

CLASSIFICATION  
**PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I**

<b>1. PROJECT TITLE</b>			<b>2. PROJECT NUMBER</b> 615-0169		<b>3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE</b> USAID/Kenya	
AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS SUPPORT PROJECT (615-0169)			<b>4. EVALUATION NUMBER</b> (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>615-83-01</u>			
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>REGULAR EVALUATION</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>SPECIAL EVALUATION</b>			
<b>5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES</b>			<b>6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING</b>		<b>7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION</b>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>78</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>83</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>86</u>	A. Total \$ <u>67,900,000</u>		From (month/yr.) <u>March 1982</u>	
			B. U.S. \$ <u>49,800,000</u>		To (month/yr.) <u>Aug. 1982</u>	
Date of Evaluation Review						

**8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR**

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<b>Recommendations</b>		
1. To extend the PACD for one year at no additional cost to effectively complete project components.	Charles Hash	March 1983
2. To amend the Project Agreement to reflect Project Paper and Project Authorization, i.e. increase fund from \$26,118,000 to \$26,208,000.	Charles Hash	March 1983
3. To amend the ACDI/MOCD Contract to include participant training.	Charles Hash	March 1983
4. That un-earmarked funds should be allocated for maximum impact on Kenyan agriculture development under the scope of the project. This includes \$560,000 for incountry training, \$385,000 AFC training activities, \$110,000 for Kiboko maintenance program and \$175,000 for special duties in support of ASSP agriculture programs.	Charles Hash	Feb/March 1983
5. Install a computer-based participant training tracking system.	Bertolin/Lundberg	Dec. 1983
6. To amend the AFC - PAS/SGV contract allowing a non-cost extension of the fiscal planning advisor.	Tom Worrick	March 1983
7. Increase attention to outreach in Kiboko range research	Gary Lewis Winrock Int'l MOLD	June 1983

<b>9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS</b>			<b>10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT</b>		
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or		
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change implementation Plan		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project		

<b>11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)</b>		<b>12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval</b>	
Deputy Chief Agriculture Division		Signature <u>Allison B. Herrick</u>	
		Typed Name <u>Allison B. Herrick</u>	
		Date _____	

## RESULTS OF THE REVIEW OF THE ASSP EVALUATION

### Background

During the period January through April 1982 an evaluation of the Agricultural Systems Support Project (ASSP) was carried out by USAID with the assistance of an external evaluation team. The final evaluation report was submitted in July 1982. Based on this evaluation a major review of the ASSP was carried out in November and December 1982. The purpose of the review was: (1) to determine actions required based on the evaluation recommendations, (2) to carry out a detailed analysis of the financial status of the project, and (3) to carry out a detailed analysis of the participant training status within the project.

The results of this review will be presented in the following format:

- I. Summary of Required Actions and Recommendations
- II. The Financial Analysis
- III. Analysis of participant training
- IV. An Examination of Evaluation Recommendations
  - A. Overall Project Assessment
  - B. Egerton College Expansion
  - C. Agriculture Cooperative and AFC Training Fund
  - D. Range Research Systems Support - Kiboko
  - E. Agricultural Finance Corporation
  - F. Evaluation and Special Studies

### I. Summary of Required Actions/Recommendations

Based on the AGR Division's analysis of the evaluation conclusions and recommendations and the financial analysis prepared in cooperation with RFMC the following major decisions/actions were recommended for immediate attention:

1. The PACD should be extended by one year, at no additional cost, to March 31, 1986. The extension will (1) permit the orderly completion of training activities under several components (Kiboko, MOCD, MOA/MOLD, AFC), (2) permit necessary overlap between returning participants and one Winrock consultant at Kiboko. Extension of the Winrock Contract by nine months will be accomplished within the present contract funding level by rescheduling the TA component of the Contract, (3) permit an orderly transition from ongoing agriculture management training to initiation on the planned FY 1984 effort.

2. The Project Agreement and amplified project description should be modified to bring the LOP funding (grant portion) in the PROAG into conformity with the project Paper and project authorization, i.e., increased from \$26,118,000 to \$26,200,000.

3. Request that the contract between ACDI and the Ministry of Cooperative Development (MOCD) be amended to include the cost of participant training from June 23, 1982 onward. On June 23, 1982 the contract was amended to provide funds for the contractor, rather than USAID, to carry out all MOCD training. Implementation Letter No.89 signed by the Mission Director on December 16, 1982 transferred responsibility for all training from USAID to the contractor (see attachment No.2 Implementation Letter No. 89).

