

XID-AAP-210-A

RURAL PLANNING PROJECT

PHASE II

Mid-Term Evaluation
for U S A I D

by

John T. Saywell, PhD.

UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR

and

Professor in History and Social Science
Professor in Environmental Studies (Planning)

York University
Toronto, Canada

September - October 1983

✓

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: COMMENDATION AND RECOMMENDATION

1. The accomplishments of the RPP are extensive and important. Progress has been made, often remarkable, in all areas of project activities. The advisors in the RPD have responded quickly and effectively in materially assisting the implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development and their efforts, quite properly have been recognized and applauded by senior Kenyan officials in MEPD, Finance, and OoP, as well as sectoral ministries.

2. The District Planning exercise, currently nearing completion, will, for the first time, provide the basis for integrating district-level and regional and national planning for development, and lead to what should be a much more effective system of monitoring plan and project implementation.

3. The advisors in the RPD have materially assisted in the important orientation seminars/workshops for District Plans and District Focus, and have outlined an ambitious but crucial education/re-orientation programme at all levels of government (and society) to be carried out over the next few years. It is a commendable programme, and should be pursued with vigour.

4. Priorities have shifted as the external environment has changed, and properly so, but the long-run objectives of the project have never been altered.

5. In short, the evaluation finds that USAID, not only for its support but for permitting project flexibility, the MEPD, for not diverting scarce advisory resources to other tasks as so often happens under the pressure of day to day activities, and HIID for recruiting a team of talented, dedicated and enthusiastic advisors, have to be commended for a project that is now playing an important role at the centre of an important new thrust in national policy.

6. I believe I have reviewed the current position in all phases of project activity, and have examined the general set of priorities once the District Plans are published. I see no reason to recommend any changes in the proposed forward work programme.

7. I concur in the importance of developing a project monitoring system by the RPD, and would remind the RPD that it should work in the closest collaboration with similar plans being developed in operating ministries, such as the now combined MoALD.

8. I would recommend also that even before such a monitoring system was fully developed, that the RPD use the microprocessor to assess the situation of project implementation, by ministry, as seen from the field. This should be a salutary object lesson to the operating ministries whose implementation and maintenance rate is less than satisfactory. It would also provide the data base for some preliminary examination of district distribution and per capita averages of development assistance.

9. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. If the objective of decentralised planning and control is to be successfully implemented and have a real impact on national policy, the government must:

- improve the morale, elevate the compensation and increase the status of the District Development Officers,
- ensure that District Commissioners regard themselves as development officers, and have some understanding of the planning process and rational economic decision-making,
- enforce inter-ministerial co-operation on sectoral officers at the district level and at headquarters, and encourage a district-wide, rather than a sectoral, concept of project identification and prioritising,

- continue to enforce ministerial budget disaggregation, staff redeployment, expenditure control, and project monitoring,
- decide at once on the future of the elusive District Planning Officer, after very careful study,
- continue to build the Kenyan capacity of the RPD.

10. I recommend that the RPD proceed with despatch to improve its organisational structure, along lines currently in process, in such a way as to bring Kenyan officers along to the point where advisors become advisors and the way is paved for their exodus by the end of the next planning cycle.

11. I recommend again that government give very serious attention to the apparent shortcomings of the Scheme of Service in order that the best young officers choose to remain in the Scheme, knowing that the work will be challenging and that merit will be both appreciated and rewarded.

12. I recommend that the current approach to an overall view of ASAL projects, under the District Focus umbrella, be pursued sympathetically, and that the ASAL position be retained within the RPP/RPD.

13. I recommend that the successfully Small Projects for Rural Development manual be approved and published, and that the RPD begin an intensive training program with DDOs, DCs and DVDCs and DDCs on its use. DDOs who cannot master the fundamentals of small project identification and evaluation should be removed from post.

14. In recommending the intensive implementation of the widespread training programme envisaged by the RPD/RSCTU, I would encourage donors to add support whenever government funds are insufficient: it is an important undertaking.

I would recommend also that the RPD consider writing a short text on planning in Kenyan context that would not only be of general educational utility, but should with the co-operation of the Ministry of Education, and even Higher Education find its way discreetly into some corner of the social science curriculum in the upper schools, the university and other training institutions. Given the work load of the advisors, a short term consultant, familiar with the structure of government at all levels and the history of planning in Kenya since independence might be considered to draft such a document.

15. I recommend that USAID and GOK meet soon to consider the future of the RPP beyond its currently scheduled termination date. My own view is that advisors will be wanted and will be necessary to continue to assist in District Focus to follow up the district planning exercise and to assist in the next five year plan. If the present course is followed and if my recommendations to government are implemented, I believe that the advisors can increasingly as time passes play that role to the extent that at the end of the next cycle their disappearance should hardly be noticed.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION | 1 |
| I INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| II DISTRICT FOCUS | 6 |
| III DISTRICT PLAN 1983 - 1988 | 12 |
| The District Development Officer | |
| The District Planning Officer | |
| The DDCs and DvDCs | |
| IV PROJECTS | 24 |
| V ASAL AND THE RPD | 26 |
| VI TRAINING | 31 |
| A Overseas Training | |
| B Training for District Focus | |
| C Counterparting | |
| VII ORGANISATION AND STAFFING OF THE RPD | 36 |
| VIII QUALITY OF ADVISORY SERVICES | 39 |
| IX CONSULTANT SERVICES | 41 |
| X CONCLUSION | 42 |

Table of Annexures

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| SELECTED PERSONS CONTACTED | A |
| DOCUMENTS REVIEWED | B |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | C |
| TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR DISTRICT FOCUS | D |
| DISTRICT FOCUS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT | E |

✓

CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

I arrived in Nairobi on 20th August and began the evaluation of TAP II-ATAP at once in the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock Development and Economic Planning and Development. In so doing, I paid particular attention to the response to the District Focus in the operating Ministries, particularly their work in budget disaggregation and their formal responses to the request from the Office of the President and the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development for a written statement on their plans to follow the District Focus guidelines. During that period, I also began building up the bibliography of documents and working papers listed in an annex to this evaluation. Since some advisors, officers, and USAID officials were going on leave, I also took an early opportunity to interview them before their departure.

I began formal interviewing of advisors, officers in the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, Office of the President, Ministry of Finance and field staff (DDOs and PPOs) on September 19th, having read most of the material collected. Accompanied by the senior advisor and the EEC micro-projects advisors, I also visited the DDOs in the three districts in North-Eastern Province. Finally, I asked for further documentation from the RPD to elaborate and clarify some issues that perplexed me. Let me say here that, despite the pressure of on-going work, I received the fullest cooperation from government, project advisors and USAID.

A preliminary draft report was submitted for purposes of discussion with all parties. I then revised the report as seemed appropriate, and now submit the final report to USAID who, I understand, will use it as the basis for discussions with the Government and the Harvard Institute for International Development.

