four jeeps for the FAMU contract team arrived in March 1972.

b) The Family Planning van was delivered in October.

c) Funds for the roads commodities, including one vehicle, were obligated in FY 1972, and delivery was planned to coincide as well as possible with the arrival of the Roads Engineer in January 1973. Actual delivery will probably take place in May 1973.

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147SUBMISSION Supplement No. (Number)
 ORIGINAL REVISION 10.3DATE
1/30/73

PAGE 39 of 104 PAGES

(4) Local Currency

Local currency inputs are obligated annually in the Project Agreement. They are provided to the GOK on a reimbursement basis at the end of the fiscal year upon submission of appropriate documentation by the Ministry of Finance and Planning to the USAID Controller.

b. GOK**(1) Staff**

a) GOK staff should have been on board at the start of the program in July 1970. Actually, the Area Coordinator was in place and the presence of an experienced Provincial Planning Officer was most helpful. Technical personnel, however, were generally not available because of funding delays at the Center, shortages of individual technical people and limited outputs from training institutions. In practice, technicians, already at work were assigned S.R.D.P. responsibilities in addition to their regular duties. Also, SRDP work was often performed at the Province and the District levels, rather than at the Division as intended. As of January 1973 there are still many vacancies and the schedule is to fill them as soon as possible.

(2) Other Costs

GOK scheduling of other cost inputs is on a fiscal year basis. In the first year of the program, FY 1971, there were substantial funding delays at the Center. There has been gradual improvement, however, so that, by FY 1973, funding was available at the start of the fiscal year, i.e. in July 1972.

c. Other Donors**(1) Technical Staff**

a) Two technicians provided by other donors were on board at the start of the program in July 1970, i.e. the FAO Fertilizer Advisor and the Rockefeller Resident Evaluator.

b) The first of the six PFP rural industries advisors arrived in November 1970 and the staff was built up to six by June 1971.

d. Other Costs

Other cost inputs have generally been provided expeditiously by the other donors. The schedule by fiscal years is given in Table 1.

3. Assumption Related to Inputs

Ready availability of necessary technical skills for SRDP activities in Kenya or the donor countries, and adequate Kenyan and donor administrative and budgetary capability to recruit and assign appropriate personnel within the time frame required for effective program operation.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement</u> <u>Copy</u> <u>Number</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>40</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	------------------------------------

VII. COURSE OF ACTION

No.	Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates	
			Physical Start	Physical Completion
1	Preparation of Vihiga SRDP Outline Plan	SRDP/HQ	Jan.1970	Jan.1970
2	Selection of U.S. as Donor for Vihiga SRDP Pilot Area	GOK	May 1970	Jun.1970
3	Assignment of Vihiga SRDP Area Coordinator	SRDP/HQ	May 1970	Jun.1976
4	Assignment of Vihiga Area Evaluator (Moock)	IDS	May 1970	Jan.1972
5	Vihiga Participation in Overall SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jun.1970	Jun.1970
6	Official Initiation of Vihiga SRDP	GOK	Jul.1970	Jun.1976
7	Recruitment of Kenyan SRDP Staff for Vihiga	GOK	Jul.1970	Cont.
8	Planning, technical, and administrative guidance and support to Vihiga and other Pilot Areas	SRDP/HQ Nbi.Ministries	Jul.1970	Jun.1976
9	Continuation of Ongoing Kenyan and Other Donor Pr Programs in Vihiga	Field Staff	Jul.1970	Jun.1976
10	Assignment of Rural Development Advisor (Harron) to Vihiga	AID/W	Jul.1970	Sept.1970
11	Preparation of the Harron Report proposing revisions in the Vihiga Outline Plan	Harron	Jul.1970	Sept.1970
12	Preparations for 1971 Vihiga Maize Campaign	Field & Nbi.Staff	Aug.1970	Feb.1971
13	Survey of 600 Vihiga Farmers	Moock	Sept.1970	May 1971
14	Preparation of Original Vihiga PROP	USAID	Sept.1970	Sept.1970
15	Training of Vihiga Extension Staff for 1971 Maize Campaign	Field Staff	Oct.1970	Oct.1970
16	Assignment of Second Rural Development Advisor (Dusenberry)	AID/W	Oct.1970	Dec.1970
17	Submission of FY 1972 Budget to Treasury for Vihiga and other pilot areas	SRDP/HQ	Nov.1970	Nov.1970
18	Preparation and Signature of FY 1971 Vihiga ProAg	USAID MFP	Jan.1971	Jan.1971
19	Negotiation of FAMU Contract	AID/W	Jan.1971	Oct.1971
20	Recruitment of AID long term field advisors	AID/W	Jan.1971	Cont.
21	Preparations for Vihiga Family Planning Program	MOH	Jan.1971	Cont.

No.	Description of Major Actions of Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates	
			Physical Start	Physical Completion
22	Preparations for Vihiga Roads Program	MOU AID/W	Jan. 1971	Cont.
23	Assignment of Small Industries Advisors (Poling and Reed)	AID/W	Feb. 1971	Mar. 1971
24	Preparations for Vihiga Small Industries Program	Poling & Reed	Feb. 1971	Mar. 1971
25	Preparation of Vihiga PROP Revision No. 1 (for Roads Element)	USAID	Mar. 1971	Mar. 1971
26	Implementation of the 1971 Maize Campaign (including collection of loan repayments)	AFC & Vihiga Field Staff	Mar. 1971	Cont.
27	Preparations for 1972 Maize Campaign	Mbi. & Field Staff	Mar. 1971	Feb. 1972
28	Grant Agreement with Partnership for Productivity	USAID PFP	Mar. 1971	Jun. 1976
29	Assignment of Maize Credit Advisor (Slotten)	USAID	Apr. 1971	Apr. 1971
30	Implementation of Small Industries Program	PFP	Apr. 1971	Jun. 1976
31	Assignment of Third Rural Development Advisor (Johnson)	AID/W	May 1971	Jul. 1971
32	Assignment of CD Advisor (Langley)	USAID	Jun. 1971	Jul. 1971
33	Processing of Reimbursement for FY 1971 Vihiga Local Costs	USAID MFP	Jul. 1971	Jul. 1971
34	Vihiga Participation in SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jul. 1971	Jul. 1971
35	Implementation of FY 1972 Programs for Vihiga	Field Staff	Jul. 1971	Jun. 1972
36	Preparations for Vihiga Vegetables Program	Field Staff	Jul. 1971	Sept. 1972
37	Preparation of Vihiga Monthly Implementation Reports	Field Staff	Aug. 1971	Jun. 1976
38	Procurement of Vehicles for FAMU Team	USAID	Aug. 1971	Mar. 1972
39	Preparations for Vihiga Dips Program	MinAg & Field Staff	Sept. 1971	Apr. 1972
40	Assignment of Maize Credit Advisor (Slotten)	USAID	Oct. 1971	Nov. 1971
41	1971 Annual Audit of Vihiga Project	AAG	Oct. 1971	Nov. 1971
42	Preparation of PROP Revision No. 2	USAID	Oct. 1971	Oct. 1972
43	Preparation of FY 1972 Phasing Forms for Individual Vihiga Program Elements	Field Staff	Nov. 1971	Dec. 1971

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147		SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3		DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 42 of 104 PAGES	
No.	Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates			
			Physical Start	Physical Completion		
44	Preparations for Vihiga Tea Program	MinAg & Field Staff	Nov.1971	Sept.1972		
45	Submission of FY 1973 Budget to Treasury for Vihiga and other pilot areas	SRDP/HQ	Nov.1971	Nov.1971		
46	Assignment of Rural Development Advisor and FAMU Team Leader (Holmes) to Vihiga	FAMU	Dec.1971	Jun.1976		
47	Negotiation of Crawford Contract with TransCentury	AID/W	Dec.1971	May 1972		
48	Preparation of Rural Development Chapter of 1974-78 Plan (First Draft) covering Vihiga and other Rural Development	SRDP/HQ	Jan.1972	Jun.1972		
49	Assignment of USAID Project Advisor (Doggett)	USAID	Jan.1972	Jun.1976		
50	Preparation and Signature of FY 1972 ProAg	USAID MFP	Feb.1972	Feb.1972		
51	Assignment of Extension Advisor (Mills) to Vihiga	FAMU	Feb.1972	Jun.1976		
52	Preparation of Overall Extension Program for Vihiga	Field Staff and Mills	Feb.1972	Jun.1972		
53	Preparation of Overall SRDP Evaluation for FY 1972 for Vihiga and other programs	IDS	Feb.1972	Aug.1972		
54	Implementation of the 1972 Maize Campaign (including collection of Loan Repayments)	AFC & Vihiga Field Staff	Mar.1972	Feb.1974		
55	Preparations for the 1973 Maize Campaign	Nairobi & Field Staff	Mar.1972	Feb.1973		
56	Implementation of Dips Program	Field Staff	Apr.1972	Jun.1974		
57	Assignment of Ag Economist (Henrehan) to Vihiga	FAMU	Apr.1972	Jun.1976		
58	Comprehensive Marketing and Profitability Analysis for Vihiga Products	AID Field Staff	Apr.1972	Jun.1974		
59	Assignment of District Development Officer (Crawford)	Trans Century	May 1972	Jun.1976		
60	Preparation of Guidance for the Vihiga Replan through FY 1976	USAID SRDP/HQ	Jun.1972	Jun.1972		
61	Negotiation of Weissel Contract with TransCentury	AID/W	Jun.1972	Sept.197		
62	Preparation of Annual Implementation Review for FY 1972	Field Staff	Jul.1972	Aug.1972		