4. Project funds not required to finance existing contracts should be devoted to: (1) bridging into the future Agricultural Program areas of Management and Human Resources Development, Agricultural Research, Policy Planning and Analyses and Agribusiness Development, and (2) Institutionalizing an on station maintenance and repair capability at Kiboko. Specific funding recommendations are:

- a. Approximately \$560,000 in MOA/MOLD training will provide the transition from the Kakamega workshop to the beginning of the Agricultural Management and Human Resources Development Program.
- b. Some \$385,000 to complete planned AFC training activities.
- c. \$110,000 will be utilized for the Kiboko maintenance program.
- d. \$175,000 will be utilized for special studies in support of the future agriculture program areas included in the Mission agriculture strategy.

5. U.S. dollar resources made available in the loan component by the several recent devaluations of the shilling should be earmarked for installation of electricity and water service to the National Range Research Station at Kiboko. This would require a stepdown station and supply lines to provide full electrical service and the construction of a bulk water holding tank, pipe installation and pumping equipment.

6. No extension of the AFC or MOCD technical assistance contract is recommended.

7. Installation of a computer based system for monitoring participant training activities tied in with a follow-up system on returned participants.

After extensive Mission review, all but number 5 of the above recommendations were carried out. These actions are summarized below:

(a) On February 15, 1983 the Acting Director approved the extension of the PACD to June 30, 1986 to allow training activities to proceed. The decision on continuation of TA activities beyond March 31, 1986 was postponed until a later date (Action No.1).

(b) The Kiboko Project is vigorously developing off station pre-extension activities to test technologies arising from the on-station research program.

(c) On the same date, approval was given for the redirection of funds as recommended in Action No.4. A PROAG amendment confirmed these changes and brought the funding into conformity with the authorization (No.2).

(d) The ACIDI-MOCD Contract was amended on May 23, 1983 accomplishing the action required under No.3.

(e) Under the weight of strong appeals by the AFC and IBRD a no cost extension of the AFC-PAS/SGV Contract will provide one year's additional service from the fiscal planning advisor and 2 months from the training advisor.

(f) The installation of the computer based participant tracking and follow up system continues with the assistance of RFMC.

## II. The Financial Analysis

Table I summarizes the results of the financial analysis and sets forth the AGR Division's projection of project expenditures by management unit. Projected expenditures do not exceed the Project Paper budget of \$26,200,000. Projected expenditures among various management units do however vary slightly from original projections with the major variation occurring in PSI 4, MOA and MOLD training. It will utilize \$1,040,000 more than originally projected. However, over half of this (\$560,000) will be used for the transition to the 1984 Agriculture Management Program. This and other cost increases will be covered by savings in the Egerton TA and training components, the AFC training component, and the storage training component.

The last column in the table indicates the level of additional earmarkings that will be required to complete the project \$6,384,600. This is available from presently unearmarked funds (\$1,306,100) and our FY'83 allotment of \$5,077,000 of which \$1,000,000 has been received and obligated by PROAG amendment. The following amounts are required:

- \$2,240,000 for the SECID contract to complete Egerton technical assistance and training.
- \$560,000 to complete MOA/MOLD training and provide for the transition from the Kakamega Management Workshop to initiation of the FY1984 Agriculture Management Project.
- \$1,716,000 to complete funding of the Winrock contract and establish an operation and maintenance system at Kiboko.
- \$320,000 to complete training within the AFC with no addition to the TA contract.

-\$1,224,000 to complete funding of the ACDI TA and training contract, and

-\$258,500 for the final project evaluation and to carry out selected priority studies related to the Kenya Mission future agriculture development strategy. (One additional comprehensive evaluation is planned in early FY84. This evaluation will encompass the total ASSP project, but a major focus of the evaluation will be on the possible extension or a new project relating to the Kiboko Range Research Station. The cost of that evaluation will be approximately \$75,000 leaving \$180,000 for special studies or additional training activities leading to the planned FY84 Agricultural Development Program.)