I. INTRODUCTION

There is no need to begin this evaluation with the traditional reflections on the attempts at decentralized planning in Kenya from the post-independence centralization, to the Kericho Conference, to the creation of the Rural Development Fund, and other decentralized approaches and policies. The fact was that by the mid-1970s centralized planning and decision-making was firmly entrenched, and the power of the operating ministries was much too great to be even marginally reduced by the sound and well-intentioned rhetoric that occasionally emanated from the Ministry of Finance and/or Planning. But there were those in Government who remained convinced that greater decentralization in planning would mean a better allocation of resources, improved implementation and more efficient use of resources, and ultimately a more equitable distribution of wealth. The Rural Planning Project represented the implementation of their convictions. Yet three years after the project began, despite a very creditable performance by the advisors in the RPS and the Ministry of Economic Planning and Community Affairs (henceforth referred to as MEPD) in developing District Plans and in urging the Ministries to aid in the process of decentralized planning, budgeting, and implementation, progress was slight. In my earlier 1979 evaluation I noted as a foreword:

Inevitably an evaluation of an advisory project within a governmental context finds that the symbiotic relationship between the project and the context makes a clear-cut distinction impossible. In this instance the evaluation finds - or accepts - that there are historical, structural, attitudinal and manpower factors that have impeded, and will continue to impede, the efforts of the Government of Kenya to implement a rural development policy that has very strong inputs from planning at the district level in the short-term and is to be largely determined by participatory decentralized planning in the long-term.

Without a major effort by the Government to remove these impediments the ultimate success of the undertaking cannot be assured (Italics added 1983).

Later, in the body of the report, I commented:-

As expected, whatever the rhetoric of decentralized planning, the operating ministries on the whole, have found it difficult, or (in some cases) have seemingly been unwilling to expend the time and energy necessary to provide disaggregated data on current or planned expenditures; to instruct or compel their district officers to assist wholeheartedly in the work of the District Development Committees, and to implement rural development projects; and generally to welcome the co-ordination of rural development activities within the Ministry of Economic Planning and Community Affairs. The blame may be laid partly on the historical structure of Government operations and the vertical sectoral organization in particular, but it may also be laid partly at the door of officers who clearly do not wish to see their ultimate authority and power weakened.

In 1979, I was convinced that without a major change in the policy environment and, in particular, the transfer of political and bureaucratic power to those who favoured, rather than opposed, a dramatic change in the locus of planning and power, the accomplishments of the Rural Planning Division would be marginal and incremental - useful but never decisive. And, the truth be known, I was pessimistic.

Fortuitously, in an ironic and tragic sense, the policy environment did change. Declining commodity prices, the second oil shock and the world recession, rising debt services costs and increased foreign borrowing, all raised the spectre of economic and financial collapse. Every instinct and every study pointed to the necessity of improved financial management, better allocation of scarce resources to achieve increased productivity and an improved standard of living, better utilization of existing and planned infrastructure, and improved identification and implementation of development projects. The Report of the Working Party on Government Expenditure (1982) abandoned the bland vocabulary of most such studies and adopted language and solutions appropriate to the urgency of the task.

Their proposals were many and far-reaching, but among the most unequivocal was the recommendation that in the interests of efficiency and equity much of the planning and implementation of rural and urban planning had to be decentralized. After reiterating the demonstrable shortcomings of the current structures and processes, the Report stated:

180. These fundamental weaknesses in the management of rural development have serious consequences. There are costly inefficiencies in the deployment and use of manpower, vehicles, equipment and office space, but the greatest cost to the nation must be measured in terms of unrealized development opportunities. There is a lack of a sharp, carefully co-ordinated focus on rural development at the district level. There is too much emphasis on the provision of services and too little emphasis on involving the people and their resources in the development process.

Yet, because officers in the field identify more with their superiors in Nairobi than with the people in the district, even the provision of services is carried out negligently and without dedication to, or respect for, the people being served. Distance precludes the adequate enforcement of discipline and accountability. Family, farm and national development all suffer as a result.

182. Our major recommendation is that the district team, under the leadership of the District Commissioner and with the guidance of the District Development Committee, should be established as the major force and vehicle for the management and implementation of rural development. The district should be the focal point for the management of rural development by the Central Government.

The bureaucratic power and professional talent behind the report was impressive. A month after its publication the political power became massive and irresistible when His Excellency the President on September 21st declared: "The districts will become the centres for development in the rural areas, and I have instructed all ministries to ensure that this new approach is put into full operation by 1st July, 1983." District focus had become the new national policy. The Rural Planning Division and the Rural planning Project were at centre stage.

As far as the MEPD and the RPD were concerned, the District Focus did not alter directions, it simply mandated at the highest level the direction, the changes in structure and process, the reorientation of responsibilities and loyalties of personnel that had long been identified and recommended. And evolution to District Focus was to be so immediate as to be almost revolutionary. A ninety degree turn was to be implemented in 282 days.

The RPD had to establish some new priorities in terms of delivery time, but not of substance; it had been working on all the essential components for the implementation of DF for years and was already well into the District Plan exercise. Implementation of District Focus, District Plans, training for decentralized planning and implementation are three major inter-related areas which for purposes of the evaluation I will attempt to break out and examine separately in the body of the report. I will then examine the organization and operation of the RPD and the question of institution-building, the development of a project system, the relations between the ASAL projects and the RPD, and a number of other issues, concerns and constraints.

II DISTRICT FOCUS

There is very little substantively, in the District Focus for Rural Development paper and the policies and procedures now being implemented that had not been deemed necessary in RPD working papers as far back as 1978. It was clear to all who could see that if the commitment to some form of decentralised planning and decision-making was ever to be fully implemented there would have to be: disaggregation of ministerial budgets; strengthening of the DDCs and the improvement of the DVDC; an enlarged stature and role for the DDO as a planning and implementing officer; the realization by the DC that development, as well as administration, was a major responsibility; the delegation of some ministerial human and financial resource allocations to the district level; and the realization by district ministerial officers that they had responsibilities to the District as well as the Ministry and the integration of many donor-funded largely district-specific activities into the over-all district planning exercise. (See for example: the (1980) HIID response to the RP II RFP).

However, until 1981-82 the assumption about progress towards a distant goal was that it would be slow and incremental; indeed, that given all the constraints, movement should be slow and incremental. But, as stated in the introduction, however inevitable gradualism might be, and however wise, changes in the environment external to the RPD/MEPD demanded, that change be immediate and almost radical in nature.

From the release of the Working Party Report on Government Expenditure and its endorsement by the President to the June 1983 District Focus for Rural Development and beyond, the RDP and the advisors attached to it have been at the centre of District Focus. The files of the advisors are eloquent tribute to the role they played, working closely with Kenyan officers in MEPD, the OoP, and the operating ministries in almost every phase of subsequent developments:

1. The initial request to Ministries to respond to the Ndegwa Report;
2. The initial draft of the District 'Focus paper that was circulated from OoP a few months later;
3. Visiting the field with major Kenyan officers to test district and provincial reactions to the policy and detect possible problems and possibilities;

4. Assisting in preparing background material for the spring District Focus seminars and helping to draft the June 10 Paper.
5. Working with ministries (and the MoA-MoLD Task Force) in preparing their response and with officers from the OoP and Finance scrutinizing the draft responses
6. Finally meeting with Ministries in the summer and fall of 1983 to encourage or enforce a more enthusiastic and quicker implementation of the guidelines.*

Kenyan and other expatriate advisors describe their role as "substantial", "significant", "invaluable" and "crucial."

* Sometime in the future an earnest doctoral student will wade through the mass of papers to study the process of decentralizing planning to the district level. He/she will find among the operating ministries an enthusiastic acceptance in principle in the fall of 1982, combined with an endless list of the difficulties; in all a reaffirmation of more or less the status quo in decentralizing in principle but maintaining ministerial control of planning, finance and implementation in practice. The essential documents are the preliminary responses in the fall of 1982; the draft responses in the spring-summer of 1983; the notes on the responses by the OoP, Finance, and MEPD; the minutes of the meetings to discuss the draft and the criticisms where MEPD advisors and staff were in active attendance; and the final ministerial reports on their proposals for the implementation of district focus policy. Major issues were: the proposed DDF, District Accountants as opposed to ministerial; planning and implementation of district-specific ministerial projects; redeployment of staff and vehicles, etc.