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147		SUBMISSION <u>Supplement 20</u> (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>		DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>43</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES	
No.	Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates			
			Physical Start	Physical Completion		
63	Processing of Reimbursement for FY 1972 Local Costs	USAID HFP	Jul.1972	Jul.1972		
64	Vihiga Participation in SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jul.1972	Jul.1972		
65	Procurement of Commodities for Roads Program	USAID	Jul.1972	Dec.1972		
66	Implementation of FY 1973 Program	Field Staff	Jul.1972	Jun.1973		
67	Implementation of Tea Program	KIDA and Field Staff	Jul.1972	Jun.1976		
68	Implementation of Overall Vihiga Extension Program	Field Staff and Mills	Jul.1972	Jun.1976		
69	Preparation of Vihiga Replan through FY 1976	Field Staff	Jul.1972	Aug.1972		
70	Preparation of Rural Development Chapter of 1974-78 Plan (Revised Draft) for Vihiga and Other Rural Development Programs	SRDP/HQ	Jul.1972	Dec.1972		
71	Vihiga Participation in SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Aug.1972	Aug.1972		
72	Preparation of FY 1973 Phasing Forms for Individual Program Elements	Field Staff	Aug.1972	Nov.1972		
73	Preparation of Annual Evaluation Review for FY 1972	Field Staff	Sept.1972	Oct.1972		
74	Preparation of Half-Year Implementation Review for FY 1973	Field Staff	Sept.1972	Jan.1973		
75	Preparation of FY 1974 Development Estimates for Vihiga	Field Staff	Sept.1972	Oct.1972		
76	Preparation of PROP Revision No.3	USAID	Sept.1972	Oct.1972		
77	Implementation of Vegetables Program	Field Staff	Oct.1972	Jun.1976		
78	Assignment of Program Analyst (Weisel) to Vihiga	TransCentury	Oct.1972	Jun.1976		
79	Negotiation of Bartolo Contract with TransCentury	AID/W	Oct.1972	Dec.1972		
80	Preparation of Original PAR for Vihiga Project	USAID	Nov.1972	Dec.1972		
81	1972 Annual Audit	AAG	Nov.1972	Dec.1972		
82	Preparation of Original Overall PIP for Vihiga Project	USAID	Nov.1972	Nov.1972		

No.	Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates	
			Physical Start	Physical Completion
PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147		SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) 3		DATE 1/30/73
		<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION		PAGE 44 of 104 PAGES
83	Submission of FY 1974 Budget to Treasury for Vihiga and Other Programs	SRDP/HQ	Nov.1972	Nov.1972
84	Test-run of Replan for Ag projects in Vihiga	MinAg	Nov.1972	Dec.1972
85	Preparation of Draft PIO/T Revision for Re-negotiation of FAMU Contract	USAID	Jan.1973	Jan.1973
86	Supplement to PROP Revision No.3 (In response to AID/W comments)	USAID	Jan.1973	Feb.1973
87	Preparation of Monthly Advisory Report to the Area Coordinator	FAMU Team	Dec.1972	Jan.1976
88	Implementation of the Family Planning Program	Field Staff	Jan.1973	Dec.1975
89	Assignment of Rural Roads Engineer (Bartolo) to Vihiga	TransCentury	Jan.1973	Dec.1974
90	Implementation of the Roads Program	MOH and Vihiga Staff	Jan.1973	Dec.1974
91	SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jan.1973	Jan.1973
92	Preparation and Signature of FY 1973 ProAg	USAID MFP	Feb.1973	Feb.1973
93	Preparation of Annual Implementation Review for FY 1973	Field Staff	Feb.1973	May 1973
94	Revision of Vihiga Replan through FY 1976	Nairobi & Field Staff	Feb.1973	Jun.1973
95	Preparation of PIPs for individual AID-financed program elements	AID Field Staff, USAID	Mar.1973	Mar.1973
96	Implementation of the 1973 Maize Campaign (including collection of loan repayments)	AFC & Vihiga Field Staff	Mar.1973	Feb.1974
97	Preparations for the 1974 Maize Campaign	Nairobi & Field Staff	Mar.1973	Feb.1974
98	Program Evaluation (preliminary to PAR)	AID Field Staff	May 1973	May 1973
99	Preparation of FY 1973 PAR	USAID	Jun.1973	Jul.1973
100	Preparation of Annual Evaluation Review for FY 1973	Field Staff	Jun.1973	Aug.1973
101	Preparation of FY 1974 Phasing Forms for Individual Vihiga Program Elements	Field Staff	Jun.1973	Jul.1973

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147		SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3		DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 45 of 104 PAGES	
No.	Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates			
			Physical Start	Physical Completion		
102	Preparation of PROP Revision No.4	USAID	Jun.1973	Jul.1973		
103	Processing of Reimbursement for FY 1973 Local Costs	USAID MFP	Jul.1973	Jul.1973		
104	Preparation of Overall PIP Revision No.1	USAID	July 1973	Jul.1973		
105	SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jul.1973	Jul.1973		
106	Implementation of FY 1974 Program	Field Staff	Jul.1973	Jun.1974		
107	Preparation of Revision No.1 of PIPs for individual program elements	AID Field Staff	Aug.1973	Sept.1973		
108	Preparation of Overall SRDP Evaluation for FY 1973 for Vihiga and Other Programs	IDS	Sept.1973	Nov.1973		
109	Preparation of Half-Year Implementation Review for FY 1974	Field Staff	Sept.1973	Jan.1974		
110	Preparation of FY 1975 Development Estimates	Field Staff	Sept.1973	Oct.1973		
111	1973 Annual Audit	AAG	Nov.1973	Dec.1973		
112	Submission of FY 1975 Budget to Treasury for Vihiga and other Programs	SRDP/HQ	Nov.1973	Nov.1973		
113	Preparation and Signature of FY 1974 ProAg	USAID MFP	Dec.1973	Dec.1973		
114	SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jan.1974	Jan.1974		
115	Preparation of Annual Implementation Review for FY 1974	Field Staff	Feb.1974	May 1974		
116	Implementation of the 1974 Maize Campaign (including collection of loan repayment)	AFC & Vihiga Field Staff	Mar.1974	Feb.1976		
117	Preparations for the 1975 Maize Campaign	Nairobi & Field Staff	Mar.1974	Feb.1975		
118	Preparation of PROP Revision No.5 (Phase II)	USAID	May 1974	Jun.1974		
119	Program Evaluation (preliminary to PAR)	AID Field Staff	Jun.1974	Jun.1974		
120	Preparation of Annual Evaluation Review for FY 1974	Field Staff	Jun.1974	Aug.1974		
121	Preparation of FY 1975 Phasing Forms for Individual Program Elements	Field Staff	Jun.1974	Jul.1974		

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 46 of 104 PAGES
<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION		

Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates	
		Physical Start	Physical Completion
2 Processing of Reimbursement of for FY 1974 Local Costs	USAID MFP	Jul.1974	Jul.1974
3 Preparation of FY 1974 PAR	USAID	Jul.1974	Aug.1974
4 SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jul.1974	Jul.1974
5 Revisions of Comprehensive Marketing and Profitability Analysis	AID Field Staff	Jul.1974	Jun.1976
6 Preparation of Overall PIP Revision No.2	USAID	Jul.1974	Jul.1974
7 Implementation of FY 1975 Program	Field Staff	Jul.1974	Jun.1975
8 Preparation of Revision No.2 of PIPs for Individual AID-financed Program Elements	AID Field Staff	Aug.1974	Sept.1974
9 Preparation of Overall SRDP Evaluation for FY 1974	IDS	Sept.1974	Nov.1974
0 Preparation of Half-Year Implementation Review for FY 1975	Field Staff	Sept.1974	Jan.1975
1 Preparation of FY 1975 Development Estimates	Field Staff	Sept.1974	Oct.1974
2 1974 Annual Audit	AAG	Nov.1974	Dec.1974
3 Preparation and Signature of FY 1975 ProAg	USAID MFP	Nov.1974	Nov.1974
4 Submission of FY 1976 Budget to Treasury	SRDP/HO	Nov.1974	Nov.1974
5 SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jan.1975	Jan.1975
6 Preparation of Annual Implementation Review for FY 1975	Field Staff	Feb.1975	May 1975
7 Implementation of the 1975 Maize Campaign (including collection of loan repayments)	AFC & Vihiga Field Staff	Mar.1975	Jun.1975
8 Preparations for the 1976 Vihiga Maize Campaign	Nairobi & Field Staff	Mar.1975	Feb.1976
9 Program Evaluation (preliminary to PAR)	AID Field Staff	Jun.1975	Jun.1975
10 Preparation of Annual Evaluation Review for FY 1975	Field Staff	Jun.1975	Aug.1975
11 Preparation of FY 1976 Phasing Forms for Individual Program Elements	Field Staff	Jun.1975	Jul.1975

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	Supplement to 3 (Number)	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 47 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	--------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

No.	Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates	
			Physical Start	Physical Completion
142	Processing of Reimbursement for FY 1975 Vihiga Local Costs	USAID MFP	Jul.1975	Jul.1975
143	Preparation of FY 1975 PAR	USAID	Jul.1975	Aug.1975
144	SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jul.1975	Jul.1975
145	Preparation of Overall PIP Revision No.3	USAID	Jul.1975	Jul.1975
146	Implementation of FY 1976 Program	Field Staff	Jul.1975	Jul.1975
147	Preparation of Revision No.3 of PIPs for Individual Program Elements	AID Field Staff	Aug.1975	Sept.1975
149	Preparation of Overall SRDP Evaluation for FY 1975	IDS	Sept.1975	Nov.1975
149	Preparation of Half-Year Implementation Review for FY 1976	Field Staff	Sept.1975	Jan.1976
150	Preparation and Signature of FY 1976 ProAg	USAID MFP	Oct.1975	Oct.1975
151	1975 Annual Audit	AAG	Nov.1975	Dec.1975
152	SRDP Seminar	SRDP Staff	Jan.1976	Jan.1976
153	Preparation of Final SRDP Evaluation for Vihiga and other programs	IDS	Jan.1976	Jun.1976
154	Preparation of Annual Implementation Review for FY 1976	Field Staff AFC Vihiga Field Staff	Mar.1976	Jun.1976
153	Implementation of the 1976 Maize Campaign	PC & Vihiga Field Staff	Mar.1976	Jun.1976
156	Program Evaluation (for PAR)	AID Field Staff	Apr.1976	Apr.1976
157	Preparation of Annual Evaluation Review for FY 1976	Field Staff	May 1976	Jun.1976
158	Preparation of FY 1976 PAR	USAID	May 1976	Jun.1976
159	1976 Annual Audit	AAG	May 1976	Jun.1976
160	Processing of Reimbursement for FY 1976 Local Costs	USAID MFP	Jun.1976	Jun.1976
161	SRDP Seminar to Review the Total Experience in Vihiga and Other Areas	SRDP Staff	Jun.1976	Jun.1976

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)		DATE	PAGE 48 of 104 PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	1/30/73	

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: MAIZE CREDIT

A. Purpose

A test systems for achieving substantial increases in smallholder yields and production of maize through the design and effective application and coordination of an optimum mix of inputs including seeds, fertilizer, pesticides, extension training, planting time, cultivation practices, storage, and markets.

B. Description

To achieve the above purpose, the strategy followed focuses upon:

1. providing the availability of credit (in the form of farm inputs) to smallholders;
2. providing extension services aimed at teaching the farmers a new maize technology.

This strategy is based upon the assumptions that the active constraints facing smallholders involve either a cash flow problem (not sufficient financial resources at the necessary times to purchase improved maize inputs), and thus the need for credit, or a lack of knowledge concerning the proper use of improved inputs as well as knowledge of the probable economic return from their use. The strategy is designed to overcome these two constraints.