5

Table 1

AGRICULTURAL SYSTEMS SUPPORT PROJECT 615-0169  
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS AND PROJECTION DEC 15, 1982

GRANT PORTION

(\$1,000)

<u>PSI</u>	<u>ACTIVITY</u>	<u>PP. BUDGET</u>	<u>CURRENT PROJECTION</u>	<u>PROJECTED BALANCE</u>	<u>EARMARKED 11-30-82</u>	<u>COMMITTED 11-30-82</u>	<u>ADDITIONAL EARMARKING</u>
01	Egerton TA & TR	10,932	10,240	492	8,000	8,000	2,240
03	Coast Ag. Instit.	216	253.3	-37.3	253.3	253.3	-0-
04	MOA-MOLD Training	3,460	4,500	-1,040	3,940.5	2,718.1	559.51/
05	Kiboko TA & TR	5,142	5,250	- 108	3,534	3,528.6	1,716
07	AFC TA	1,277	1,275.9	1.1	1,275.9	1,275.9	-0-2/
08	AFC Training	1,390	850	540	463.6	362.9	386.4
09-12	MOCD TA & TR	3,099	3,099	-0-	1,874.8	1,716.8	1,224.23/
13	Storage Training	215	-0-	215	-0-	-0-	
14	Storage Study	204	250.5	-46.5	250.5	250.5	-0-
15	<u>Evaluation</u>	<u>465</u>	<u>481.3</u>	<u>-16.3</u>	<u>222.8</u>	<u>177.8</u>	<u>258.5</u>
		<u>26,2004/</u>	<u>26,200</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>19,815.4</u>	<u>18,283.9</u>	<u>6,384.6*</u>
<b>Funds Available:</b>							
	Unearmarked	1,306.1					
	FY 83 Allotment	5,077					
		<u>6,383.1*</u>					

- 1/ Proposed bridge funding for selected training activities leading into FY 84 Ag. Management & Human Resources Program.
- 2/ Presumes no additional funds for extension of present TA contract
- 3/ Fully funding ACDI contract as amended and allowing approximately \$33,000 for adjustments on outstanding PIO/PS
- 4/ Will require PROAG amendment and revision of Annex 1 Amplified Project Description as PROAG total is \$26,118,000

\* Differences due to rounding

### III. Participant Training Summary

The non-contract participant training activities more than any other project component have suffered from the impact of inflation. The original project documentation apparently assumed zero inflation and training costs were estimated at \$12,500 per participant year. At present we are estimating those costs at \$23,000. Actual training targets are perforce reduced from the 25 per year for 5 years envisioned for the MOA/MLD training fund, for example.

In view of the increasing costs and the implementation agencies' difficulties in nominating qualified applicants the following revised targets for long term academic training were made:

<u>PSI</u>	<u>PP Target</u>	<u>Revised target Feb '83</u>
Egerton College	43 (incl 8 doctorate)	43 (incl 10 doctorates)
MOA/MLD T.F.	125	85
Kiboko NRRS	18 (3 Ph.D, 15 MSc)	18 (2 Ph.D, 15 MS, 7BSc)
AFC	15	12
MOCD	70	45
Grain Storage	7	Inc. in MOA/MLD

Further refinement of the MOA/MLD targets are to be worked out with the training officers following Mission agreement on the utilization of remaining project funds per the above financial analysis.

The status of participant training is partially sketched out in the following table.

Table 2  
Agricultural Systems Support Project  
Status of Long Term Participant Training  
January 1, 1983

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Doctorate</u>	<u>Master</u>	<u>Bachelor</u>
<u>Egerton College</u>				
Completed	26*	5*	15*	6*
Currently in Training	25	5	7	13
<u>MOA/MLD Training Fund (Including Grain Storage)</u>				
Completed	18	0	4	14
In training	64	5	19	40
<u>Kiboko NRRS</u>				
Completed	5	0	1	4**
In training	19	2	15	3
<u>AFC</u>				
Completed	3	0	0	3
In training	6	0	0	6

\* One doctoral and one M.Sc. participant dropped out without completing their programs.

\*\* Three students who have completed Bachelor's degrees are continuing for the Masters.

\*\*\* All who have completed or are working toward the B.Sc. are to also complete M.Sc. degrees.

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Doctorate</u>	<u>Master</u>	<u>Bachelor</u>
<u>MOCD</u>				
Completed	1	0	1	0
In training	14	0	10	4

IV. An Examination of the Evaluation Recommendations

The Agriculture Division has addressed each of the recommendations presented in the July 1982 Evaluation of the Kenya Agricultural Systems Support Project (ASSP) Final Report. Each component is identified, the evaluation conclusions and recommendations noted and the Agriculture response is given. Specific actions are summarized in Section 1 of this paper.

A. Overall Project Assessment

Conclusions and Recommendations  
Conclusion A

While implementation progress is commendable given a project of this size and complexity, there is room for improvement in several areas--actions to assure that the project is completed only one year later than initially expected, actions to assure that performance objectives are met, and actions to assure that additional internal and external linkages are fostered.

Recommendation 1: Immediately extend the PACD date by one year while gaining a commitment from the GOK to initiate their immediate phase out of the Kiboko component.