My terms of reference ask: "Have the objectives been taken over by the GoK's desire to achieve them earlier?" To the extent that I understand the question, I would say that the District Focus thrust in the government policy has:

- i) enabled the MEPD/RPD to achieve its objectives much faster and, presumably in time, much more fully than had been anticipated, or even expected; and
- ii) in areas such as district accounting and financial decentralization, personnel deployment, and tendering has moved well beyond what the RPD thought might be possible, even in the intermediate term.

I imagine there was considerable scepticism in the fall of 1982 that the power of Treasury and OoP would be used so quickly and so brutally in the last three areas.

Finally, the RPD/RPP has taken the initiative in assisting the operating ministries in meeting the financial management and disaggregation demands of the District Focus policy. In one sense the way had been pioneered by the TAP II - ATAP pool in the MoA and MoLD with the use of micro-processors. (See Saywell and McCalla, "Mid-Term Evaluation of TAP II." September 1983, II-F). In February-March, Dr. Clay Westcott, who was thoroughly familiar with the planning and budgeting system in government, was contracted by HIID as a consultant to examine the ways in which micro-processors could improve, or even make possible, the financial management for district focus in those ministries which played a key role in rural development. His comprehensive and realistic report (March 1983) examined not only financial management at the centre but also at the district level and in the ASAL programmes. His review of MoA and MoLD was presented in a paper initially prepared for the Fourth ATAP Task Force.*

* Clay G. Westcott and Z.E.N. Achira, "District Focus and Financial management in the Ministries of Livestock Development Agriculture," MEPD, April 1983.

The substance of his finding in the consultancy report was as follows:

"Microprocessors have, without question, proved to be an important financial management tool in the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock Development. However, the successful use of this new tool has been contingent on at least three factors:

- An energetic PF & EO with a genuine commitment to financial and budgetary reform
- The development and use of improved proformas for the regular reporting of financial data from AIE holders to headquarters, and of streamlined tables for reporting summary data to senior officials
- A very tight financial environment coupled with more stringent financial management guidelines from Treasury.

In this supportive environment, the microprocessors have contributed both to more effective overall financial management, and to better accountability of expenditures at the district level. There is considerable room for improvement particularly concerning the better management of district level data and the ministries are presently considering numerous proposals for reforms generated by their staff over the last year.

As other ministries consider adopting microprocessor-based systems for their own use, they begin the exercise with certain advantages that MoA and MoLD did not have:

- The financial environment is becoming tighter, and the Treasury guidelines more stringent, making financial management reform more urgent than ever.
- Other ministries have the example of MoA and MoLD to learn from; for example, officials of the Ministry of Cooperatives have been attending the MoA and MoLD task force meetings for the last year, and have both observed and helped to work out the teething problems experienced by those two ministries.

However, as was the case in MoA and MoLD, new systems in other ministries will only be effective if there is top-level support both for fully integrating the microprocessor into the decision-making process, and for improving financial procedures in all aspects of the ministry's work.

The Rural Planning Division has an immediate interest in assisting ministries involved in rural development in improving their financial management. Ministries which have not succeeded in adopting effective financial controls over their central operations will be less willing or able to devolve increasing financial responsibility to their district staff. By assisting ministries in using microprocessors and other tools to improve their overall financial systems, these ministries will be in a much improved position to produce district disaggregated forward budgets and estimates, to increase the proportion of funds controlled by district-level AIE holders, and to solicit meaningful input from their district-based staff in budgeting, and expenditure and revenue monitoring activities".

Then followed a detailed list of action recommendations involving further study of financial management and budgetary processes in other ministries; the acquisition of microprocessors; demonstration lessons; creation of a financial management position in the RPD; selection and training of operators and district level officers; assistance to ministries (as well as the MEPD itself) to install microprocessors; and the development of improved management systems for District Focus and budgets generally.

The report was accepted in principle. Dr. Westcott was brought on stream as an advisor and while sharing much of the responsibility for the production schedule of District Plans, began to implement his own recommendations.

By September, with five microprocessors on hand, prototype systems were being tested in the MEPD for budgetary processes and project monitoring. When fully tested the systems would be demonstrated in other ministries as they begin incorporating district-specific proposals into their forward budgets. The RPD has already instructed a number of the staff in the use of the word processor and electronic spreadsheet programmes, and are now in the first phase of training a number of secretaries in the ministry in the use of the machines. This is a wise course, which should be encouraged in other ministries as they enter the microprocessor age. The RPD might also consider training one or two members in elementary programming, so that in future minor modifications can be made without the use of outside consultants.

III DISTRICT PLANS 1984 - 1988

Ultimately the District Plan would become the basis for local input into the national development plan and its successful implementation at the local level. Moreover, it would be the process through which local participation in planning and implementation would be ensured.

The RPD gained invaluable experience in the only partially successful 1978-79 district planning exercise. As the earlier evaluation and their own post-mortems showed, expectations were too high: data did not exist, the DDOs and the DDCs could not deliver the quality and quantity of material required; ministries could not (or refused to) provide disaggregated data; and the time frame was too short. The RPD realized that the preparation for new district plans for the 1984-88 Plan should begin in 1981. But while a good deal of thinking took place, concrete action did not seem to begin until the spring of 1982 when a consultant reviewed the previous planning experience and laid out some preliminary ideas for the next exercise.

Fortunately, however, the consultant was one who had worked extensively, both in Nairobi and in the field, on the earlier exercise and was uniquely well qualified to present a report which was in fact an action plan, (two other advisors had also worked on the 1979 district plans). Conceptually, and to a large extent in detail, the proposals in the May 1982 report quickly became the basis of the 1983 exercise, and the consultant came on staff to play a major role.

Between June 1st and October 1st the RPD staff, including the consultant and two advisors, drew up rough guidelines for the District Plans, and then met with a number of DDOs and PPOs to seek their wisdom and suggestions as to their feasibility. Revisions were then made, and in December 1982 detailed instructions on format and guidelines were issued by the MEPD.* At the same time a set of formats and guidelines were issued for updating the infrastructure inventories, and by the end of January other "cook books" were issued on the organization of program and project material for Chapter II of the District Plan.

The Central document was an exceptionally clear statement that could only have been produced by an experienced team; the new District Plan, it observed with an eye to the scepticism of the DDOs, was to be shorter, more analytical, more functional, more participatory, and more closely linked to the national development plan and national priorities than the previous ones. The new realism permeated every page of the documents and the subsequent plan writing process.

Nevertheless, the learning process went on and revised guidelines were drawn up at various times as problems were identified in the field or new data became available. During an early exercise in March-April, known as National Planning Week, it became clear that the Districts could not, as a rule, meet all the objectives of the exercise. As outlined in one document:

"The objective was to get a divisional-level identification of top priority projects, stressing underutilized existing facilities and incompleted ones, and limited to two projects in each of the three major sectors (production, physical infrastructure and social services) plus two from any sector.

The projects chosen by this process were to have the problem reports submitted for them. These contain detailed data on the project, its components, the elements missing (if existing project), the objective, and costings of the steps and inputs necessary to bring the facility or programme service into full productive use".

* Format and Guidelines for the 1984-1988 District Development Plans (RPD, MEPD, December 1982)

The results were less than satisfactory. The formats proved to be confusing; costing proved too difficult in many cases; the DDOs were often uncertain as to how to guide the Divisional Development Committees to identify and limit project selection; and in the end there were too many projects. Nevertheless, there were successes. The learning process among advisors and the field went on, and the basis again laid for the future.