The experimental component of the project largely revolves around:

1. The attempt to formulate a workable credit program which can be utilized by the low-income farmer, and
2. Devising effective extension techniques which, with limited staff, can reach large numbers of farmers.

To achieve (a), above, a credit scheme has been devised which makes available to the farmer a "package" of maize inputs and, for him to receive this credit, requires only that he produce a minimum of one acre of maize. The loan is to be paid back after the maize crop is harvested and sold. Thus, the scheme requires none of the usual "hard" collateral typical of normal commercial credit, and, in effect, puts the loan within the reach of the smallholder.

To reach large numbers of farmers with extension services a combination of both group and individual extension methods are being tested, e.g., group meetings followed-up by farm visits to selected farms, group demonstrations, and audio-visual methods of information dissemination to large numbers.

C. Progress

Over the two years during which this project has been implemented considerable tangible progress has been made. Specifically:

1. Whereas prior to the inception of the program and during its first year

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	Supplemental to 3 (Number)	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 49 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-------------------------------	-----------------	----------------------

any organized extension effort was largely non-existent, for the 1973 credit and extension effort the extension staff has either already accomplished or plans the following:

- a. Printing and circulating announcements for and information concerning the maize program;
- b. Assistance to farmers applying for the loans and explanation of the credit terms to them;
- c. Scheduling in an orderly fashion and carrying out group extension activities, e.g. group demonstrations;
- d. Following-up the group activities with assistance to individual farmers who express true need and desire.

2. During the first two years of the credit scheme a continual bottleneck to the program was the effective participation of the stockists. Stockists were discouraged from participating because of the great lag-time between crediting the inputs to the farmers and being repaid by the institution granting the loan (AFC). They, further, were given no economic incentive to become involved in the program other than possible increased volume of business (an incentive which, given the problem confronting the stockists of limited working capital, was hardly sufficient).

The 1973 loan is, at least, partially, addressing these problems by allowing stockists to claim reimbursement not from AFC but directly and immediately from their wholesale suppliers. No stockists will be required to tie up large amounts of their working capital for long periods of time.

3. Whereas in 1971 and 1972 expressed farmer interest in the credit scheme was limited, in 1973 far more farmers are applying for loans than it will be possible to accommodate (due to limited funds). This increased interest is an indication to some extent of felt need for the program on the part of the farmer and of successful implementation of the smallholder program.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Number of loans	500	1,200	2,000	3,000
Total Acreage	1,500	3,600	6,000	9,000
Percentage of Repayment	80	80	80	80
Average Yields in Bags per Acre	15	16	17	18

2. Qualitative

The following data are needed with which to measure the progress of the

projects.

a. To measure the effect of the project on increasing maize output, a proxy variable is needed to estimate the extent to which farmers who utilized the credit and/or the extension services would have purchased the improved inputs and learned their use had the project not existed. Such a variable cannot be easily defined. The following information is needed as a component of such measure:

- estimate of the increase in yield between using no improved inputs and utilizing the credit package.
- history of the use by the farmers of improved inputs.
- attitudes of farmers and their use of improved inputs had the credit program not existed and had the extension services not been available.

b. The facility with which the farmers received loans: how and when was information concerning the loan communicated to them and at what time did they obtain coupon books.

c. Understanding of the farmer re the terms of the loans: interest charge, repayment date.

d. Reasons for difference between applications made and loans approved.

e. Availability of adequate stocks by stockists; timing of available stocks.

f. Cost of inputs to the farmer.

g. Record of extension services rendered: group demonstrations conducted, numbers participating, actions taken, visits to farms, actions taken.

h. Where farmers learned of improved maize inputs (by input) and the technology of their use.

i. Proxy variable for the size of the farmer (was he a "smallholder"?)

Note: the above data are designed to measure the progress of the project over time. They do not include certain baseline data or data relating to special problems concerning the appropriateness of the project strategy.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the maize credit program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
15	22	56	73	97	263	

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)		DATE	PAGE	of	PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	1/30/73	51	of	104

These amounts are to be used for loans to individual Vihiga farmers administered by the Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC) for the purchase of hybrid seed, fertilizer and DDT. The cost of these inputs per acre is the local currency equivalent of approximately \$23, broken-down as follows:

Seed	2
Fertilizer	20
DDT	<u>1</u>
Total	23

Assuming 80 percent repayment each year of the loans made in the previous year and also assuming an average acreage of three per loanee, these funding projections would permit the following estimated acreages and numbers of farmers served by the program:

	<u>Collections</u>	<u>New Funds</u>	<u>Total Funds</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Farmers</u>
FY 73	12	22	34	1,500	500
FY 74	27	56	83	3,600	1,200
FY 75	66	73	139	6,000	2,000
FY 76	111	97	208	9,000	3,000

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Funding Allocation to AFC	MinAg	Dec.1 72	Jan.15 73
2. Preparation of Revised Cost Estimates per acre	MinAg DAO AAOs	Sept.1 72	Sept. 30 72
3. Approval of Revised Cost Estimates per acre	MinAg MFP AFC	Oct.1 72	Oct.30 72
4. Publicity to Prospective Loanees	AAOs DO Chiefs	Sept.15 72	Nov.30 72
5. Distribution of Applications	AAOs	Nov.1 72	Nov. 30 72
6. Checking of Applications	AAOs	Nov.1 72	Nov.30 72
7. Review and Approval of Selected Applications	Loans Committee	Dec.1 72	Dec.31 72
8. Assignment of AFC Staff to the Field	AFC	Sept.1 72	Sept.30 72
9. Visits to Stockists	AAOs	Sept.1 72	Sept.30 72

Description of Major Actions or Steps	Primary Action Agent	Target Dates	
		Physical Start	Physical Completion
10. Preparation of List of Selected Stockists	AAOs	Oct.1 72	Oct.30 72
11. Preparation of Land and Checking of Inputs	AAOs	Dec.1 72	Jan.31 73
12. Planting Check	EAOs	Feb.1 73	Apr.15 73
13. Supervision of Top-dressing, Weeding, and Insect Control	AAOs	March 1 73	May 15 73
14. Supervision of Harvesting	AAOs	Aug.1 73	Sept.30 73
15. Issuance of Reminder Notices re Loan Repayment	AFC	Aug.1 73	Aug.31 73
16. Collection of Loan Repayments	AFC	Sept.1 73	Sept.30 73

Abbreviations:

MinAg	-	Ministry of Agriculture
DAO	-	District Agricultural Officer
AAO	-	Assistant Agricultural Officer
MFP	-	Ministry of Finance and Planning
AFC	-	Agricultural Finance Corporation
DO	-	District Officer (Vihiga Division)

PROJECT NO.
615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION

 ORIGINAL

Supplement to (Number) 3

DATE
1/30/73

PAGE 53 of 104 PAGES

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: CATTLE DIPS**A. Purpose**

To demonstrate the feasibility of utilizing local self-help to carry out production-oriented development activities filling a specific role in the development plan for the Division as a whole and involving the active collaboration of the Community Development Department with one or more of the technical ministries.

B. Description

Historically, the single most serious problem facing the farmer in Vihiga in milk production has been the high incidence of tick-borne diseases. In instances where the diseases have existed, the milk production of dairy cows typically has been down and the mortality rate of cattle has been higher than would otherwise have been the case.

The dip program is designed to utilize local initiative in addressing this problem. It has been given particular impetus as a support effort to the newly initiated grade cattle project. Eleven localities in Vihiga were selected as appropriate centers for construction of the first group of dips. The localities are providing one half of the cost of construction (while the SRDP is funding the balance) and are to maintain and operate the dips. The construction of an additional eighteen dips is planned for 1973-74.

C. Progress

The target of 11 dips to be constructed during FY 1971-72 was not met; 7 of the total were completed. The remaining 4 were finished by mid FY 1973. The biggest single factor in delaying progress was a lag in both local and GOK contributions. The 1972-73 construction schedule is presently on target.

D. Indicators**1. Quantitative**

- a. 11 dips constructed by end of FY 1972
- b. 10 additional dips constructed by end of FY 1973.
- c. 8 additional dips constructed by end of FY 1974.
- d. Average of 1000 cattle using each dip per month.

2. Qualitative

- a. Record of amounts contributed by localities; timing of contribution.
- b. Timing of opening of dip with attendant hired, number of days per year dip open.
- c. Estimate of pre-dip, post dip mortality rate of cattle.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION	Supplement to (Number) 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 54	104
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION		PAGE	of

d. Estimate of pre-dip, post dip production of milk.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the dips program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Local Self help	4	4	8	7	-	-	23
SRDP (i.e. US)	4	4	8	7	4	-	27
Total	<u>8</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>50</u>

The cost of each dip is the local currency equivalent of about \$1,680 of which half is contributed through local community self-help and half by USAID through SRDP.

One dip was in place before the program started and 21 have been funded in the years FY 1971 through FY 1973. An additional eight are being provided for in the FY 1974 projection, and an allocation of \$4,000 is proposed for FY 1975 to cover various finishing up costs.

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Release of FY 73 Funds	MinAg	Sept.1 72	Sept.30 72
2. Completion of FY 72 Dips	LO	Jul.1 72	Oct.31 72
3. Selection of Sites for FY 73 Dips	LO	Oct.1 72	Oct.15 72
4. Collection of Self-Help Funds	DO, Chiefs, ACDO	Oct.15 72	Dec.31 72
5. Organization of Labor for construction	ACDO, DO Chiefs	Jan.1 73	June 30 73
6. Calling for Tenders	DAO, DC, AC	Dec.1 72	Dec.31 72
7. Signing of Contracts	DAO, AC, DC	Jan.1 73	Jan.6 73
8. Construction	LO	Jan.7 73	Jun.30 73
9. Checking of Construction	LO	Jan.7 73	Jun.30 73
10. Hiring of Dip Attendants	LO	Mar.1 73	Jun.30 73
11. Checking of Dips Operation	LO	Mar.1 73	Continuing

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION _____	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 55 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	------------------------------------

Abbreviations:

MinAg - Ministry of Agriculture
LO - Livestock Officer
DO - District Officer (Vihiga Division)
ACDO - Assistant Community Development Officer
DAO - District Agricultural Officer
DC - District Commissioner
AC - Area Coordinator

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: VEGETABLES

A. PURPOSE

To develop a system for exploiting Vihiga's considerable, but hitherto unorganized, income and employment potential in horticultural products by organizing local production and arranging for its orderly marketing in Vihiga, Kakamega, and Kisumu.