Recommendation 2: Review the existing Winrock and SECID contracts with the GOK, and determine ways to upgrade their smallholder/pastoralist focus.

AGR Response:

1. GOK action on the budget for their current fiscal year and recent discussions with H.E. Mr. Ngei, Minister of Livestock Development, indicate at least an acceptable level of commitment to the activity. There has also been some progress and some backsliding on the station management issue. The AGR Division feels that on net that the project is deserving of continued support and that the PACD should be extended to allow the orderly completion of training and winding down of the project. The FY84 evaluation should address the issue of support beyond the current project.

3

2. The recent amendment of the Winrock Contract and the curriculum revision work at Egerton are directed toward improving the focus of those institutions toward the target group of smallholders and pastoralists in the smallholder areas, (including pastoralists on group ranches and cooperative ranches). We are satisfied with movement on this issue but actual progress cannot be evaluated until implementation is underway. The FY84 evaluation will address this.

Conclusion B

USAID's management role is evolving as ASSP moves from the start-up phase into operation and phase-down.

Recommendation 3: The Agriculture Office management style should become more field oriented and focus on active monitoring of project accomplishments.

Recommendation 4: USAID should begin to seriously plan for an orderly phase-down and institutionalization of project components.

AGR Response:

Regarding Recommendation 3, AGR project officers are prepared to carry out the spirit of this recommendation. The new management objective system now instituted will include a regularization of field monitoring and field review of all projects.

Regarding Recommendation 4, we totally agree. This assessment of evaluation findings and the joint AGR/RPMC financial analysis are major steps in providing a basis for planning the orderly phase down. The institutionalization will require follow-on assistance for the major components. USAID/AGR feels that we should concentrate our follow-on assistance in the research and human resources development areas if we are to achieve a significant impact on increasing the incomes and employment opportunities of Kenya's rural population.

B. Egerton College Expansion

Conclusion A:

The TA staff at Egerton has generally been of good quality, though some appear to be overqualified for their tasks resulting in a few cases of unnecessarily high salaries.

Recommendation 1: Persons with M.Sc. degrees and teaching experience plus, if possible, experience in developing countries should be recruited by SECID/Mississippi State for TA positions unless there is compelling need for a Ph.D in a specific position.

AGR Response:

Recruitment by SECID/Mississippi State has been completed and all the TA staff is currently at the College. The Principal and COP were aware of this recommendation when selecting the final complement of TA staff and gave due consideration to these suggestions in their final selections: only persons qualified to the M.Sc. level were selected.

It should be noted that this recommendation conflicts with the designers intention. One could speculate that had we staffed the TA component with persons at the M.Sc. level we might have had a very junior inexperienced group at Egerton and now be living with the problem that could result. As it is we had, or the most part, a group of senior professionals and the result reflects that professionalism.

#### Conclusion B.

Participant training in the US is generally proceeding satisfactorily. The training of Egerton diploma holders to the B.Sc. level abroad is expensive, but until the accreditation issue is resolved there appears to be no alternative. Training to the M.Sc. level is appropriate and sufficient for most Egerton faculty. Attention needs to be given to the training of maintenance staff.

Recommendation 2. USAID and Egerton College should continue to press for recognition of the Egerton diploma for credit purposes so that diploma holders can complete B.Sc. degrees in Kenya in not more than two years of full-time study. Similarly, Egerton should consider whether credit can be given for certificates from Agriculture Institutes and AHITI towards Egerton diplomas.

#### AGR Response

USAID/AGR is continuing to press for recognition of work done at the several Agriculture training institutions by all educational institutions, including Egerton. Meetings under the aegis of the Directorate of Personnel Management have been scheduled several times but to date none has taken place; illustrating the depth of feeling in opposition to this very reasonable sounding proposal.

The dissolution by Presidential Order of the University following the "events" of August 1 further compound the problem. The energy of concerned educational policy makers is going to be focused entirely on clearing the political obstacles to reopening that institution with little left over for inter institutional relations.

AGR has begun to negotiate hard to win this recognition for the institutions controlled by the Ministries of Agriculture (MOA) and Livestock Development (MLD) in connection with the forthcoming Agricultural Management/Human Resources Program scheduled for FY'84 funding.

Egerton has submitted a proposal for funding of technical assistance in establishing a maintenance system. Discussions between the College and USAID continue. USAID/AGR is supportive of the concept but seeking lower cost alternatives.

Recommendation 3. Egerton College and SECID/Virginia State should use a greater portion of participant training funds to bring Egerton faculty to the M.Sc. level. Participant training at the Ph.D. level should be limited to fields where specific needs for a Ph.D. level staff have been identified. Faculty members should be selected on the basis of their academic records, teaching and research abilities rather than their positions in the administrative hierarchy.