Meanwhile, the guidelines continued to be clarified and refined/simplified, largely because of representation from the field, and new circulars issued. The format for the Plan was left more or less in abeyance until the critical question of what district-disaggregated ministerial information on project and programme expenditures would be available. When it became clear that the answer was very little in time to be useful, a conceptual framework and format consistent with what information was available for the DDO was written for the program/project sections of the plan and circulated in July.

A final circular was issued in August to clarify the question of project rankings, when it again became clear at the first training seminar on the guidelines (KIA July) that further clarification was necessary.

By the time plan writing started in earnest, therefore, there had been an extensive interactive process between the RDP and the field, with advisors playing a key role, which, whatever the constraints (and there were many), promised to provide the delivery of 40 district plans of varying quality by December 12th 1983.

The format was straightforward. Chapter I of the Plan was to provide an evaluative description of the district: its physical, demographic and socio-economic characteristics; an evaluative examination of infrastructure distribution and the level of project implementation and utilization, including trends in the provision of infrastructural services and production; an examination of the structure and working of development institutions; and a survey inventory of further resources. Chapter II was to be a DDC-agreed District Development Strategy for the plan period and a statement, both general and specific, of programme and project priorities, with the ten top projects/programmes listed in order for each sector. An Annex was to provide a work programme for implementing the current year's projects, and the identification of 1984-85 projects, as the first year in a two year rolling plan for district development. The rolling plan was to become the essential instrument of monitoring and control, for as it was reviewed and moved forward each year, implementation rates/constraints would be examined and priorities changed or rescheduled as conditions warranted in time to best allocate scarce resources.

Once the general format was agreed on in this lengthy iterative process between the RPD and the field, the RPD launched a series of three regional seminar/workshops with the DDOs, which involved RPD staff, an engineer advisor, provincial planning staff, and planning officers and ministry personnel dealing with District Focus. (These seminars also led to further refinements and clarifications in the final guidelines and format instructions which were issued in August). Since then RPD advisors together with Kenyan officers have assisted the DDOs in the field and in Nairobi with data collection, analysis, and, at the moment, organization and presentation. The RPD advisors have been resolute in refusing to write plans, although in many cases it would have been more efficient to do so (and in some cases it was probably expected). They advise, they console, they assist, and they provide editorial support. But they properly insist that fundamentally the plan must be the work of the DDO and the DDC. Only ten days ago the first 1984-88 plan was set in its binder.

With the use of the microprocessor the RPD currently has a continually updated file on all 40 plans. Chapters 1 and 2 representing the bulk of the plan, were to be drafted by September 15th for despatch to the MEPD in Nairobi. As of September 30th, the print out revealed:

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Received complete | 17 |
| One Chapter received | 6 |
| Draft material received but requiring revision, or material not received but DDO reporting complete and in transit to Nairobi | 13 |
| Little or nothing received | $\frac{4}{40}$ |

The staff of the RPD has assigned Kenyan officers and advisors to monitor groups of districts: the ASAL advisor, for example, taking responsibility with Kenyan officers for 11 of the ASAL districts. With each passing deadline the DDOs are hounded to get their drafts in: sometimes RPD staff go to the field to offer assistance and when draft material is ready the DDOs are often brought to Nairobi to go over the material. The RPD is convinced that it will meet the December 12 deadline for 40 completed and published District Plans. If so, they will probably have to write some themselves. (One DDO, for example, was a candidate in the September 26th elections - unsuccessful as it happened - and no replacement was in post. Many other DDOs were conscripted by their DCs to assist in administering the election, and only on September 28th with the votes counted could they resume normal activities). I have read five plans that are complete, or nearly so, and glanced at materials in house for others. Obviously, the quality varies considerably, although most officers have made an earnest attempt to deliver what the guidelines and format have called for. When they have finished the complete exercise under the tutelage of the staff of the RPD, they should be reasonably familiar, if not adept, with the process, and the plans on the whole should provide an admirable basis for continuous identification and monitoring of development projects, and measuring accomplishments and impact.

Indeed, the existence of the data in the District Plans can be/should be used for much broader purposes. Once in the microprocessor, data on infrastructure utilization and project implementation and impact can be broken out in a number of different ways for use by MEPD and the operating ministries. It can help in improving the efficient use and allocation of resources throughout the government. (Ministries could be rated/graded on implementation efficiency, bottlenecks identified generically, incompetence identified with appropriate rewards and punishments.

Once the District Plans are completed I would recommend that the RPD, in consultation with the operating ministries, devise programmes to achieve that generally stated objective.

In the long run, of course, this will be one of the benefits of the district monitoring system now being developed in the RPD. Consultant Geist prepared a consultants report in 1982 analysing the issues that had to be addressed in developing a district-level monitoring system, and the Infrastructure, Inventories and Utilization material in the current district plans were designed to yield base line data for the system. Currently, the RPD staff is working with the RDF and EEC Micro-projects advisors and staff, as well as the Development Coordination section in the O o P, to develop a district monitoring system on a national level using microprocessors. The general terms of reference have been prepared for a consultant to help design the software, the intention being to test the design on a pilot basis and then extend it to cover all districts by the end of the plan period.

The RPD hopes to put the consultancy in the hands of a local contractor, as part of a planned policy of encouraging the development of local capacity in the private sector. This seems to me commendable, and, as McCalla and Saywell suggested in the TAP II evaluation a similar use of local resources, as part of national institution building should be carried out in other areas as well.

The District Development Officer

Clearly the DDOs are working under enormous constraints, which will have to be removed if District Focus is to succeed and district planning is to have the desired impact and prove its worth to the still sceptical ministerial officers and headquarters. The constraints are twofold: the training, experience and commitment of the DDOs themselves; and the bureaucratic structure at the district level.

There are no CVs for the DDOs that I have been able to examine, and I have not seen any specific criteria for their selection. All, I understand, have university degrees, but not necessarily in economics or planning; and while some are relatively recent graduates, others have been out of the classroom for many years. Very few have had any experience in an exercise of this magnitude. Some who participated in the 1979-84 district plans entered this one reluctantly and with considerable cynicism. My conversations with a number of DDOs, as well as with RPD staff and advisors, strongly suggest that on the whole DDO morale is not high. The job group classification is low; there seems to be no opportunity for upward mobility; and to many, the position seems to be a dead end and one which, when taken, seems to be a barrier to other employment - a form of professional leprosy as one DDO implied.

The bureaucratic structure and working conditions at the district level often make a mockery of the clean crisp documents that flow from Nairobi. There are exceptions in the field of course, but on the whole the DDOs lack the support services and often the power to do their job the way it is intended: indeed conditions in some field offices would provide the scenario for a Kafkaesque film.

The DDO often has no vehicle, no telephone, no typist and/or no typewriter, no respect, and no power. Unless he has the support of the DC, he is, in fact a supplicant for transport, secretarial support and even information. There is no doubt that the District Focus policy has enhanced his position, but even a circular from MEPD, the Treasury, or the OoP seems to lose authority the further it moves from Nairobi. (Ironically several DDOs informed me that upon returning from a District Focus training workshop ministerial officers informed them that the District Planning exercise was dead, for it had been replaced by a new policy called District Focus!) On the brighter side when the DC has been wholeheartedly behind the DDO, the constraints are removed: one of the first DDOs to complete his plan was given the exclusive use of a vehicle, an assistant, and when he was ready, four typists were placed at his disposal. Ministerial officers were also aware that his project was of high priority, and while he was wise enough to go to them for information and not ask them for it - a strategy that should be emphasized in training seminars for DDOs - he got their support, grudging as it sometimes may have been.

