

UNCLASSIFIED  
CLASSIFICATION

App SM, Ch 5, HB 3  
(TM 3-25) 8-3-78

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Project Symbol: 11-87

1. PROJECT TITLE <b>Marginal/Semi-Arid Lands Pre-Investment Study</b>			2. PROJECT NUMBER <b>615-0166</b>	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE <b>USAID/Kenya</b>
4. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES A. First PROAG or Equivalent <b>PY 76</b> B. First Obligation Expenses <b>PY 78</b> C. Final Input Delivery <b>PY 78</b>			5. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. \$ _____	6. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number assigned by the receiving country to the Country or AID/W Administrative Case, Fiscal Year, Serial No beginning with the fiscal FY) <b>termination of project</b> <input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION
			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From _____ To (inclusive) <b>AUG. 1978</b>	8. DATE OF EVALUATION <b>DEC. 15, 1977</b>

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

A. List actions and/or unresolved issues (the three items needing further study).  
(NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAR, PID, which will prepare detailed report.)

B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION

C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED

USAID review of final report Scheduling joint USAID/CGK meeting to discuss report and follow-on activities.

10. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper     | <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan (e.g., CPI Network) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan    | <input type="checkbox"/> PID/T                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework | <input type="checkbox"/> PID/C <b>NONE</b>                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement | <input type="checkbox"/> PID/P                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |

11. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A.  Continue Project with out Change
- B.  Change Project Design and/or Change Implementation Plan  
**Project terminated**
- C.  Discontinue Project

12. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER BANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)

Jerome Hulehan, Project Manager and (Drafter)  
Kevin F. O'Donnell, Head of TSS (Cleared)  
Michael A. Rugh, PROG (Cleared)  
Robert Miscat, A/D **KF**

13. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: **[Signature]**  
Typed name: **Glenwood P. Roane**  
Date: **10/11/78**

13. Summary of Current Project Status: The project has been completed. The purpose of the project was to prepare a report, containing a resources inventory and project identification papers. The final ten-volume report has been printed and distributed to USAID and the GOK. The ten-volumes include the following:

- Volume 1 - Analysis and Project Identification
- Volume 2 - Agronomy
- Volume 3 - Economics
- Volume 4 - Soil and Water management (Engineering)
- Volume 5 - Forestry
- Volume 6 - Human Resources and Social Characteristics
- Volume 7 - Institutions
- Volume 8 - Livestock and Range Management
- Volume 9 - Seeds
- Volume 10 - Soil Science

The last U.S. team member, the U.S. project coordinator, departed Kenya on August 17, 1978. A joint USAID/GOK meeting to review the findings of the final report will be held in several weeks. It is anticipated that the U.S. project coordinator will return to participate in the meeting.

14. Evaluation Methodology: The evaluation was held because the project has terminated. A draft of this PES was prepared by the Project Manager and circulated in the Mission for clearance. Under ordinary circumstances, this evaluation might have been held after the joint USAID/GOK review after the USAID has had more time to review the final report. However, the USAID project manager is departing post, and therefore it is deemed appropriate to undertake an evaluation at this time. USAID may wish to undertake an additional, separate evaluation, following a more careful review of the final report. The GOK did not participate in this review.

15. External Factor: There are no major external factors which impinged on the project in a negative way. Both the GOK and USAID strongly supported the project. The team was working in a very favorable atmosphere.

16. Inputs: All inputs have been provided; project has terminated.

17. Outputs: The principal output, the final report, has been prepared and distributed. The original plan called for the final report to be ready in April. However, it became clear after the Mid-Point Review of the project, held last November 29 - December 2, 1977, that an extension would be required in order to complete the study. The final report has just been received and is now being reviewed by USAID and GOK; therefore no final evaluation can be made of the report.

18. Purpose: The main purpose of the project was to produce a report, containing a resources inventory and project identification sections, which would be adequate to use for project planning in the area. The report has been produced and distributed and is now being reviewed. While it appears to be a satisfactory document, its length (ten-volumes containing approximately 1,700 pages) does not lend itself to a quick review. Whether or not the project has actually attained its purpose satisfactorily will only become clear as the report is reviewed in depth and as the GOX (and USAID, if asked) begin to use it as a planning document. A secondary purpose of the project was to develop a methodology which might be replicated in other parts of Kenya in carrying out similar studies. It is unclear this has been accomplished. It was expected that the final report would contain a rather thorough section on methodology, discussing how one should carry out a multi-disciplinary study of this nature. Although in various places the final report refers to methodology, the discussion appears quite superficial (talking about staff meetings, consultations, etc.) and there appears to be no thorough explanation of the methodology used. Individual specialists in their individual subject-matter reports discuss their own methodology in carrying out the study (conducting a survey, etc.), but there is no over-all treatment of the subject in a detailed and substantive way as hoped for. A final purpose of the project was to provide on-the-job training to the Kenyan counterparts so that they might carry out without outside help. The general feeling, stated in the earlier FES prepared last December 1977, is that the U.S. team gave this training aspect inadequate attention. Some of the Kenyan counterparts have commented on what they felt was inadequate on-the-job training. More systematic attention should have been given to this aspect of the project.