AGR Response

As all participants planned for Ph.D. level training had departed for training by the conclusion of the evaluation this is a gratuitous and unactionable recommendation. It may also be wrong! In the current state of turmoil in post secondary education in Kenya there is every possibility that Egerton will become a part of any reorganized agricultural university and will have compelling need for more Ph.D's than were trained under this project component. The task of obtaining university recognition of Egerton work is certainly enhanced by the presence of Ph.D. holders on the Egerton staff.

The final component of this recommendation has a certain appeal but is hardly realistic in a third world setting as it ignores the power inherent in a high status position. Who will make the selections? --- the department heads. Who will they select for receipt of what are perceived to be highly valued perquisite? They will select themselves! Few if any Kenyans would question such an arrangement. Having said this we do plan to address the quality of trainees in design of the '84 Management/Human Resources Program.

Recommendation 4. As a high priority, participant training funds should be allocated to Egerton and SECID/Virginia State to provide for in-country training for maintenance staff at Egerton.

AGR Response

The Agriculture Division, the SECID Chief of Party and the Administrative/Procurement specialist have taken this recommendation very seriously and are developing a plan for the training of maintenance staff. There are grave concerns about the college's ability to retain these staff members as well (see conclusion E below) and we will continue to discuss this issue with the GOK.

Conclusion C.

In the early stages of the SECID contract, numerous administrative and management difficulties were encountered in the field and at the home office. To a large extent these difficulties have now been resolved and do not appear to be affecting the overall performance of SECID staff. As the Egerton component is now well into the operations phase, the management concerns of SECID, the GOK, and USAID should evidence a more proactive stance with respect to assuring that the TA and participant training activities contribute to long-run agricultural production objectives.

Recommendation 5. SECID and USAID should take a more proactive management stance now that the expansion activity is into the operations phase. More time should be spent on assuring that the TA is properly engaged in curriculum design and outreach activity, and that returned participants are appropriately used.

AGR Response

To the extent that the press of other duties permit, the USAID/Kenya staff, the SECID COP and senior TA are attempting to involve themselves in curriculum modification. The Kenyan staff and administration have rather strong feelings about their role in that endeavor and remain very sensitive to outside pressure--nevertheless it is and will continue to be exerted.

As neither the SECID Contract nor Egerton College has funds for "outreach activity" there is little chance for an immediate response to this part of the recommendation. The planned new Extension Resource Center will however provide the vehicle to begin outreach activities and allow feedback from graduates to the Egerton faculty.

Conclusion D. Egerton's practical orientation has generally resulted in the training of effective extension workers. However, the high number of classroom contact hours encourages rote memorization and mitigates against independent studies and field trips. The planned curriculum revision started later than originally intended, but appears to be progressing rapidly and should be completed by PACD. Continuous curriculum revision is needed and should be geared more to the needs of the smallholder and pastoralist.

Recommendation 6. The process of curriculum revision should become a year round continuous function of the faculty and academic board, and it should emphasize the needs of the smallholder and pastoralist. The current revision exercise should include measures to reduce student contact hours to not more than 32 hours per week and to reduce class sizes by double or triple streaming where necessary. Courses in general management principles and in the procedures of the Kenya Government should be introduced into all specializations.

AGR Response.

At present the curricula are being revised with a view to significantly reducing the contact hours.

The introduction of general management principles and GOK procedures is being considered. Appropriately trained faculty will have to be recruited to introduce these courses. We are planning that management training will be an important element of our '84 program and see Egerton as an integral part of the program.

Conclusion E. The retention of Egerton staff, particularly those trained in the US under the ASSP, will be difficult unless improved terms of service are introduced.

12

Recommendation 7. Egerton Should introduce improved terms of service for staff as soon as possible. Simultaneously, Egerton Should make greater efforts to recruit Kenyan staff (including Kenyans living abroad).

AGR Response

There has been a modest increase in the Terms of Service for Egerton staff. Further adjustments are likely to be required once the University is reestablished. Improved terms of service and additional staff recruiting must be accommodated to reduced availability of Government financial resources.

The returned participants remain employees of the GOK and their utilization by that sovereign Government may or may not involve continuous tenure at Egerton. To the extent that they are utilized at Egerton AGR staff will remain alert to the effectiveness of such utilization and counsel the College administration when appropriate. So far we have not noted this as a major problem.

Conclusion F. There is a need for Egerton to maintain better contact with alumni and generally to expand its outreach/resource center activities.

Recommendation 8.