B. Description

A cursory examination of a number of characteristics of Vihiga, e.g. its climatic conditions, population, and the resource endowments of its farmers, suggests that the production of horticultural crops might be potentially attractive. As a result, during the past several months a study of the potential market for these crops has been made in order to determine the economic feasibility of encouraging increased output and organizing the marketing of such output.

A primary aim of this study was to determine if the market was sufficiently large and sufficiently profitable to interest the Horticultural Crops Development Authority (HCDA), a semi-autonomous government body whose function is to develop the production and regulate the marketing of horticultural crops in Kenya, to undertake a vegetable program in Vihiga. The rationale of seeking HCDA involvement revolves largely around the complexities of organizing the production and marketing of perishable produce such as vegetables. To successfully carry out a program the implementing agent would be required to undertake the following:

- provide intensive extension services to producers; advise on which varieties to plant, which crops to produce for the known market, and the proper application of fertilizers and insecticides.
- see that producers have available a steady, reliable supply of inputs.
- Coordinate the production of each crop with the market demand.
- Maintain a central grading and packing station.
- Provide transportation system to be certain that the produce, at the appropriate times, is transported from the farmer to the grading station and from the grading station to the markets.

To successfully accomplish these functions, a well organized and efficient organization is needed. That the SRDP is adequately staffed to carry out such a task seems doubtful. The HCDA, however, is organized to perform precisely these activities. Should they become interested and involved, there would seem to be a good chance of formulating and initiating a sound program.

C. Progress

The market study referred to above has been completed and discussions with the HCDA will be held in February. The conclusions of the research suggest that vegetable program has the potential of being a profitable venture. During the first

PROJECT NO. 815-11-810-147	SUBMISSION		DATE	PAGE	of	PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	1/30/73	57	104	

2-3 years costs would likely exceed returns and the operation would have to be subsidized. Market development within that time should make the activity self sufficient.

If such a program does get underway, the direct SRDP input would (after the period of subsidization) evolve largely around carrying out certain agronomic research and conducting demonstrations for farmers.

D. Indicators

Progress indicators are as follows:

1. Quantitative

- a. Have NCDA agreement and program formulated by mid FY 1974.
- b. Registration of 12 new producers groups by end of FY 1975.
- c. Double vegetable output by end of FY 1975.

2. Qualitative

- a. Inputs used, timing of their use, input shortages.
- b. Extension services provided; timing
- c. Record of produce sold to grading stations; excess produced but not sold, excess demanded but not produced.
- d. Record of produce sold by grading station to markets; excess on hand but not sold, excess demanded but not produced.
- e. Accounting records of the NCDA operation; costs, returns.
- f. Transportation provided; when adequate, when inadequate.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the proposed vegetable program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
-	-	17	17	3	-	37

These amounts are projected to be used primarily to cover the excess of NCDA costs over initial returns. Approximately three thousand dollars in each of the years FY 73 - FY 75 will be expended for agronomic research and demonstrations.

PROJECT NO.

615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION

Supplement to (Number)

DATE

1/30/73

PAGE

39

of 104

PAGES

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Date</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Gather Market data for Feasibility Study:	HCO, MRO	Nov. 1 72	Dec.1 72
2. Analyzing Data and Preparation of Horticultural Crops Report	HCO	Dec.1 72	Jan.15 73
3. Discussions/Negotiations with HCDA	HCO, DAO, PDA	Feb.15 73	March 15 73
4. Assistance with the Formulation of the HCDA Program	HCO, DAO, PDA	Apr.1 73	Aug.15 73
5. Initiation of HCDA Program	HCDA	Oct.1 73	-
6. SRDP Research and Demonstration Activity	HCO, AAO's AA's	Jul.1 73	-

Abbreviations:

HCO - Horticultural Coops Officer
 DAO - District Agricultural Officer
 PDA - Provincial Agricultural Officer
 AAO - Assistant Agricultural Officer
 AA - Agricultural Assistant

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION		Supplement to	DATE	PAGE 59 of 104 PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	3 (Number)	1/30/73	

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: TEA

A. Purpose

To demonstrate that a well-conceived and administered credit program will result in a substantial increase in smallholder tea production by the vegetative propagation method, and thereby contribute to a significant, increase in farmer income.

B. Description

The eastern side of Vihiga Division is a tea development zone as specified in the Kenya Tea Development Orders of 1964. Tea planting started in 1958. By 1970, 974 acres had been established with a production of 50,000 pounds of green leaf per month.

Tea is an excellent cash crop for small farmers. Tea is picked and sold steadily throughout the year. However, there are several limiting factors to the spread of tea acreage on small plots. It is very expensive to establish an acre of tea, whereas it is expensive to collect and deliver to the factory tea from plots of less than one acre. Once tea is planted, there is a lag of 3 to 4 years before any return is realized. Intensive technical assistance is needed with farmers who are unskilled in tea production.

To speed up the rate at which tea acreage was planted, the government proposed that a credit program be operated and be funded under the SRDP. Farmers are to be given loans to finance planting costs. The loan will be repaid when the tea comes into production.

The Kenya Tea Development Authority, the government agency charged with tea development in Kenya, agreed to operate the program. Technical assistance is provided under KTDA and Ministry of Agriculture auspices. KIDA and MOA involvement is aimed at technical and organizational problems, while tea credit is aimed at the outlay and delayed return problems which make farmers reluctant to plant tea.

C. Progress

A selection committee to select farmers has been established by PDA, Western, with KTDA participation. The KTDA has introduced the vegetative propagation method, which allows better quality tea to be more quickly established.

The first year of the program is FY 72-73. The target was to select 227 farmers and to establish 227 new acres. £3,000 were appropriated for the purpose. To date loans have been extended for 217 acres. This would indicate that all £3,000 have been used, as 330X are loaned per acre. The program is therefore ahead of schedule.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. 227 acres established 1972-73, 500 established 1973-74, 500 1974-75,

PROJECT NO. 815-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number) <u>3</u> DATE <u>1/30/73</u>		PAGE <u>90</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	

and 300 1975-76.

- b. 1527 new tea farmers by 1976.
- c. Total tea production in Division raised from 50 to 87 thousand pounds yearly by 1976.
- d. Tea processing plant constructed in area by 1976.
- e. Loan recovery rate at 95% or better.

2. Qualitative

- a. Capacity of extension service to backstop program.
- b. Farmer understanding of loan terms.
- c. Good tea growing practices used.
- J. Stable prices.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the tea program are as follows (in thousands of dollars):

<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
-	-	9	23	23	14	69

These amounts are to be used for loans to individual Vihiga farmers administered by the Kenya Tea Development Authority (KTDA) for the purchase of nursery construction materials and vegetative propagation units including tea cuttings, polythene sleeves and tents. The cost of these inputs per acre is the local currency equivalent of \$46, broken down as follows:

4 Vegetative Propagation Units	37
Nursery Construction Materials	$\frac{9}{46}$

Therefore, these funding projections will permit the following program:

	<u>Number of Farmers</u>	<u>Number of Acres</u>	<u>Loans in Thousands of Dollars</u>
FY 73	200	200	9
FY 74	500	500	23
FY 75	500	500	23
FY 76	300	300	14

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Recruitment and Selection of 200 farmers for FY 73 Program	TO, AAOs, AAs	Apr.15 72	Apr.30 72
2. Interview of Applicants and Approval of Loans	TO, 2 AAOs, AC, DO	Apr.20 72	Apr.30 72
3. Preparation of Nurseries and Building Sheds in which VP units will be rooted	TO, AAOs, AAs	Jun.1 72	Jul.30 72
4. Preparation of Polythene Sleeves to Receive Cuttings	TO, AAO AAs	Jul.1 72	Aug.31 72
5. Supply of Cuttings to Farmers	TO	Aug.1 72	Aug.31 72
6. Follow up on Established Nurseries to Ensure Proper Water and Pest Control	AAs	Aug.1 72	Aug.31 72
7. Recruitment and Selection of 500 Farmers for FY 74 Program	TO, AAOs, AAs	Apr.15 73	Apr.30 73
8. Interview of Applicants and Approval of Loans	TO, 2 AAOs, AC, DO	Apr.20 73	Apr.30 73
9. Land Preparation and Transplanting of FY 73 Program Tea to the Field	TO, AAOs, AAs	May 1, 73	May 31 73
10. Day to Day Supervision	TO, AAOs, AAs	Continuing	

From here on the cycle repeats itself for the FY 74, FY 75, and FY 76 programs.

Abbreviations:

TO - Tea Officer
 AAO - Assistant Agricultural Officer
 AA - Agricultural Assistant
 AC - Area Coordinator
 DO - District Officer (Vihiga Division)

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: EXTENSIONA. Purpose

To determine an ideal mix of training, organizational, motivational, planning, and scheduling inputs into a system for improving the quality and efficiency of a Division level agricultural staff.

B. Description:

This program was originally designed to train extension staff for specific SRDP projects. Extension personnel were to be trained in farm management, credit, efficient distribution of technical inputs, and development of work programs. A series of short courses was run at Bukura Farmers Training Center. 45 extension staff participated in 1970, and 55 in 1971.

The focus of the program has now changed. It is now proposed to determine the amounts of extension workers' time devoted to alternative projects; to rank alternative extension projects according to a system of priorities, and then to allocate available extension time according to the system of priorities.

The objective of this exercise would be efficient allocation of extension time among priority GOK projects. The exercise would also indicate time available for new projects and would reveal gaps in extension coverage.

The program requires that a very careful survey of extension activities be undertaken. Subsequently, it requires complete and thorough long range planning.

C. Progress

A study of staff time devoted to extension activities is now in progress at the Provincial level in Western Province. MOA in Nairobi is very enthusiastic about this project and is pushing hard on it.