19. Goal/Subgoal: The project does not have a logical framework. It was funded under a special Congressional appropriation for drought related projects and at the time the project was approved by AID/W, a logical framework was not required. Therefore, there was no explicitly stated goal towards which the attainment of this project was to contribute. One of the general USAID goals, as stated in the DAP, is to assist agricultural small-holders to improve their production, incomes and standards of living. It remains to be shown that the approach used in this project contributes to that goal. The project has been completed and a planning document has been prepared for the project area. Only if and when this planning document leads to the implementation of development projects in the area, can it be realistically said that the present project has contributed to the overall goal. At present, it remains an assumption that such a study was in fact required and will contribute to the overall goal stated above.

20. Beneficiaries: The immediate beneficiaries (in the narrow sense) are officials in the GOK responsible for carrying out the planning of a development program in the project area. It is expected that the report will be of assistance to them as they develop a plan for the area. The final beneficiaries, assuming sound projects are prepared and implemented based on the final report, will be the many agricultural small-holders living in the project area. The number which will benefit and the way in which they will benefit will, of course, ultimately depend on the follow-on projects prepared and implemented.

21. Unplanned Effects: None

22. It would not be possible to list the lessons learned by the Mission. (Such an attempt would, in the first place, imply some sort of corporate mind, or at the very least, an agreed-to Mission position on the question. Neither exists). Many of the key Mission officers who have followed this project have recently departed the USAID--the Director, Assistant Director and Program Officer. Therefore, what follows are the comments of the project manager, unclear to the Mission. The Mission (other Mission officers) may wish to add qualifying or additional remarks. Rather than indicate that these are lessons learned. I prefer to call these issues raised by the project. I have come to no definite conclusions on these various items and cannot therefore say that a lesson has been learned. My thinking has, however, been stimulated on these issues:

(a) Need for such an extended, in-depth study--The GOK first requested the USAID to carry out such a study in 1974. The ultimate goal, of course, is to develop projects which will benefit the small-holders in the project area. Given the length of time it took to initiate the project and carry out the study, the earliest such development projects will be initiated will be 1979-80, five to six years after the original GOK request. This is too long. It raises in my mind whether there are better ways of identifying sound project ideas in an area. I believe there are. I would not support such long, in-depth resources based on my experience with the present study.

(b) Roles of USAID Project Manager and U.S. Chief of Party - several problems arose with regard to the respective roles of the U.S. project coordinator (U.S. contract employee) and the Mission's project manager. The GOK officials particularly had difficulty in understanding the respective responsibilities of these two persons. My suggestion would be that as any new project is initiated, a very clear understanding be reached between USAID, the U.S. implementing agency and the GOK as to the roles and responsibilities of the U.S. chief of party and the USAID project manager. Such an understanding may help to avoid problems as the project is implemented.

(c) Budget for local support costs of U.S. contract employees--In an effort to save on the contractor's overhead fee, the USAID decided to budget for the local support costs of the project outside the contract. In all, we spent approximately one quarter of a million dollars on such things as housing and utilities, in-country per diem, rental of vehicles, purchase of supplies, materials and other commodities, reproduction of final report, etc. Since these funds were controlled by USAID and not the U.S. chief of party, he had to go through the USAID to obtain many items required by the project. This was not a satisfactory procedure. Much time was spent by the chief and the USAID in administering these funds. It would have been much better to have put all of these funds in the contract and leave it up to the chief of party to administer, even though this would have resulted in USAID's paying the contractor's overhead on such expenses. This would have freed the project manager from much routine work and given the chief of party a freer hand and more flexibility.

Mission Director's Note - Oct. 11, 1978

While I have signed this document indicating my approval;  
~~report~~ I cannot fully support the statements  
that were made by the drafter, Mr. Hulehan. However,  
since he has now departed post I do not have the oppor-  
tunity to discuss the contents of his report nor to  
give him the benefit of my thinking with respect to the  
analysis he has made of this project and the performance  
of the contractor.

*However,* With respect to item 22(c) the former project manager  
indicates that greater responsibility should have been  
placed on the contractor as Chief-of-Party for adminis-  
tering the funds contained in the contract. I cannot  
agree with this recommendation because the Chief-of-Party  
and the personnel that worked under the contract inappro-  
priately used other funds that were intended for a specific  
purpose <sup>which contravened</sup> <sup>terms of the</sup> and spelled out in the contract. Moreover, I  
cannot agree that the contractor should be paid overhead  
or profit on housing and utilities, in-country per diem,  
renting of vehicles, etc, as is suggested.

Glenwood P. Roane, DIRECTOR