Egerton should expand its outreach in-service training and resource center activities through the proposed new resource center. These outreach activities should include the creation of an alumni association which will keep the College and its graduates in touch on a continuing basis. Egerton graduates should be provided with a small, personal reference library to take with them when they graduate.

AGR Response.

Egerton College is taking measures to implement the first recommendation, the second is being considered in light of funding realities.

Conclusion G. In order for the maximum benefit to be obtained from the Egerton component of ASSP, some further support will be needed.

Recommendation 9.

USAID/Kenya should give positive consideration to the recent request submitted by Egerton College for an extension of USAID support.

AGR Response

The request is being considered and discussions continue on the level and form of continued assistance to Egerton College under the proposed FY'84 DA program. At present it is expected to be a part of the FY'84 program.

C. Agriculture Cooperative and AFC Training Fund

Conclusion 1. The activities involved in selecting and processing participants have improved greatly since the beginning of the project, attributable in part to the conscientious efforts of the USAID project officer and other USAID staff.

Recommendation 1. If there is any change of personnel, either in USAID or in the Kenyan institutions, USAID should fully orient the new officers in procedures for processing candidates.

AGR Response.

USAID/AGR concurs and has requested TDY assistance from the former project officer to conduct a follow up on the orientation. A major review of all ASSP participant training has been conducted, the results of which will contribute to this process.

Conclusion 2. The training funds are likely to be fully utilized by the PACD. However, disbursement rates in the AFC and the MOCD are very slow.

Recommendation 2. USAID should hold discussions with AFC and MOCD in the near future on the use of remaining funds, and intensify efforts to reduce delays in nominating and placing long-term training participants.

AGR Response.

The MOCD training was placed under the ACDI contract following discussions as recommended.

The issue has been raised with AFC and they are aware that they will be unable to utilize all the funds allotted due to a lack of qualified candidates who can be released for training. Based on the detailed review of participants in ASSP and our financial analyses of ASSP component funding has been adjusted to bring about better utilization of available funding.

Conclusion 3. Women and individuals from pastoral areas have not been given preference for training as specified in the PP.

Recommendation 3. USAID staff should review selection criteria with the Kenyan institutions to ensure that increased numbers of women and people from pastoral areas are selected for training.

AGR Response.

To the extent that qualified candidates are available USAID/AGR continues to press the Grantee agencies to give priority to women and individuals from pastoral areas.

Conclusion 4. Not enough information is provided to long-term participants before their departure.

Recommendation 4. USAID should request USDA to ask each university which has accepted a participant to send its catalog and other information to the participant in Kenya to permit him/her to develop a tentative program before departing for the US.

AGR Response. USAID/AGR has requested USDA to ask the universities to supply the recommended information.

Conclusion 5. In order to decide which courses are most beneficial for future participants, and to assess the impact of training on work performance and on the pursuit of project goals, a more rigorous form of ongoing evaluation is needed.

Recommendation 5. USAID should institute a training follow-up and evaluation system involving assessments and interviews with returned participants.

AGR Response. Such a system is being installed by the training officers of the grantee agencies. In addition the AGR Project Officers have been charged with closer monitoring of participant training including follow-up of returned participants.

Conclusion 6. There are many advantages associated with in-country training.

Recommendation 6. USAID and the interministerial committee should arrange for more in-country training programs.

AGR Response. USAID/AGR agrees. In-country training will receive major emphasis for the rest of Project. The planned FY'84 program will also emphasize in-country training.

Conclusion 7. The relationship between the ASSP Training Funds and the improvement of well-being of the smallholders and pastoralists is a tenuous one. More effort should be made to reinforce it.

Recommendation 7. USAID should explore ways of using some of the training funds for training lower levels of personnel. Such efforts should supplement, but not replace current GOK programs. For example, the Rural Services Coordination and Training Unit of the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development provides on-site, in-service training to district and lower level personnel across ministerial lines. In section 11.A.5., it is suggested that courses for cooperative society managers are clearly needed. Expanding efforts of this type could help spread training benefits over more cadres of personnel and move them closer to the level of the smallholder. Further, the CIMMYT Economics Program in Nairobi might be able to effectively utilize some support for short courses in farming systems research methodology.

15

AGR Response: USAID/AGR agrees on the importance of training lower levels of personnel but remaining resources in the project do not permit a broad move into that field. The recent 4 week Agricultural Management Workshop held in Kakamega for District Agriculture Officers illustrates our resolve to expand lower level efforts. A follow-up evaluation workshop for participants in the Agricultural Management course was held.

Extensive training of this sort is envisioned in the forthcoming Agricultural Management and Human Resources Development Program.