The Report of the Working Party and District Focus paper repeatedly state that the DC must become development conscious : "In keeping with his development responsibilities, he should be independent of politics and a manager qualified by training and experience" As the senior officer for the District and chairman of the DDC, the final responsibility at the district level for the successful implementation of the new policy will fall to a large extent on his shoulders. The exhortations from MEPD will move neither men nor mountains in Mandera unless they are supported by the DC.

The dual and somewhat ambiguous role of the DDOs in the administrative structure has long been recognized and at one time placing them fully under the wing of the MEPD was considered.

However, the 1979 Mule-Njuguna report concluded that little was to be gained by making the DDO an officer in the planning ministry, but recommended that his special relation to that ministry and the RPD be explicitly recognized. While his functional responsibilities to MEPD were to be made clear, it was obviously felt that he could work more effectively as part of the district administration. The decision was probably wise, but if there were benefits, there were also costs. I would not recommend that the decision be reconsidered, but I do believe that the position of the DDO should be studied further and a very unequivocal job description written which makes clear his role and responsibilities, and guarantees his freedom to carry out his role as the key development coordinator in the district. The same study should also examine the position within the government structure, and make adequate provision for career mobility, vertically and horizontally, including training, that will attract and retain good officers.

Finally, I would recommend that the RPD secure the CVs of all DDOs. Recognizing that there are many other variables, I would suggest that an attempt be made to correlate the quality of the District Plans with the educational background and experience of the DDOs. Such a study might help in selection of future DDOs and would certainly assist in developing on-going training programmes.

The District Planning Officer

The creation of the post of District Planning Officer has been discussed since it was first suggested in the Public Service Commission Report of 1971, the report which recommended the creation of DDOs and DDCs. But the proposal was never implemented, and in the 1979 evaluation I observed that while the addition of DPOs to the overall district planning exercise would be useful I doubted whether such officers could be found and trained in the short-term.

In its response to that evaluation HIID, presumably after consultation with the GoK, commented:

The Government has decided to move ahead with the establishment of DPOs, but with some important changes from the original concept. DPOs are now seen as relatively senior officers, who will serve at District level with geographic rather than sectoral responsibilities. The ASAL programmes offer a means of establishing a number of DPOs who will serve initially as field planning and coordinating officers for these programmes.

The evaluation is doubtful that such officers can be found, trained and placed, given the existing manpower constraints. The Government feels that this pessimism is excessive and that if access to professional training is made part of the programme for DPO development, it will be possible to identify and begin to form a substantial cadre of competent experienced officers over the next four years.

This response was dated March 1980, and by August, USAID's project paper (615-0189) went even further in outlining the role of the DPOs:

This new group of DPOs will be the key agents in accomplishing the objectives of this section (the District Support Section). They must be well-trained self assured, and self directed persons able to assume highly responsible and demanding roles. In contrast to the DDOs who are responsible for comprehensive planning among all sectors within their geographically defined district, DPOs will be assigned one of three sectoral responsibilities:

- a) infrastructure construction, industrial development, and nonagrarian components of provincial development;
- b) services to provide basic needs, including nutrition, health, education, family planning and housing; or
- c) agriculture-related services and facilities.

DPOs will be assigned at the provincial level in the densely settled, geographically compact provinces - Western, Nyanza and Central. In the geographically dispersed provinces, which are the locus of major ASAL programs, DPOs may be assigned at the district level. Each will report directly through the PPO to the RPD in Nairobi. Thus, they will constitute the field staff of the MEPD and the RPD.

The Report of the Working Party on Government Expenditure (1982) did not refer to the DPOs nor did the District Focus for Rural Development unless, as I suspect, the following statement on redeployment (page 4) implied the creation of some new position: ("the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, for example, will be expected to redeploy officers to the districts to support the planning work and monitor project progress"). However, the elusive DPO refuses to go away. Reference is still made to the position in conversation, and DDOs and PPOs constantly ask whether the position is to be created and, if so, what effect it may have on their role and responsibilities.

It is my strongly held view that this question should be studied and settled.

It is not for an external evaluator of the RPP II to advise the Government of Kenya on its bureaucratic structure, but it may not be presumptuous to suggest that the creation of such a position, without much study and analysis, could well confuse an already somewhat confused situation at the district and provincial level. At the operational level there are already too many lines of responsibility and accountability, too many loci of planning and implementing responsibility, to guarantee the end of the bottlenecks that have to date drastically impeded the ability of the district to meet the development objectives. One more should only be added after the most thorough consideration.

The DDCs and the DvDCs

The heart of local participatory planning lies in the activities of the locational, divisional and district development committees. From this distance it is impossible to determine how they have developed over the past decade, and how successfully and how quickly they will mature. Experience in more developed communities underlines the great difficulties involved in overcoming local inertia, not simply using the oil-can-on-the-squeaking-wheel, or bowing to the exercise of position or power. My limited observation (in the field and from reading the section on development institutions in the Plans), suggests that the same conditions apply in Kenya. It will be sometime before the system matures. Over time the varied training of trainers and other activities of the RPD/RSCTU and the ambitious educational programme envisaged in the USAID - funded agricultural and Human Resources Development Project should prove to be invaluable in developing the local planning and management capacity.

IV PROJECTS

In the final analysis development, particularly at the local level, rests upon the successful identification, implementation and maintenance of a wide variety of projects. The project road, however, is strewn with the carcasses of projects that have not been completed or once finished have quickly deteriorated and fallen into disuse or have singularly failed to meet their objectives. Other project proposals have never got underway. Those working in the small project field are only too familiar with the lack of planning and implementation capacity, financial and other constraints, bureaucratic inertia or political interference, among a host of reasons, that have led to what has been at best a mixed performance in the allocation of resources to small projects despite the marked increase in total project funding over the past five or ten years. Major small projects programmes now absorb about 5.5% of the 82-83 development budget, and the projects probably number about 5,000. District Focus implementation will mean that even more of the development budget on district specific projects will be identified, appraised, and hopefully implemented largely through district initiatives and control.

The Report of the Working Party on Government Expenditures underlined the importance of small projects, and recommended a course of action:

....Many more small projects will need to be planned and implemented.....and sophisticated techniques are not appropriate to their evaluations. The Working Party recommends that simple guidelines for the evaluation of projects at the district level should be prepared and distributed to all district and urban centres in booklet form and that all district and urban centre projects should be evaluated accordingly.

Small and medium sized projects had long been a concern of the RPD. The RPD was, in fact, first created as the old Regional and Physical planning unit to house the Special Rural Development Fund, and by the late 1970's, as the RPD, had been given the responsibility for rural development activities including the ASAL projects and programmes and the RDF. RPI included an advisor specialist in district project identification and evaluation, but no sooner had he arrived than all the unit's energy was thrown into the district planning exercise and the project advisor also had the additional assignment of working on the Machakos Project. However, the experience with Machakos and with the District Plans provided invaluable experience that could be brought to bear on the challenging task of developing a sound and simple system for project identification, evaluation, and implementation at the divisional and district level.