D. Indicators

- a. Study completed by 6/30/74.
- b. Priority items designated by 1/1/74
- c. Plan finished and operational by 1/1/75

E. Budget

The annual costs of the extension program in Vihiga are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) 3 DATE 1/30/73		PAGE 63 of 104 PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>FY 77</u>
<u>GOK</u>	32	21	41	52	38	42	226
Kenyan SRDP Staff	11	8	12	18	21	26	96
Bldgs and Works	12	12	27	27	14	11	103
Vehicles	9	-	1	4	1	2	17
Local Transport	-	1	-	1	1	1	4
Upkeep	-	0	1	2	1	2	6
<u>USAID</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>17</u>
Kenyan SRDP Staff	3	6	6	6	6	6	33
Training	2	6	2	3	3	3	19
Gasoline	2	4	4	4	5	6	25
TOTAL	<u>39</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>303</u>

F. Course of Action

<u>Descriptions of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Design study	MinAg	Jul.1 72	Dec.31 72
2. Undertake Study	MinAg, AEA	Jan.1 73	June 30 74
3. Designate Priorities	MinAg	Jan.1 73	Jan.1 74
4. Complete Final Work Plan	MinAg, AEA	Jul.1 74	Dec.31 74

Abbreviations :

MinAg - Ministry of Agriculture
AEA - Agricultural Extension Advisor

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to (number)</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION _____	<u>01/50/73</u>	PAGE <u>64</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	------------------------------------

C VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: RURAL INDUSTRIES

A. Purpose

To test ways and means of creating a system of local industry development in an upcountry setting of small towns and rural communities involving: 1) the testing of various methods of creating new entrepreneurship and strengthening established entrepreneurship; 2) a search for ideal modes of upward and downward communication between a Province-level Rural Industrial Development Center (RIDC) and actual or potential local entrepreneurs; and 3) efforts to establish effective relationships between the skill training facilities at Village Polytechnics and the actual employee requirements of local entrepreneurs and the services offered by the Province-level RIDC.

B. Description

In recent years there has been a considerable out-migration from Vihiga, particularly of males, seeking employment elsewhere in Kenya. This has resulted, in part, from a dense population in relation to available farm land coupled with lack of non-agricultural employment opportunities within Vihiga. In order to help meet the local demand for employment and so increase local income generation, the Government of Kenya has initiated a program aimed at expanding rural commercial and industrial development.

The strategy followed which is geared to meet this objective involves:

1. Supporting the efforts of the Partnership for Productivity. The PFP provides loans, technical assistance and management guidance to a variety of both new and established businesses. Their emphasis is to develop, through a process of flexible but controlled experimentation, new approaches to small industry promotion and assistance. These approaches, it is hoped, may have some replicability in other areas of rural Kenya, with appropriate adjustments to unit and specific local socio-economic conditions.

2. Coordinating the efforts of the PFP with the development of a local Rural Industrial Development Center. The RIDC, while still in the formulation stage, is intended to initially complement the work of the PFP, and eventually will assume all of the PFP functions.

C. Progress

1. To date PFP has provided assistance to twenty-nine projects, of which nineteen are on-going industrial or commercial enterprises, four are educational and training activities, and six are new projects under consideration or in early stages of development. The activities of the enterprises assisted include, among others, automotive repair, metal working, cloth manufacture, hand screen cloth printing, furniture manufacture, maize milling, fertilizer and seed retailing, and woodworking.

2. Approximately 150 new jobs have been created.

3. The RIDC has made some progress in administrative organization, but is not yet functioning organization.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. 20 new industries assisted in Vihiga by end of FY 1976.
- b. 35 established businesses assisted by end of FY 1976.
- c. Employment generations: 245 jobs created in both new and established enterprises.

2. Qualitative

- a. Estimate of income generated in enterprises assisted.
- b. Data concerning the viability of establishments assisted (financial and with regard to the competence of the management).
- c. Assessment of the relative effectiveness of alternative approaches tried in assisting enterprises.
- d. Information over time concerning the activities assumed by the RIDC and actions taken in coordinating PFP and RIDC work.
- e. Data on employment needs in Vihiga; correlation of these needs with specific training being offered by the village polytechnics.

E. Budget

USAID support for the rural industries element of the program takes the form of a Grant Agreement which covers a portion of PFP's annual costs of operation. Estimates of these costs and the level of USAID support are as follows:

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Total PFP Costs	-	135	139	135	135	135	679
AID Support	-	40	40	64	30	20	194

PFP's projected budget for FY 1974 to cover a staff of seven expatriates plus short-term consultants and eight Kenyan professional and clerical staff engaged in assisting 29 enterprises in Vihiga and nearby areas is as follows (in dollars):

Staff Salaries, Overseas Travel, Residences, Education Allowances, and General Support	79,800
Local Transport of Staff, Local Business, Travel and Business Expenses	31,200
Office Operations	18,000

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 66 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

Experimental Operations Relating to Starting or Improving
Local Enterprises 6,000

Deferred Debt to AAI for FY 1973 Program Evaluation 3,500
TOTAL 138,800

FY 1974 support from sources other than USAID are projected as follows
(in thousands of dollars):

Barclays Development Fund	19
CGK Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services	15
Rockefeller Brothers Fund	21
Quaker One Percent Funds	5
Methodist Overseas Mission Board	5
Ford Foundation	<u>10</u>

TOTAL 75

The residual difference of \$63,500 is requested of USAID. The USAID Director and staff strongly endorse the PFP request in view of PFP's highly efficient and economical contribution to Vihiga program objectives. In future years, however, PFP is aware that it will be necessary to anticipate a declining USAID contribution as Vihiga SRDP moves toward its terminal date of June 30, 1976.

F. Course of Action

<u>Descriptions of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. RIDC Functional	RIDC	Jan 1 72	Jan. 1 74
2. Release PFP Funds	Treasury	Jul. 1 72	Jul. 1 73
3. Search for New Business Projects	PFP, RIDC	Jul. 1 72	Continuous
4. Integrate PFP and RIDC Activities	PFP, RIDC	Jan. 1 74	Jan. 1 78
5. Evaluation of Established Businesses	PFP	Ongoing	

Abbreviations:

PFP - Partnership for Productivity
RIDC - Rural Industrial Development Commission

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>67</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	------------------------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECT: VILLAGE POLYTECHNICS

A. Purpose

To determine the best methods of improving the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of local Village Polytechnics without significantly changing their basic role and character at the local level and without jeopardizing their capability to remain viable over the long term without substantial injections of technical and financial resources from outside the local community.

B. Description

Although the exact magnitude is not known, over the past several years it has become apparent that the number of primary school leavers in Vihiga is rapidly increasing. These students often are not interested in pursuing farming activities (and in many cases employment options in farming are either closed to them or are economically unattractive), and they are not sufficiently skilled to acquire work outside of the agricultural sector. At the same time, it appears that the supply of technicians skilled in vocational trades falls far short of local demand for such skills. Thus, a strong argument has been made for expanding local training facilities to provide school leavers with the skills needed to fill the gap.

This project is aimed at developing viable village polytechnics in Vihiga whose function is to attract and train primary school leavers in basic vocational skills. At present there are two such polytechnics, one at Keveye and another at Maseno. The course offerings include training in carpentry, leather training, shoemaking, tailoring, accounting, mechanics and plumbing. To date SRDP support has been largely through the Partnership for Productivity, and has taken the form of technical assistance in addressing administrative problems, assisting with curriculum development, strengthening and improving the training staff, instructing courses in accounting and mechanics, and identifying employment needs in Vihiga and gearing the polytechnic course offerings to meet such needs.

C. Progress

To date the primary effort has been in improving the operation of the Keveye Polytechnic. Progress during the past two years can be summarized as follows:

1. In 1970-71 enrollment was 36, in 1971-72 it increased to 48, and in 1973 the prospects are that it will double.
2. In 1970-71 there were 4 full-time instructors, in 1971-72 there were 8.
3. In 1972 all 28 graduates were placed within one month after graduation in productive employment.
4. The physical facilities are slowly being improved and needed instruction aids are being provided.
5. It appears that a comprehensive program for upgrading the skills of instructors will be initiated in 1973.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION	Supplement to (Number)	DATE	PAGE	of	PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	3	1/30/73	68	104

D. Indicators

Project progress indicators include the following:

1. Quantitative

- a. Enrollment of 130 students in FY 1973.
- b. 100% of students having completed training are fully employed within two months after course completion.
- c. Increase of 20% in incomes earned by graduates over pre-instruction incomes.
- d. 75% of graduates are utilizing the skills which they studied.

2. Qualitative

- a. Data concerning local employment opportunities and extent to which the training is matching skills needed.
- b. Record of progress of improvements in both physical facilities and instruction needs (tools, texts, etc.) of the polytechnics.
- c. Record of progress in upgrading teachers.
- d. A proxy for the quality of instruction.
- e. A proxy for the extent to which the polytechnics are locally supervised, run and financed.

E. Budget

The Village Polytechnic program in Vihiga is receiving support from the Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services, the National Christian Council of Kenya, and from USAID through Partnership for Productivity approximately as follows (in thousands of dollars):

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
MCSS	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
NCCK	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
PFP	-	6	6	6	6	6	30
TOTAL	4	10	10	10	10	10	54

Requirements take the form of management advice, teaching time, shop construction, equipment, and teaching materials.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>69</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Begin Program to Upgrade Instructors Skills	MCSS PFP	Jul.1 73	Oct.1 73
2. Provide Instructional Aids	MCSS	Jul.1 73	Jul.1 74
3. Experiment with Program	PFP, RIDA	Continuous	
4. Evaluate Program	RIDC, PFP	Continuous	

Abbreviations:

MCSS - Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services

PFP - Partnership for Productivity

RIDC - Rural Industrial Development Commission

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 79 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: ROADS

A. Purpose

To develop replicable techniques and systems for labor-intensive construction of farm-to-market feeder roads.

B. Description

Vihiga is a hilly area. Ministry of Works roads do not reach all parts of the Division. Some areas are reached by footpath only. Communication and movement of produce from farm to market from areas without roads is difficult.

The Ministry of Works has a road construction program in Vihiga. Their roads are machine built and create little local employment. To build a road, MOW must first adopt the road. Procedures are slow, the Ministry has a large backlog of work, and present methods have little income impact on affected areas.

To speed road building and to generate local employment and income, the SRDP proposed to build 6 pieces of road totaling 41 miles in length. Design is basic. Local labor will be extensively used. The roads will be simple, but will be built much more quickly than if done by MOW. It is calculated that they will generate 39,000 days of employment worth \$28,000 income to the workers employed. The project will employ one USAID road engineer for 2 years at a total cost of \$65,000. It will employ 3 supervisory personnel, 3 drivers and a clerk for 2 years at a total cost of \$12,000. It will require 2 dump trucks, 1 tractor, and one jeep, for \$12,000; road fill worth \$20,000; and additional commodities worth \$38,000. The project is to be completed by the end of FY 74.

C. Progress

This program was delayed for months because the USAID road engineer had not arrived in Kenya. He has now arrived and the first stages of the program are underway.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. 41 miles of roads, completed by July 1, 1974.
- b. \$28,000 disbursed in local labor payments.
- c. 39,000 man days labor created.
- d. Per-mile costs of this type of road versus per-mile costs of standard MOW roads.