D. Range Research System Support - Kiboko

Conclusion A:

The Range Research component of ASSP has made considerable progress in rehabilitating the National Range Research Station (NRRS), but delays in construction and training make it doubtful that all the project activities will be completed prior to the current PACD.

Recommendation No.1:

Extend the PACD for one year to complete the training activities and facilitate greater overlap between the TA team and returning participant trainees. The extension should be conditional upon: major progress in completing the outstanding construction; improvements in supplies of fuel; and more effective station management prior to March 1, 1983. If the conditions are not met, USAID should consider an early phase down of all project activities

AGR Position:

The PACD for the Kiboko component should be extended for one year to permit orderly completion of training and improve the possibility of overlap between TA's and returning participants.

A detailed review of the implementation contract is being completed by the MOLD and Winrock. This review will explore sources of funds within the present project budget to extend the overall PACD for one year with no additional funds.

Conclusion B:

Fuel, and hence power supplied by generators, are likely to be continuing problems hampering all station operations.

Recommendation No.2:

USAID and Winrock should consider supporting with project funds, electricity hookups to the main transmission line. Recurrent expenditures should remain a GOK responsibility.

AGR Position.

For the Kiboko Station to be a viable research entity, a permanent source of electricity must be provided by AID and the GOK (i.e. regenerated shilling or direct project funds) to bring electricity to the Kiboko Station.

KPLounds 200,000 is provided in the '82 GOK Development Budget but this is not expected to be sufficient. Additional regenerated shillings or other project resources must be made available for this purpose.

Conclusion C.

The research program, which is derived from the project agreement with the GOK, does not appear to clearly reflect the project objectives of assisting smallholder and pastoralist production in an adaptive research mode.

Recommendation No.3.

The focus of the research program should be partially and gradually shifted to work that is more directly relevant to pastoralist systems and that is more adaptive in nature. Research on intensive practices and basic range research should be assigned low priority. Procedures should be installed for reviewing existing research projects and developing new projects which will involve a systematic assessment of the relevance of the research to existing range management systems in Kenya.

AGR Position.

The AGR Division supports an integrated research program that effectively enhances presently known Range Research knowledge utilizing basic, applied, and adaptive forms of research. Such a research format is clearly identified in the Kiboko research plan (a plan for action 1980-1985) developed jointly by MOLD and Winrock staff and the memorandum dated November 19, 1982 by Dr. Burzlaff which provides an in-depth review of extension/outreach goals, objectives and suggested activities towards meeting these objectives. This memorandum clearly outlines Winrock's strategy for transferring technology from the Station to the users.

An updated life-of-project research plan is being developed following the arrival of the new long term Winrock scientist. This review will assess the relevance of ongoing research as well as any future research projects.

The AGR Division feels that the present research program at Kiboko will lead to the development of technical information that will be useful to all classes of range livestock producers and that Winrock's latest plans to move the information to the user is valid.

17

Recommendation No.4.

Future staffing and training provided under the Winrock contract should reflect this change in emphasis as far as possible. We support the MOLD/Winrock decision not to recruit a full-time hydrologist as a sixth team member. Specific attention should be given to strengthening the social science component.

AGR Position.

The AGR Division concurs with the MOLD's acceptance of the new long term TAs and contractor plans to provide 24 consultant months in the social science areas. Two social science consultants are now in Kenya assisting with adaptive research efforts.

Conclusion D.

The NRRS/Kiboko has not as yet initiated technology transfer activities to any significant degree. The research program has only recently become fully operational and there are limited results to transfer to extension services. However, stronger connections with client groups, including pastoralists and smallholders, are essential to properly define research priorities and field test results.

Recommendation No.5.

A minimum of 25% of staff time should be devoted to off 1/N/station (sic) work with client groups and extension services. In addition, NRRS should mount special training programs for range extension agents at Kiboko or elsewhere as research results become available.

AGR Position.

The Division supports the expanded extension research activities for the research program at Kiboko as presented in Dr. Burzloff's memorandum dated November 19, 1982. Petrol supplies and per diem for local staff are however major constraints to off station work and must be addressed.

Conclusion E.

There is serious question whether the research activities at Kiboko will be self-sustaining by the termination date for the current Winrock contract in 1985.

Recommendation No. 6.

All parties should begin to consider a possible extension of the Kiboko component. Such an extension should be conditional upon the completion of outstanding construction, improved supplies of petrol and electricity, and significant progress in station management as noted under Recommendation 1. The extension might take the form of additional training and a reduced TA component.

B

AGR Position.