By the spring of 1979 the advisor had prepared a brief five-page "Action-research" proposal for a small project document, and circulated it among members of the MEPD and MOA. The lack of all but one response suggested a lack of interest, and his energy was diverted to other activities. However, the subsequent close involvement with small projects programmes (RDF and EEC Micro-projects among others) revealed that among the DDOs and the DDCs there was both a felt need and a real interest in such a manual. While pursuing his normal activities the advisor made a point of discussing the possible approach, level and content of such a manual with field officers, MEPD planners, foreign donors, and other advisors throughout the government. By the spring of 1982 a draft document was ready, which once again was widely circulated and the advisor held personal discussions with headquarters, provincial and district staff to go over the proposal in detail. The draft was further clarified, simplified, elaborated as seemed necessary as a result of this iterative process.

The booklet requested was therefore well underway when the Working Party recommendation appeared. Entitled Small Projects for Rural Development: Selection and Formulation Guidelines, it appeared over the name of the small projects advisor Klaus Bethke in May 1983 and was at once circulated to all project formulation staff in MEPD and other operating ministries on May 30.

The booklet is an admirable introduction to small projects. It includes simple and workable instructions on project selection criteria, simple feasibility analysis, and the small project cycle from identification through feasibility and selection to implementation and funding. A series of annexes provide checklists and the formats to be used in preparing projects at the divisional and district level for final approval and funding. A series of tables provide essential data on approximate costs of materials, and the items that must be included in most development projects, including their post-implementation operation and maintenance. The route to follow is as clear as a first-class road map, and the recipes as simple as those in a good bachelor's cook book: only the most determined can go wrong. At the same time it permits controlled flexibility as local conditions warrant. If digested and followed at all levels of government from the division to the central ministries it should have, in conjunction with the District Plans, a significant effect on the development of rural projects.

V ASAL AND THE RPD

I have titled this section deliberately, for it is neither within my mandate nor my competence to examine the ASAL projects as projects. My terms of reference ask first that, within the overall

objective of monitoring the planning and implementation of district level activities, I determine what "has been achieved the special effort in the ASAL district?" Second, that I examine the recommendations of the Hook Report on ASAL-Kitui and, presumably, see whether I agree with them: "Specifically is the extra emphasis on ASAL districts resulting in better planning and implementation of development activities? Have they received proportionately larger resources?" Once again I find the questions somewhat disconcerting in their specificity. Perhaps I can best approach an answer by speaking generally at first. In my judgement, with the implementation of District Focus and the upgrading of District Plans as an essential instrument of the national planning and implementation process, ASAL projects must fall under the umbrella of district plans, as must projects under the RDF and the EEC micro projects programme. This it seems to me is fundamental. The Hook Report clearly accepted this, and I believe that it should be accepted by donors. The argument is convincing in theory, and should be obvious in practice. The recent (July 20, 1983) GoK trip report on the proposed ASAL programme in Taita-Taveta District (prepared with the assistance of the ASAL advisor in MEPD) seems to me to be conceptually sound, particularly the statement that: "while there can be no expectation that in the short-run all priorities can be funded, it is important that (the) proposed ASAL programme be identified as consistent with District priorities and not as a separate entity with its own "projects" and "mini-DDP"

The reference to the mini-District Development Plan is elaborated in another working document within the RDP with whose general thrust I completely concur:

One of the recent problems associated with several of the area-based ASAL programmes has been that their project proposals and workplans have the appearances of "mini-DDPs".

On one hand, there is the official District Development Plan, while on the other there is the project document for the donor-funded Programme. This situation has had several pernicious effects. First, it has given the impression that the donor will take "care of" the major development needs of the Programme area, thereby displacing rather than augmenting GoK involvement there. Second, the Programme undoubtedly funds projects at sites which are lesser priority and urgency than some other sites outside the Programme area within the district. Since it is always possible that lesser priority project will get financed before more urgent ones, there is no real pressure for the district to formulate and enforce a set of district-wide priorities. Thus it has been the availability of ad hoc donor financing of such area-specific projects which probably represents one of the major reasons why wishlists still persist at the DDC level. Third, some of these ASAL Programmes have promoted a kind of pseudo-coordination where the Programme and GoK departmental heads attempt not to step on each others toes by ensuring that each is not planning the same kind of project for the same area.

In the last year there has been an increasingly shift to rectify some of these problems. Now, most ASAL Programmes not only are actively assisting the drafting of the forthcoming 1984/88 District Development Plan, but they are also attempting to identify as their future projects those that have been earmarked during this DDP-drafting exercise. In addition, most of these Programmes have accepted the principle that their "area" should be the entire district, rather than only a part of it for special favouring. We can also expect to see ASAL coordinators becoming major resource persons for the proposed planning units the Executive Committees under the District Focus strategy. Thus in the future, there may well be no "special" ASAL Programmes as such with their own organisations, priorities and areas. Instead there should be the accelerated implementation of DDP-priority projects, assisted by specialised units which would provide both technical advice and field assistance in project planning and implementation. It is the support of the district planning process and its priority setting which will constitute the major link these programmes have with the other MEPD programmes of RDF and EEC Micro-projects.

None of what has been written above, however, reflects what can be the major contribution of the ASAL Programme to MEPD's spearheading the acceleration of rural development under the District Focus strategy. Over the next 12-18 months, effort should be made under the national ASAL Programme to diversify the repertoire of planning strategies available at the district level, particularly for the arid and semi arid lands. This diversification of planning strategies should be encouraged to travel along three different paths, albeit in roughly the same direction:

1. There is a need to consolidate experience on the various ways and methods of undertaking the field assessment of needs and opportunities at the local level. The proposed planning links between the DvDC and DDC has now become clearer with the publication of the District Focus document and MEPD's Project Formulation Handbook. What is less clear is how local-level needs and opportunities become project "ideas" to be acted upon by the DvDC. It is this area of field assessment (which is not necessarily an "extension" problem) that several ASAL Programmes have innovated, namely MIDP and the West Pokot ASAL Programme. It is this latter programme's sondeo approach will be duplicated and refined in several other districts, with a view of tying the field assessment directly to the district's estimates preparation cycle under the District Focus.
2. Some field ASAL Programmes have used air photography for the identification of sites within a catchment or sub-catchment areas suitable for new soil and water conservation works and/or for the location of new water points such as dams or weirs. Within this approach lie the seeds of developing a broader land-use planning methodology for the district or sub-district level. Here the experience of these Programmes should be consolidated, refined and extended.
3. Last, but not least, the national ASAL Programme and its area-based field programmes have an important role to play in developing field of contingency planning at the district level.

As far as I can determine, the advisors (if not the donors) for the Danida RDF and the EEC micro-projects have, in general, accepted this approach, and are currently working very closely with HIID advisors in the RPD, even to the extent in the case of the RDF advisor participating actively in the supervision of a number of District Plans.

It is difficult to be specific in answering the questions in the terms of reference relating to ASAL. Monitoring activities in any district, including ASAL, is a difficult task, as any trip to the field will reveal. (See the earlier section on District Plans and the DDO). The many lines of authority, and accountability for implementation, which stretch from the division to ministry

headquarters, and between and among ministries in the field, often at the provincial level and at headquarters makes effective monitoring extremely difficult. Nevertheless, more specifically, more organization has been introduced into the embryonic ASAL section in the RPD. Planning officers and assistants have been given formal explicit responsibilities for field programmes. And prototype monitoring and evaluation systems, I am informed, are currently in the proposal or design stage for the Machakos and Kitui projects.

Improved planning and implementation for ASAL districts must be viewed in the context of improved district planning as a whole. The ASAL advisor has been involved in all phases of the District Planning exercise, and has, naturally enough, assumed responsibility for eleven District Plans from ASAL districts, and other members of the ASAL section have been given the responsibility for others. The section has also spent considerable time on identification, design, and implementation procedures and issues in the large number of field programmes now underway and in the pipeline. I have no reasons to question the view that the impact of these efforts has been an improved rate of getting programme estimates into the national budget; increased attention by programme staff to drawing their projects from the sectoral and project priority listings in the 1984-88 District Plans; and an overall increase in the national funding of ASAL field programmes from about K£ 4.8 million in 1982/83 to K£ 5.2 million in 1983/84.