2. Qualitative

- a. Increased welfare of people served by new roads.
- b. Willingness of MOW to consider this type of road building technique.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	Supplement to (Number) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 71 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	--	-----------------	----------------------

E. Budget

The estimated costs of the labor-intensive roads program are as follows (in thousands of dollars):

	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Imported Commodities	38	6	44
Local Costs	<u>13</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>72</u>
TOTAL	51	65	116

The breakdown of the estimated total is as follows (in dollars):

<u>Imported Commodities</u>	<u>43,509</u>
1 Jeep Wagoneer	5,715
100 Shovels, 100 picks, 20 wheel barrows, 30 axes, and 10 sledge hammers	2,230
2 Dump Trucks	25,064
1 Tractor	10,000
1 Calculating Machine	350
Miscellaneous	150
<u>Local Costs</u>	<u>72,000</u>
Labor for 2 years	28,000
Local Supervisory Staff for 2 years	12,000
Equipment Operation for 2 Years	12,000
Construction Materials	20,000
TOTAL	<u>115,509</u>

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Engineer in Vihige	TC	Jan.22 73	Jan.22,75
2. Clear Building PGM BY NOW	NOW, RE	Jan.22 73	June 1 73
3. Procure Equipment and Commodities	NOW, USAID	Jun.1 72	Jun.1 73
4. Advertise Local Employment	NOW, MOA	May 1, 73	Jun.1 73
5. Surveys Completed	RE, NOW	Feb.1 73	Jan.1 73
6. Construct Roads	RE, SRDP	Jun.1 73	Jan.1 75

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>72</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

Abbreviations:

TC - TransCentury Corporation
RE - Roads Engineer
MOW - Ministry of Works

PROJECT NO. 615-11-310-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>773</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	-------------------------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: FAMILY PLANNING

A. Purpose

To test and evaluate the relative effectiveness of alternative approaches to motivating new acceptors of contraceptive devices and providing clinical services.

B. Description

The Government of Kenya, Ministry of Health, recently completed a five-year operational plan for the national family planning program. This Plan draws on such demographic data as are available from the 1969 census (and subsequently studies of basic census data) and attempts to specify how many and what types of personnel -- including motivational workers, enlisted nurse, registered nurses, and doctors -- will be required to realize any given percentage reductions in the population growth rate by 1976.

A working group of representatives from the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Finance and Planning, and USAID was established in December, 1971 and charged with devising a special family planning effort for a rural area of Kenya where alternative approaches to motivational work and the actual providing of family planning services could be intensively studied from the standpoint of effectiveness and comparative costs.

The target area selected was Vihiga, primarily because, as one of the GOK's SRDP areas, it possesses a local administrative structure geared to the implementation and evaluation of experimental programs, and because Vihiga is one of the most densely populated rural areas in Kenya.

The strategy to be followed involves testing the following approaches:

1. Low density approach - designated clinics will provide periodic family planning clinics and more remote areas will be reached periodically by a mobil clinic unit.
2. Medium intensity approach - certain clinics will provide full-time family planning services administered by midwives who are trained in family planning techniques.
3. High intensity approach - other clinics will receive additional trained staff and women accepting contraceptive devices will receive follow-up visits by motivation workers.

C. Progress

The Vihiga family planning program is a national pilot program. One of its greatest achievements to date is that members of Ministry of Health officials now realize its importance for future family planning programs. It will have large impact on the direction of family planning in Kenya.

The program requires eight motivation personnel positions and 4 clinical staff positions.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to (Number)</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>74</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

Recruitment and hiring of the eight motivation workers is complete. They are now attending a training course which will be complete on 5/2/73.

Recruitment of the 4 clinical staff is now underway.

Related material requirements, such as staff housing, vehicles, and supplies, have been procured.

The program will get underway in May.

A major problem to date has been that administrative procedures in the Ministry of Health have been very slow.

D. Indicators

Data needed with which to evaluate the experimental approaches detailed in B above are:

1. The number of new patient visits (per clinic).
2. The distance from the acceptor's home to the clinic for each new contraceptive acceptor.
3. The method of referral.
4. The type of contraceptive used.
5. Age.
6. Level of education.
7. Number of living children.
8. Number of children who died.
9. Both male and female attitudes concerning contraceptive use.
10. Family members who make decisions concerning contraceptive use.
11. History of contraceptive use; if previously stopped, why?

E. Budget

The costs of this program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Staff	-	16	17	33
Equipment and Supplies	-	4	3	7
Housing Allowances	-	2	2	4
Training	-	3	1	4
Operations	-	5	6	11
Vehicles	11	-	-	11

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number) <u>3</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>75</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

Total 11 30 29 70

These expenses, however, are not charged to USAID Project Number 147, Rural Development - Vihiga. They are covered under another project entitled Population Dynamics, Number 141.

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Final Program cleared and agreed on	MOH, MFP, USAID		Jan.1 73
2. Staff Recruitment	MOH, SRDP	Oct.1 72	Feb.1 73
3. Commodity Procurement	MOH	Jan.1 73	Jun.1 73
4. Training Completed	MOH	Jan.1 73	May 1, 73
5. Publicity	SRDP, MOH	Jan.1 73	Continuous
6. Evaluation	MOH, IDS, PA	Jan.1 73	Jun.30 76

Abbreviations:

- MOH - Ministry of Health
- MFP - Ministry of Finance and Planning
- IDS - Institute for Development Studies
- PA - Program Analyst

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 76 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: STOCKIST INPUTS CREDIT (FAQ)

A. Purpose

To develop a system for providing credit from commercial banks to stockists as a complementary approach to the SRDP/USAID maize credit program under which AFC makes credit available to farmers in the form of inputs provided by stockists.

B. Description

The tonnage of fertilizer sold in Vihiga Division is increasing by more than 100% per year. Fertilizer is sold through retail stores whose operating capital resources are often small. Large stocks of items having peak demand times cannot be acquired by storekeepers with limited operating capital. Fertilizer has peak demand at planting time. Thus there is an operating capital constraint restraining growth of fertilizer use in Vihiga.

The FAO proposes to solve this problem by opening lines of credit with commercial banks for selected Vihiga stockists. The stockists would then be able to make fertilizer available in quantity at planting time. The program will remove a large bottleneck to increased use of fertilizers.

C. Progress

10 stockists have been included for this year. Arrangements with Kenya Commercial Bank are being finalized.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. Target number of stockists each year receive loans.
- b. Quantity of fertilizer stocked under loan.
- c. Quantity of fertilizer sold under loan.
- d. Repayment Rate.
- e. Increase in tonnage sold over tonnage sold before program began.

2. Qualitative

- a. Receptiveness of stockists to credit arrangements.
- b. Stockist understanding of loan.
- c. Attitudes at the bank toward the stockists.

E. Budget

The annual costs of this sub-project are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>73</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------	------------------------------------

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
-	-	4	8	13	14	39

These projects are based on the following estimates of the numbers of participating stockists and the average amounts of the loans:

	<u>Number of Stockists</u>	<u>Average Loan \$ Equivalent</u>	<u>Total Loan \$ Equivalent</u>
FY 73	10	420	4,200
FY 74	15	560	8,400
FY 75	20	630	12,600
FY 76	20	700	14,000

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Agreement on Loan Arrangements with the Kenya Commercial Bank.	MinAg, FAO	Apr.1 72	May 15 72
2. Selection of Stockists through Publicity Campaign and Distribution of Information Sheets	FAO	Jul.1 72	Sept.15 72
3. Discussions with Other Banks	MinAg, FAO	Aug.15 72	Sept.15 72
4. Estimation of the Quantities of Inputs Required	MinAg	Aug.15 72	Sept.15 72
5. Placement with Suppliers of Orders for Required Inputs	FAO	Aug.15 72	Sept.15 72
6. Completion of Loan Applications by Stockists	FAO	Sept.15 72	Nov.1 72
7. Submission of Loan Applications to the Bank	FAO	Sept.15 72	Nov.1 72
8. Review and Approval of Loan Applications	Bank	Oct.1 72	Nov. 30 72
9. Signature of Loan Agreements by Stockists	Bank	Oct.1 72	Nov.30 72
10. Distribution of Inputs to Stockists	FAO	Jan.1 73	Jan.15 73
11. Collection of Loan Repayments	Bank	Feb.15 73	Jul.15 73

Abbreviations:

MinAg-Ministry of Agriculture

FAO - FAO Officer (i.e. Technical Assistance Advisor in Vihiga)

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 78 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: FERTILIZER (FAO)

A. Purpose

To demonstrate the effectiveness of proper fertilizer inputs in the achievement of increased maize yields.

B. Description

Vihiga has 1500 people per square mile. The land is cropped two to three times per year, maize is the predominant crop. Hybrid maize was unknown prior to 1966, while fertilizers were little known prior to that date. The soils have been exhausted. Unfertilized maize yields are often poor.

The SRDP, collaborating with the FAO fertilizer program in Kenya, proposed to undertake a series of demonstration plots throughout the Division. 100 demonstration plots were to be planted per year. Half of each plot was to be planted to hybrid maize at a rate of 60-60-0 kg. per acre, half of the plot at 0-0-0. FAO was to provide fertilizer and overall supervision. It was hoped that hybrid maize together with fertilizer on the exhausted soils and with close extension supervision of the plots would have great educational impact in demonstrating the use of fertilizers and proper cultural practices to improve yields.

The program was originally designed as part of the 600 farmer program, but has been widened in subsequent years. The target now is to expose as many Vihigans as possible to the dramatic differences between fertilized and unfertilized maize.

C. Progress

100 plots were selected and 85 planted during 1970-71. 6 farmers were involved in each plot, for a total of 510 farmers. 100 more plots were planted in 1971-72, and 100 again are planned for 1972-73. In each case, $\frac{1}{2}$ the plot was fertilized with 60-60-0 kg. per acre, $\frac{1}{2}$ was the 0-0-0 control. Results have been dramatic. Some farmers have demanded compensation for the 0-0-0 control maize because yields were so much poorer than on the fertilized plots.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- 100 plots planted per year.
- Yearly increases in the tonnage of fertilizers sold in Vihiga.
- Number of farmers taking part in demonstrations.
- Yield differences in treated vs. untreated plots.

2. Qualitative

- Capacity of the extension staff to supervise the program.
- Changed attitudes toward fertilizer use.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplemental</u> (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>779</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	--	-----------------	-------------------------------------

E. Budget

The annual costs of the FAO fertilizer demonstration program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
-	15	16	15	16	15	77

The cost of the fertilizer amounts to about \$2,000 annually. Other costs relate to mixing, rebagging, transport, laying out of plots and instructing field people.

