

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO. 615-11-110-157	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: July 1972 TO June 1, 1974	3. COUNTRY KENYA	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 74-5 4p.
---	--	----------------------------	--------------------------------------

NATIONAL RANGE/RANCH DEVELOPMENT

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 73 Ends FY 82	7. DATE LATEST PROP 6/23/72	8. DATE LATEST PIP NONE	9. DATE PRIOR PAR NONE
---	---------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	----------------------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 386,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 497,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ 3,754,000
------------------	---	---	---

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

d. NAME USDA PASA	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. AFR (AJ) 08-73
-----------------------------	--

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

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID/W	HOST		
X		X	1. Provide better logistic support of PASA teams through provision of commodities and provision of logistic specialist.	September 1974
		X	2. Provide candidates for engineering degree participant training (5) over 4 years.	March 1975
X	X		3. Arrange recruitment schedules to provide more time and concentration of effort for provision and replacement of PASAs.	July 1974
X		X	4. Provision of counterparts for each PASA team member.	December 1974.
X		X	5. Establish system for coordinated team efforts for the N.E. Province planning team (PASA & counterparts).	September 1974
X		X	6. Request additional PASA Range Management trainer position.	July 1974

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES

REVISED OR NEW:

PROP
 PIP
 PRO AG
 PIO/T
 PIO/C
 PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW

5/31/74

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

F. LeRoy Hoffarth *[Signature]* **5/31/74**

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

Edward B. Hogan, Acting Director *[Signature]* **5/31/74**

ii. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

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

Comment on key factors determining rating

Provision of technical personnel required must be considered generally satisfactory. The quality of personnel has generally been excellent; however, delays in recruitment have proven quite costly.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING			X										X	
-------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment on key factors determining rating

While two of the three government departments concerned have performed satisfactorily in providing participants the third department has been entirely unsatisfactory. Water Department has a critical need for Agriculture Engineers and is very heavily dependant upon expatriate staff, yet to date they have yet to furnish a satisfactory candidate for participant training.

5. COMMODITIES		X											X	
----------------	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment on key factors determining rating

Provision of commodities for construction (implementation) have been reasonably good. However, commodities required for planning, such as vehicles, scientific equipment, test drilling equipment have been late, irregular in supply or non available.

6. COOPERATING COUNTRY	a. PERSONNEL				X									X	
	b. OTHER Organization		X									X			

Comment on key factors determining rating

In two of three cooperating country departments concerned, the counterpart personnel and leadership can be generally classified as satisfactory to good. However, the third department (Water Development) has to date provided only one counterpart for PASA technicians and supervisory personnel have a high rate of turnover and are often with little administrative experience. The organizational structure has also made adequate coordination difficult.

7. OTHER DONORS					X									X	
-----------------	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

AID 1820-25(10-78)	PROJECT NO. 615-11-190-157	PAR FOR PERIOD: June 1, 1974	COUNTRY KENYA	PAR SERIAL NO. 74-5
--------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------

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

Other donors IBRD and CIDA have, to date, been involved in providing loan funds for the purchase of construction equipment and certain operational costs. Their performance in this role has been satisfactory.

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY		FY_75	FY_76	END OF PROJECT
			TO DATE	TO END			
No. of ranch plans developed.	PLANNED	/	8	16	75	118	162
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	/	5				
	REPLANNED						
Grazing blocks developed and management plans initiated.	PLANNED	4	1	1	3	7	12
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	3	2/3				
	REPLANNED						
No. of participants trained and/or in training.	PLANNED	/	6	6	14	20	26
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	/	4				
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE						
	REPLANNED						
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		COMMENT:					
1.	No. ranch plans developed.	Due to widespread drought in development area the completion of plans has been difficult due to prolonged absence of ranch owners.					
2.	Grazing blocks developed and management plans initiated.	Plans for development and management have proceeded at near the expected rate. However, due to delays in capital inputs development construction has been considerably reduced.					
3.	Participant training.	Participants from two GOK departments have been forthcoming as planned and to date are making satisfactory progress. The third department has to date produced no candidate accepted in U.S. Universities.					

AID 1020-23 (10-70) PAGE 4 PAR	PROJECT NO. 615-11-190-157	PAR FOR PERIOD: June 1, 1974	COUNTRY KENYA	PAR SERIAL NO. 74-5
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	------------------	------------------------

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? YES NO

To diminish to the extent possible the constraints to substantially increase in quantity and quality of livestock production and offtake from the range (arid and semi arid) areas of Kenya.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased income to residents of areas. 2. Nomadism considerably reduced in development area. 3. More and better quality meat available for domestic consumption and export. 4. Residents of the area have the opportunity to enter the mainstream of Kenya's social, economic, and political life. 	<p>Project activities to date have largely been in the area of detail planning for implementation of the development and management phase of this project. The principal evidence of progress toward these conditions is obtained from the previous "pilot projects" generally termed Phase I. Evidence from this source indicates progress in the following terms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considerably reduced livestock losses during severe drought. 2. Pastoralist willingness to market livestock which would have previously been lost during stress periods. 3. Utilization of loan funds for improved livestock and permanent facilities. 4. Almost 50% increase over previous 3 years in normal livestock marketing from some remote range areas.

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

To assist the Kenyan Government to increase food production in Kenya at reasonable cost for domestic consumption and surpluses for export, in support of the overall economy. To increase the income, particularly of small farmers in the rural areas of the country.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

The project area includes over 18 million acres of range areas suitable only for the production of livestock. These areas support large herds of livestock tended by nomads or semi nomadic people who have followed traditional patterns of husbandry which is extremely wasteful in economic terms. This project will provide major development and management resources which will provide for the marketing of livestock through channels which will provide most supplies for the domestic market and export. At full development more than 50,000 head of additional livestock per year will enter the market. An estimated 50,000 people in the range areas will gain employment as a result of the project.