Recommendation: That the ASAL advisory position be retained with in the RPD; that MEPS make it clear to all donors that bilateral advisors work with the Division and the Section; that the projects selected in ASAL areas should come within the divisional and district priorities as outlined in the District Plans with whatever gesture

towards donor ideology seems appropriate but never to the extent of destroying district priorities or becoming mini-DDPs; and if donors wish to encourage through funding specific activities, such as the promotion of womens' groups, they should provide a grant to each district for that purpose to be used by the DDO on the recommendation of the DDC.

VI TRAINING

The contract between HIID and GOK provided that Harvard should:

Develop training programmes for officers engaged in decentralized planning and development. This will include degree and non-degree programmes, seminars and short term workshops, in Kenya and abroad.

The training programme can be divided into three categories: advanced training in overseas institutions; seminars and workshops connected with district planning and District Focus; and on the job "counterpart" training by advisors.

A Overseas training

During the life of the project Harvard was to provide 24 years of advanced training. Since 1981 seven students have returned from overseas training. One student who departed in 1982 is expected to complete his degree late in 1983, and three others left for the United States in late June - early July 1983. Excluding the last group, a total of 13 trainee years has been used since RPP II began. Seven of nine students who have returned since RPP II began completed a degree programme, and two took a non-degree course in administration. Of the nine who have returned five are working in the RPD, one is a PPO, one works in the Ministry of Finance and another in Water, and one officer is assigned to the Machakos Intergrated Development Programme.(see p.39)

B Training for District Focus

To be implemented successfully, the District Focus Policy demanded an immediate and massive programme of education and re-education. A generation of civil servants needed to re-orient their thinking away from centralised and ministerial planning and implementation to new forms of decentralisation. Thousands of government officers would assume new and challenging responsibilities, as more authority was delegated to the district, and Nairobi based officers were redeployed. Local government officials, politicians, and locational and divisional leaders had to be trained to think of coordinated local rural development if participatory bottom-up planning and implementation was to work and achieve the objectives of greater efficiency, productivity and a more equitable distribution of wealth.

Long before District Focus became a reality in the fall of 1982, the RPD had realised that even the more modest moves to decentralised planning and implementation demanded the training of what they described as "District Development Teams", a description later used in the 1982 Ndegwa Report. In 1979 and again in 1981, the RPD through the Rural Services Coordination and Training Unit, (with inputs from the RPD advisors), held district team training workshops. Yet the programme seemed to lack urgency, or certainly does not appear to have been given high priority and the RSCTU seemed to remain on the periphery of the central activities of the RPD.

By early 1983, however, what had seemed of low priority now took on a new urgency, and a new and crucial dimension had to be added to the role of RPD. Reference has already been made to the inputs of MEPD/RPD to the agenda for the meeting of the Permanent Secretaries at the KICC in March, and the four briefing seminars on District Focus, each of three days and involving 1,200 government officials and politicians, at the Kenya Institute of Administration in April.

In April Mr. Alan G. Johnson, whose extensive experience in Kenya and other African countries which had experimented with decentralized planning uniquely qualified him for the task, was hired by HIID as a consultant. His lengthy report was submitted in May. It was a comprehensive document which both underlined the enormity of the task, and recommended a detailed but realistic short and intermediate term training programme.* The general scope and nature of the proposals were accepted and Mr. Johnson joined the staff as consultant - advisor.

The immediate need was to hold a series of briefing or training seminar/workshops on the district planning exercise. An agenda was prepared and the circulars issued and, as referred to earlier, three regional week-long sessions were held in the late summer of 1983. The workshops not only benefitted the DDOs and others involved in District Plan preparation, but again alerted the RPD to potential and actual difficulties.**

* MEPD, RPD, Training for Implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development. May 1983, pp 108. The paper was later also issued in the form of a discussion draft in a more manageable 22 page version.

** For example the working files of one advisor after the Bandari College meeting noted that it would be essential to have the Ministry of Local Government issue a circular informing Local Governments that all development plans and projects had to be approved by the DDC before coming to the Ministry for approval. The same comment was true of the Ministry of Co-operatives and district and regional development authorities.

With the back of the District Planning exercise broken by the early fall of 1983 the RPD Consultant-Advisor and the RSCTU could again turn their attention to the wide variety of training programmes that had to be undertaken to facilitate District Focus at the district and divisional levels, in the operating ministries (each of which had been instructed to outline their personnel training programmes in their response to District Focus), in the many training institutions in the Republic all of whom would be asked to include District Focus courses or content in their programmes, and continuously among the officers (DDOs, PPOs, PPAs) responsible for its implementation at the district level. Late in September a detailed outline of the proposed training programmes was forwarded to the Head of RPD by the Training Advisor and the Head of the RSCTU for approval, and is attached as Annex D.

This programme seems eminently reasonable and very necessary, although like most pedagogues the authors live in hopes that Utopia lies around the corner after next. With adequate support I believe its objectives can be approached and I would recommend that the MEPD and donors provide the necessary support, a small cost for a very great benefit.

C Counterparting

I use the word despite its many uses and frequent abuse because it is a convenient word to describe generally the process of advisors working with Kenyan officers in the day to day activities of the Division, whether formal counterpart assignments have been made or are understood. Counterparting is not mentioned in the Scope of Work attached to the 1981 contract ammendment, but it is clearly assumed. It is also assumed by USAID who included the following in my terms of reference:

- (g) Since this is an institution building project, what has been and what are the prospects for establishing thorough training and job exposure capacity to carry on the activities in the absence of project support ? What progress is being made towards improving the terms of service and staff retention ?

Counterparting has been explicitly undertaken by all advisors and in most aspects of their work. Advisors and RPD staff worked together as a team in the District Planning exercise, both in the field and in Nairobi sitting with the DDOs in order to get the plans underway and then again in draft reading and final editing. The Training Advisor Consultant, from the beginning of his work, deliberately decided that the substance of the District Focus training should, in the field at least and in the preparation of materials, be carried out largely through the RSCTU, and a form of counterpart relationship has been established there for the first time. The Senior Advisor may be said to counterpart with the Head and Deputy Head of the division, but he also counterparts with junior officers in the District Planning exercise. The ASAL Advisor works closely with the staff attached to that section. The Projects Advisor has sought the support of the Kenyan staff in preparing the manual, worked with staff on the Machakos project, and in the District Planning exercise.

At the moment the financial management advisor has no Kenya officers assigned to work on that project, but hopefully in time such an assignment might be made. However, he does work closely with Kenyan officers in organising the very tight production schedule for the editing and publication of the District Plans. On the whole, I believe that the advisors have done what might reasonably have been expected.

But the need for some form of advisory services will stretch beyond the contract period. The following observations about the staffing and organisation of the RPD will explain why I believe this to be so, and might offer some modest suggestions as to how the ultimate Kenyanization of the division can best be assured.

Let me say at once, however, that the RPD has grown significantly in the past few years, and at a time when it has been under enormous pressure. Usually structures and systems collapse under pressure, but the RPD has in fact gradually improved its structure and its operations. My comments should be read in that context.