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Select Plots	AAO's	Nov.1 72	Feb.1 73
2. Plan Planting and Field Days Schedule	FE, AAO's	Jan.15 73	Feb.1 73
3. Plant Plots	FE, JA's	Feb.10 73	Mar.10 73
4. Carry Out Field Days	AAO's	May 1 73	Jul.15 73
5. Harvest Plots, Record Data	FE's, JA's	Aug.1 73	Oct.1 73

Abbreviations:

- FE - FAO Fertilizer Expert
JA - Junior Agriculturalists

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to (Number)</u> <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>80</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: GRADE CATTLE

A. Purpose

To achieve substantial increases in milk production and sales through the procurement and proper management of grade cattle.

B. Description

There is not enough milk produced in Vihiga to meet local demand. This problem is to be attacked by increasing the number of grade cattle in the Division.

Farmers are often willing to acquire grade cows, but prevented from doing so by high initial cost. A grade cow costs about \$200. The International Development Administration of the UN has made a loan to the Kenya Government. The loan is for credit to purchase grade cows. The loan is being administered through the Agricultural Finance Corporation. A farmer must have a title deed to secure the loan given him to buy the grade cow. He must have a fenced, improved pasture for the cow, and have access to either a cattle dip or to a sprayer. He is then given authority to order a cow and, upon, delivery, charged by AFC with the loan.

C. Progress

136 cows were delivered to Vihiga farmers under IDA loans during 1972-73. The target for 1973-74 is 300 cows with 150 loanes, or 2 cows per farmer. Applications to date are ahead of schedule. There are now 798 grade cows in Vihiga, 136 delivered under IDA loans.

Progress has been held back because the lands office has been slow to register land in Vihiga and therefore title deed acquisition has been slow. Again, many grade cows have died because of poor sanitary conditions for the animals. This leaves the farmer stuck with a big loan, and this has made farmers not in the program reluctant to enter it.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. 150 applications approved per year, 1973 to 1976.
- b. 300 cows delivered per year, 1973 to 1976.
- c. Grade cow mortality reduced from 50 to 10%.
- d. Land adjudication program completed, all Vihiga farmers eligible for loan.

2. Qualitative

- a. Effective livestock extension resulting in lower cow mortality.
- b. Increased farmer willingness to implement approved loans.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 81 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

c. Stable milk prices.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the IDA grade cattle program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
19	19	84	84	84	84	374

These allocations are being used for loans, usually of five years duration, to individual Vihiga farmers, administered by the Agricultural Finance Corporation (AFC) on behalf of the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) for the purchase of grade cattle and supporting facilities. The loans usually amount to the local currency equivalent of about \$200 per cow. IDA funding in FY 1971 and FY 1972 permitted the introduction of 136 grade cattle into Vihiga during that period. The projected loan capabilities from FY 1973 through FY 1976 will make it possible to step up the rate of procurement to 300 cows per annum.

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Publicity	AAOs	Jul.1 72	Continuous
2. Distribution of Loan Applications	AAOs	Jul.1 72	Continuous
3. Processing of Loan Applications	AAOs, DFMO	Jul.1 72	Continuous
4. Approval of Loans	Loan Committee	Jul.1 72	Continuous
5. Organization of Cattle Purchases	DAHO, DFMO	Jul.1 72	Continuous
6. Field Days and Demonstrations	AAOs, LO	Jul.1 72	Continuous
7. Farm Visits	AAOs, LO	Jul.1 72	Continuous

Abbreviations:

AAO - Assistant Agricultural Officer
DFMO - District Farm Management Officer
DAHO - District Animal Husbandry Officer
LO - Livestock Officer

SUBJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)		DATE	PAGE	of	PAGES
	<input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	3	1/30/73	82	104

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: ARTIFICIAL INSEMINATION (SIDA)

A. Purpose

To supplement the IDA Grade Cattle program and other livestock development efforts in a systematic program to improve local Zebu varieties by means of artificial insemination.

B. Description

This program is designed to improve milking capacity of local cows by using semen from superior bulls on native cows to produce superior offspring. The program supplements the IDA grade cow scheme, and probably has major long term significance.

A route with 22 inseminating points was established. 22 cattle crushes were built. The inseminator travels a fixed route. He keeps to a schedule. His visits are publicized beforehand by chiefs and ministry staff. The fee is 1x per cow.

The program requires one artificial inseminator, a Volkswagen, petrol, semen, and support. It is financed by SIDA.

C. Progress

This program is ongoing. All 22 crushes are built. The inseminator keeps to a weekly route. Number of cattle serviced weekly and conception rates are not known.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. Number of services.
- b. Conception rate.
- c. Increase over native cows of milk yield from AI cows.

2. Qualitative

- a. Farmer attitudes toward AI cattle.
- b. Stable milk prices.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 63 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
4	11	6	0	7	7	44

Costs relate primarily to construction of crushes, transport, and semen and other related inputs. The estimates represent net costs over and above the revenues obtained at the rate of one shilling per cow serviced.

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agents</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Establishment of New A.I. Routes (22 points)	LO, LO(AI)	Jul.1 72	Jul.31 72
2. Construction of Crushes	AHA, Chiefs Asst. Chiefs	Jul.10 72	Aug.15 72
3. Publicity	LO, LO(AI), DO Chiefs	Sept.1 72	Continuous
4. Castration of Bulls	AHAs, LO	Sept.1 72	Continuous
5. Implementation of AI Runs	LO, Insemination	Sept.1 72	Continuous

Abbreviations:

LO - Livestock Officer
 LO(AI) - Livestock Officer Artificial Insemination
 AHA - Animal Husbandry Assistant

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <u>Supplement to</u> (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>84</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: LAND ADJUDICATION

A. Purpose

To adjudicate and register all land in Vihiga by mid-1973. Subsequent to registration, farmers are encouraged to purchase title deeds so that they will be afforded the option of using the deeds as collateral for available farm loans.

B. Description

Historically, smallholders have not qualified for farm loans because they have had no available collateral. An obvious source of collateral is their land, but by and large they have not held title deeds to it, i.e., their ownership rights have been recognized only under the traditional land tenure system. To address this problem the Government of Kenya has initiated a vigorous land adjudication and registration program.

C. Progress

Out of some 32 thousand hectares in Vihiga, approximately 28.3 thousand have been demarcated and surveyed (and are either pending registration or are registered). The titles for East and West Bunyore have been received. Work is currently underway in surveying the balance of land not yet covered.

D. Indicators

Quantitative

- All land surveyed and registered by end of FY 1973.
- 50% of all deeds issued by mid FY 1974.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the land adjudication program in Vihiga are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
6	6	6	3	-	-	21

The amounts are largely for salaries plus small requirements for survey equipment.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 85 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: PIGS

A. Purpose

To develop a simple package for improved smallholder pig husbandry, slaughtering, and marketing.

B. Status

To date none of the background work has been done which is necessary to effectively plan a pig production and marketing project. Project planning requires a series of data on markets, prices, costs, available farmer resources, and certain attitudes concerning pig production as an alternative economic activity. The planned course of action is to form a system to collect this data in 1973 so that planning can proceed in early 1974.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	Supplement to <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION	(Number) 3	DATE 1/5 /73	PAGE 86	of 104	PAGES
-------------------------------	---	--	---------------	-----------------	------------	-----------	-------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: POULTRY

A. Purpose

To study production and marketing possibilities.

B. Status

To date none of the background work has been done which is necessary to effectively plan a poultry production and marketing project. Project planning requires a series of data on markets, prices, costs, available farmer resources, and certain attitudes concerning poultry production as an alternative economic activity. The planned course of action is to form a system to collect this data in 1973 so that planning can proceed in early 1974.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 87 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	----------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: COOPERATIVES

A. Purpose

To discover effective means of organizing and operating cooperatives in support of Vihiga's development.

B. Status

Since the inception of the Vihiga SRDP, it has been envisioned that cooperatives would play an increasingly important role in agricultural development. Specifically, it was thought that coops could be effectively utilized as one method to accomplish a whole series of activities, e.g. information concerning new crops and new technologies could be disseminated, inputs could be provided to the farmer, output could be channelled and sold, and storage facilities for certain crops could be provided.

The development of such organizations, however, has not taken place. Historically, few cooperative forms appear to have developed, and the few recent attempts to organize farmers have been largely unsuccessful. Recognizing these failures and realizing that little was known concerning either the reasons for failure or what form a cooperative program should take, Kenyan officials decided to postpone planning a coop project until more data could be gathered.

Specific information gathering which addresses these problems is yet to get underway. However, an organized data gathering effort is being planned and will begin soon. The specific questions to be addressed and the data to be acquired are as follows:

Primary questions:

1. Are cooperative efforts, in whatever form, an appropriate instrument to promote development in Vihiga?
2. If so, what form should they take?

Specific Questions which Need to be Addressed (to be asked of farmers):

I. General

1. History

- a. What coops and types of coops have historically existed in Vihiga?
 - Have you ever been in a coop?
 - Have you ever heard of any coop? How did it work?
- b. Describe:
 - the function of any know group effort.
 - the organization of it.

PROJECT NO.

615-11-810-147

SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number)

 ORIGINAL REVISION 3

DATE

1/30/73

PAGE 86⁷ of 104 PAGES**2. Perceptions**

- What are group efforts?
- What tasks do they perform?
- What benefit are they to the farmer, if any?
- Would the government necessarily become involved in any cooperative organization?

2. Attitudes**General**

- Can you get a greater return from farming as an individual or in groups with other farmers?
- In a cooperative would the government interfere? Help?
- Are coops too risky? What risks: lack of knowledge by the farmer, lack of control by the farmer, return likely not to come to the farmer.
- Is there the opportunity for individual gain through group efforts?
- Are coops the best way to get farm inputs?
- Are coops the best way to sell goods?
- Are coops the best way to get information concerning crop production?

II. Specific

1. What, if anything, would you most like to join others in doing?
(what activity)

- What service can a coop (group) best perform?
- Give out information on producing crops
- Help sell crops.
- Provide storage.
- Carry goods to market
- Sell crop inputs to farmers
- Nothing

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: RURAL WATER (SIDA)

A. Purpose

To provide suitable water for human consumption and for grade cattle development in rural Vihiga.

B. Description

SIDA is financing this project aimed at improving the quality and availability of water in five different localities within Vihiga.

C. Progress

The initial water scheme to be undertaken is located at Mbale. The first phase of the scheme was the construction of a unit capable of pumping 33,600 gallons per day; this phase has been completed. The second phase involves expanding the capacity to better than double that of the initial unit, and is expected to be completed in 1973.

Planning has been completed for three additional schemes.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. Mbale scheme completed by the end of FY 1973.
- b. The three additional schemes presently planned to be constructed by end of FY 1975.