The Mission should reserve judgment as to a Phase II of the Kiboko Range Research Project until the GOK clearly establishes a high priority for such an effort. In the meantime every effort should be made to institutionalize with presently available resources. Continued discussions with the GOK will be carried out to determine their priority for Kiboko. The planned 1984 evaluation will also provide input for our decision on a phase II program.

Recommendation No.7.

Winrock and NRRS should prepare a report outlining how they intend to implement the recommendations in this evaluation report that are accepted by parties concerned. The proposal might detail the financial implications and the extent to which these can be accommodated under the current project. The proposal might also include discussion of a possible extension of the project and a realistic time frame for development of a self sustaining research operation. The proposal should be submitted to MOLD and USAID by September 30, 1982.

AGR Position.

The Division is participating in the specification of updated life-of-project activities to ensure that the project is adequately progressing towards the intended goals. The initial review indicates that very positive steps are being taken.

Recommendation No. 8.

The report to be prepared in connection with Recommendation 7 should be reviewed by a joint USAID/GOK workshop in the fall of 1982, convened to advise all parties on the desirability and feasibility of the proposed changes. Other potential donors might be included.

AGR Position.

The Division will participate in a joint review of proposed contract amendments with the MOLD and Winrock. The review is expected to take place in June 1983.

E. Agricultural Finance Corporation

Future Directions/Recommendations

The evaluation team is generally impressed by the progress and direction of the credit component of the ASSP. The project is less than one year old, but the TA team has been well integrated into AFC operations. The conditions assumed in the original scopes of work did not exist in all instances, requiring some modifications in work programs, particularly in the case of the financial management and fiscal planning advisors.

The General Manager has indicated that he may request the extensions of some of the advisors in view of.

- i) the high probability that the original scopes of work will not be completed within the two year period[
- ii) the desirability of continuity in staffing of TA positions where possible. The TA provisions under the IBRD project have apparently been adjusted in anticipation of some continuation of USAID support (although the project may be able to pick up support for specific TA's if USAID decides not to).

The evaluation team recommends that USAID give favorable consideration to a request for extension of selected TA team members, subject to the condition of continued GOK support for the efforts of AFC to recover overdue loans and improve seasonal credit procedures. However, it would probably be best not to make a determination on such a request until the current TA team has completed at least one year of service, by which time it is expected that the settling in process will be largely complete. With reference to the objectives of ASSP, it is difficult to see how the assistance to AFC can significantly assist the expansion of credit to smallholders given current conditions without an extension of the project for at least another two years.

#### AGR Response

The new General Manager of AFC requested that the entire PAS/SGV team be extended. USAID has met with the PAS/SGV team to discuss progress regarding loan recovery, seasonal credit improvement, and the issue of loans granted on a political and personal basis rather than sound loan appraisal. Based on these discussions and further discussions with the new General Manager a decision was made to grant limited extension of the training advisor (2 months) and a one year extension of the fiscal planning advisor. From the beginning this activity was conceived as bridging to the TA component of the IBRD's project. These two extensions complete the bridging.

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

##### Conclusion A

The ASSP Implementation planning exercise, and to a lesser degree the system, e.g. the USAID Implementation Manual and charts, were useful in clarifying the intent of the initial ASSP design and developing a functioning implementation team.

Recommendation 1. USAID should periodically revise those portions of the implementation system that were proven most useful, with the involvement of key USAID, GOK and contract personnel.

AGR Response

USAID revised the more useful portions of the implementation system in March as recommended. It now appears appropriate to do another update particularly on the Kiboko component's Research Utilization Program as those plans are more fully developed.

Conclusion B.

The special studies undertaken to date by Dr. Leonard have the potential of improving Kenya's extension service.

Recommendation 2. USAID should consider assisting implementing Leonard's recommendations, as appropriate, and determine how it can best make use of his work to improve the linkages between ASSP components and other agricultural research and development activities.

AGR Response.

Dr. Leonard's work will be used as background in design of new DA activities in Agricultural Research, Management and Human Resource Development. His reports were, however, aimed mainly at the problems of Agricultural Extension and used with good effect by the GOK designers in preparing the World Bank supported T&V project.

Conclusion C.

Further evaluation studies are required to assess ASSP's progress and impact, and to plan for an orderly phase-out of the project.

Recommendation 3. Another in-depth evaluation should be conducted in 1984. Any component evaluations should be closely synchronized with upcoming decisions in each instance.

AGR Response

The next evaluation of the project is scheduled for the third quarter of FY84 to provide input into the decisions regarding continuing assistance to Egerton College and the National Range Research Station at Kiboko.