2. Qualitative

- a. Incidence of water-borne diseases; estimates of incidence pre and post scheme.
- b. Days per year each scheme was operational.
- c. Record of funds generated for scheme operations and maintenance.
- d. Estimate of water usage; Number utilizing schemes.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the SIDA rural water program in Vihiga are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars)

<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
40	27	101	227	129	23	547

The breakdown by individual projects is as follows (in dollars):

Mbale, Phase 1	67,200
Mbale, Phase 2	100,800
Chanderema	226,800
Serem	128,800
Ebusiratsi	23,240
TOTAL	546,840

Mbale Phase 1 was covered by FY 1971 and FY 1972 funding, and Phase 2 is now underway with FY 1973 funding. The remaining proposed projects have not yet been approved by SIDA.

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION 3	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE 091 of 104 PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	-----------------------

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: ENVIRONMENTAL WATER (UNICEF)

A. Purpose

To fill gaps in the rural water (SIDA) program with small projects involving pumping untreated water obtained from reasonably clean sources.

B. Description

This project involves constructing between fifteen and twenty small rural water schemes. Financing of the project will come from both UNICEF and from the localities being served. UNICEF will provide resources for the purchase of pipes, pumps, valves, water motors, and engines, while local residents will provide for the laying of pipe and shed and tank construction. The operation and maintenance of the schemes will be the responsibility of the local communities.

C. Progress

Original project plans called for the construction of thirteen schemes in 1971-72 and an additional two in 1972-73. However, to date none have been completed. UNICEF purchased materials were procured on schedule. Local collections have lagged, due partly to problems of obtaining collection permits on the part of communities.

D. Indicators

Data needed with which to evaluate progress are:

1. Quantitative

- a. Construction of 15 schemes by the end of 1972-73.
- b. 2000 families utilizing each scheme.

2. Qualitative

- a. Days per year scheme was operational.
- b. Record of funds requested for scheme, operation and maintenance.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the UNICEF environmental water program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

	<u>FY 71</u>	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Local Self-help	-	26	4	10	-	-	40
UNICEF	-	69	11	26	-	-	106
TOTAL	-	95	15	36	-	-	146

PROJECT NO. 615-11-810-147	SUBMISSION Supplement to (Number) <input type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REVISION <u>3</u>	DATE 1/30/73	PAGE <u>92</u> of <u>104</u> PAGES
-------------------------------	---	-----------------	------------------------------------

It is intended to complete 20 individual projects at an average cost amounting to the local currency equivalent of \$7,300 each, of which \$2,000 to be contributed in the form of local self-help and the remaining \$5,300 by UNICEF. The tentative funding plan is as follows:

	<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Dollar Equivalent</u> <u>UNICEF</u>	<u>Inputs Self-Help</u>
FY 72	13	68,900	26,000
FY 73	2	10,600	4,000
FY 74	5	26,500	10,000
TOTAL	20	106,000	40,000

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A. Purpose

To build up CD capability to support other program elements through the administration of self-help projects and the conduct of motivational and informational activities.

B. Description

Community development is a supporting program. The CD staff is used to explain other SRDP projects to groups of people and to motivate self help participation in SRDP projects. CD workers also participate in all training programs.

The program requires one Assistant Community Development Officer, 3 Community Development Assistants, one Adult Education Supervisor, and 2 copy typists. It is supporting to programs with training elements, such as Womens Groups, Social Services Training, Day Care Centers, Adult Literacy, and Village Polytechnics. \$2510 are allocated to the CD program for 1972/73.

C. Progress

The ACDO, the three CDA's, and the typists have been hired and are working. Training programs in the Womens Groups, social services training, and day care centers programs have been going off according to the schedule in the SRDP phasing brief. CD staff are involved in these programs. There has been CD staff involvement in the 12 ongoing UNICEF water schemes and the 12 ongoing SRDP cattle dips.

D. Indicators

- a. Dips opening on schedule.
- b. UNICEF water schemes opening on schedule.
- c. Adult literacy classes functioning and attended.
- d. Training programs on schedule, with CD staff participation.
- e. Progress of self help projects in areas where CD staff are active, vs. progress where CD staff are not active.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the community development program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

Project No.
615-11-810-147

Submission: Supplement to
Rev. No.3

Date.
1/30/73

Page 94 of 104 Pgs.

	<u>FY 72</u>	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Staff	4	5	11	11	11	42
Buildings and Minor Works	6	1	1	1	1	10
Operations	1	1	2	2	2	8
Works Programs	1	1	2	2	2	8
Self-Help	11	9	10	10	10	50
TOTAL	23	17	26	26	26	118

Community Development Staff in Vihiga Division includes one Assistant Community Development Officer, three Community Development Assistants, two copy typists, and an Adult Education Supervisor to be posted.

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: SOCIAL SERVICES TRAINING

A. Purpose

To develop local leadership at the lowest community levels.

B. Scope

This program is internal to the Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services. It is designed to provide periodic training courses for government officers working in a variety of fields.

C. Budget

The annual costs of this sub-project are estimated at Shs.4,220 equivalent to about \$600, broken down as follows in shillings:

Self-help Seminar	615
Social Services Staff Conference	375
Program Information Seminar	300
Adult Literacy Workshop	625
Student Holiday Conference	180
Local Evaluation Seminars	600
Vihiga SRDP Staff Evaluation Seminar	900
Sports Leaders Course	125
Total	Sh.4220

D. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Seminar for 25 Self-Help Leaders	ACDO	Aug.21 72	Aug.26 72
2. Social Services Staff Conference	ACDO	Sept.1 72	Sept.15 72
3. Seminar on Program Information for Vihiga Division Staff Concerned with SRDP	AC ACDO	Sept.15 72	Sept. 30 72
4. Adult Literacy Workshop for 25 Teachers	DAES DHEO	Dec.4 72	Dec.8 72
5. Conference for 60 Students during School Holidays	ACDO	Dec.15 72	Dec.22 72
6. Evaluation Seminars in the Six Locations of Vihiga with 30 Participants per Location	AC ACDO	Jan.15 72	Feb.15 73
7. Evaluation Seminar for Vihiga SRDP Staff	AC ACDO	Feb.16 73	Feb.28 73

Project No.
615-11-810-147

Submission: Supplement to
Rev. No.3

Date
1/30/73 Page 96 of 104 Pgs.

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
8. Course for Sports Leaders	ACDO DSO	Feb.1 73	Feb.28 72

Abbreviations:

ACDO - Assistant Community Development Officer
AC - Area Coordinator
DAES - Division Adult Education Supervisor
DAEO - District Adult Education Officer
DSO - District Sports Officer

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: ADULT LITERACY

A. Purpose

To increase the overall capability and development orientation of Vihiga adults generally as the result of new skills, focus, and motivation generated by the application of UNICEF's exceptionally well prepared teaching materials and techniques.

B. Description

An unknown, but high, percentage of Vihiga adults are functionally illiterate. There are now 16 government aided adult education centers in Vihiga. Fees are 2X per student per term. The purpose of these centers is to make the adult students functionally literate.

The SRDP will fund a staff position, the Divisional Adult Education Supervisor. The DAES will be put in overall charge of adult literacy programs in Vihiga. The programs will thus have close supervision and direction.

A new set of teaching materials developed by UNESCO will be introduced.

The number of centers is to be increased from 16 in 1972/73 to 40 in 1975/76.

C. Progress

The DAES is being recruited.

D. Indicators

1. Quantitative

- a. Number of students completing courses.
- b. 40 functioning centers by 1976.
- c. Change from baseline literacy rates.

2. Qualitative

- a. Reports of tests.
- b. Effectiveness of DAES in directing and motivating the program.
- c. Effectiveness of teachers.

E. Budget

The annual costs of the adult literacy program are estimated as follows (in thousands of dollars):

Project No.
615-11-810-147

Submission: Supplement to
Rev. No.3

Date
1/30/73

Page 98 of 104 Pages

	<u>FY 73</u>	<u>FY 74</u>	<u>FY 75</u>	<u>FY 76</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Salaries	2	2	2	2	8
Teaching Materials	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>
TOTAL	4	4	4	4	16

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. DAES Hired	MCSS		Apr. 1 73
2. UNICEF Materials in 16 Centers	MCSS	Feb. 1 73	Apr. 1 73
3. Teacher Training to Use New Materials	MCSS	Apr. 1 73	Jun. 1 73
4. Open 24 New Centers	MCSS	Jan. 1 74	Jun. 30 76

Abbreviations:

MCSS - Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services

VIII. SUB-PROJECTS: WOMEN'S GROUP ACTIVITIES

A. Purpose

To further enhance the overall capability and development orientation of the women of Vihiga in their basic production and management roles during the sustained absence of the majority of the Division's males in pursuit of outside employment possibilities.

B. Description

This program aims to develop leadership capability in rural women's groups. A series of training courses are to be held Division and District GOK staff. These staff will then hold local training sessions with women's group leaders. Final evaluation will be made after field visits to group projects. The program is internal to the Ministry of Cooperatives and Social Services.

C. Progress

All training sessions have been completed on schedule.

D. Indicators

- a. Courses completed on schedule.
- b. Records of Attendance.
- c. Final evaluations.

E. Budget

The annual costs of this program are estimated at Shs.6,175, or somewhat less than \$1,000.

F. Course of Action

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
1. Release of Funds	PDSS	Jul.1 72	Sept.15 72
2. Selection of Trainees to Attend Workshop	ACDO SSHQ	Aug.1 72	Aug.15 72
3. Seminar for 60 women in Vihiga Division	ACDO	Aug.15 72	Aug.31 72
4. Interview of Trainers	SSHQ, ACDO	Aug.15 72	Sept.30 72
5. Attendance of 5 Vihiga Participants at National Trainers' Workshop in Kikuyu	SSHQ	Oct.2 72	Oct.21 72

Project No.
615-11-810-147

Submission: Supplement to
Rev. No.3

Date
1/30/73

Page 100 of 104 Pages

<u>Description of Major Actions or Steps</u>	<u>Primary Action Agent</u>	<u>Target Dates</u>	
		<u>Physical Start</u>	<u>Physical Completion</u>
6. Local Trainers' Workshop for 15 Trainees	ACDO	Nov.1 72	Nov.4 72
7. Course for 23 Local Women Leaders	ACDO	Nov.13 72	Dec.2 72
8. Follow up on the 23 Leaders and Visits to their Local Clubs	ACDO/ Trainees	Jan.1 73	Feb.23 73
9. Final Evaluation	ACDO Trainers	Mar.1 73	Mar.31 73

Abbreviations:

PDSS - Provincial District for Social Services

SSHQ - Social Services Headquarters

ACDO - Assistant Community Development Officer