VII ORGANISATION AND STAFFING OF THE RPD

The accompanying chart shows the functional structure of the RPD as it seems to exist at present. The structure is not formally established in any organisation chart, nor have Kenyan officers been appointed as section heads. Moreover, by its very nature, the work demands considerable flexibility, as advisors and staff move from one task to another as occasion demands. All for example are involved in the District Planning exercise, and, from time to time, in the District Support activities.

This functional organisation is a major step forward. I would recommend that it be further institutionalised and, as they can be identified, trained and promoted, Kenyan officers be formally appointed as section heads. Such additional structuring would materially assist in the work and on the job training. (At the same time I would caution the RPD against a too strict compartmentalization that could interfere with the collective effort when necessary).

So too would a more systematic policy of section and division-wide meetings, which I understand has been recently begun. Such meetings to discuss policy and problems and lay out forward work plans will give the younger Kenyan officers a greater sense of belonging, of participating in the process than they have at present. At the moment many of them feel that they are outside the process; that the work is going on around them; and while they see the odd tree they cannot find the forest.

In addition, there should be job descriptions for the Kenyan officers which would define their specific responsibilities as well as the ways in which they are expected to contribute generally to the work of the Division. This would not only improve morale and increase efficiency, but again would materially assist in the counterpart learning process. The head of the Division or his delegate should not hesitate to lay out very specific responsibilities for the junior officers: for example to make themselves thoroughly familiar with the Small Projects Manual or the district level monitoring system as it is developed.

Physical proximity is an important element in counterparting. I would recommend that consideration be given to locating advisors and the officers identified as head of sections within which they work, in the same or adjoining offices. The most obvious move would be to place the officer currently acting as the senior Kenyan officer responsible for much of the day to day operations, in the central office adjoining that of the RPP staff and equipment, and that of the senior advisor. I would also recommend that all work assignments be made to or through the functional divisions rather than directly to advisors, whether by senior Kenyan officers or by the Senior Advisor.

Time, shortage of staff, and a host of other constraints will often make such a structure and system inefficient or sometimes unworkable. But it seems to me that if the objective is ultimate Kenyanization the process should begin now, or it will never be implemented.

Staff remains a constraint. The RPD has grown remarkably over the past few years, and is now, I understand the, largest planning section in MEPD. This is commendable. As far as can be determined four officers are assigned primarily to RDF, nine to various ASAL activities, three to the RSCTU, one to EEC, three to district support in addition to the officer who might be called the day to day operations manager. One has recently returned and has yet to be assigned. Six are on overseas training.

In addition, of course, there are seven Provincial Planning Officers, and the 40 DDOs responsible to the MEPD for District Plans but appointed to the Office of the President.

Of the current staff of Planning Officers, (excluding the two senior officers, members of the RSCTU and the PPOs), five have received graduate training under RPP I and II. It would appear that five other officers trained, including one who was never part of the RPD, have since left the Division. The retention rate among overseas-trained planning officers in the Scheme of Service, therefore, would seem to be about 60% in the RPD. Recently trained officers seem to have a higher retention rate than those trained earlier, but it is worth noting that it is often a year or two after their return that greener pastures beckon. As a result I would caution the RPD against the too easy assumption that the returning trainees will necessarily remain with the Division, and encourage them to assist in every way in the redesigning of the Scheme of Service to ensure that the best remain. I would also suggest, based on my discussions during this and other evaluations, that more attention be paid to the care and nourishment of the junior officers: keeping in touch with them while overseas, anticipating their return with a specific position and responsibility, respecting their recently acquired additional talents by providing challenging work, and intergrating them fully into the work of the Division as suggested above.

VIII QUALITY OF ADVISORY SERVICES

As is apparent throughout the report, I believe that the quality and quantity of the work contributed by the current set of advisors is absolutely first-rate. With the possibly exception of one advisor, there has been no criticism by senior Kenyans; indeed, the reverse is true

The advisors are well educated, experienced in Kenya and other developing countries, work well within the governmental structure, relate readily and easily to their Kenyan associates, and, without exception, are completely committed to their work. I have seldom seen a group of advisors who are not only as industrious but are also as enthusiastic. HIID is to be congratulated on its recruitment, and the two senior advisors to be congratulated on creating and maintaining an action programme which allows considerable latitude and room for initiative among advisors and their Kenyan colleagues and yet retains a strong spirit of collegiality and common purpose.

The problem will be the encores. Advisors cannot stay for ever. Two may be leaving in the near future, and it will be difficult to find suitable replacements. I would suggest that recruitment begin at once, and that GOK and USAID agree to allow several months overlap so that the new advisors can in fact counterpart for a while. The benefits will far outweigh the costs. Moreover, as the contract period draws closer to an end new advisors may be reluctant to sign on because of the uncertainties over the future. Indeed, by the middle of 1984 any new candidate is bound to ask - how long- ? To ensure adequate staffing, there should /must be an answer. For that reason, as well as the more obvious and important one of ensuring uninterrupted continuity in the systems building, training programmes, implementation and monitoring of the Plans etc. I would recommend that discussions between government and donor begin as soon as possible about the likely future and possible form of any successor to RPD II.

IX CONSULTANT SERVICES

My terms of reference state:

- (f) A careful review of consultant services should be undertaken to ascertain how effective the use of these resources has been toward assisting the Ministry and districts in the decentralization process.

Reference has been made to the Geist consultancy on District Plans, the Johnson consultancy on training for District Focus, and the Westcott consultancy on financial management for decentralization. As I have commented, each report was thorough and realistic, and became the basis not only for action but for the appointment of the consultants as project advisors-consultants.

There have been four other consultants reports. After surveying the type of candidates and the nature of the work in government, Pyle prepared a report on the institution and the nature of the overseas training- the RPD planners should attend and undertake. This was a useful exercise which assisted HIID in placing the trainees in American institutions. Odell prepared a report on training capacity with the RPD, a report which questioned whether the RSCTU had the necessary resources to carry out the task. This report was fully considered during the Johnson consultancy, and helped him to realise that the experience and training talent in RSCTU should be wedded to the substantive content that advisors and Kenyan planning officers could provide. The Heneveld consultancy on district monitoring helped to provide the basis on which the current format has been based, but has been to a certain extent, overtaken by events. The Delp consultancy, provided by a former advisor in the RPP, examined the possibilities of establishing District Information and Documentation Centres. Unquestionably the DIDCs would be extremely useful to the DDOs and DDCs. But the decision has been wisely made that the task is enormous, and that progress will be slow. The accumulation of data for the District Plan provides a good beginning, and as time and human resources permit more data will be collected in Nairobi and sent to the office of the DDO as an embryonic DIDC.

X CONCLUSION

It would be foolhardy to conclude, at this stage, that the new District Focus policy and decentralized planning and implementation generally would or would not be successful. It is clear from reading this report that the problems, at all levels of government, are enormous; in disaggregating ministerial budgets, deployment of officers to the field, the establishment of District Treasuries, the proposed re-orientation of District Commissioners and other key officers at headquarters and in the field. But as the future unfolds everything will depend on the continued determination of the O of P - in alliance with the Treasury - to impose the national policy on the operating ministries and radically alter the bureaucratic and financial structure within the government.

However, assuming there will be no change in policy, the RPD will continue to a critical vehicle for the successful implementation of decentralized planning. For that reason I believe it will be necessary for the RPD to have the support of advisors throughout the next planning cycle, probably in about the same numbers and fulfilling the same functions as they do now. During that period they should become increasingly "advisory" and by the end of that period the process of institution building, both in terms of the creation of systems and the development of human resources, should be complete. If not the government of Kenya will only have itself to blame.

ANNEX A

SELECTED PERSONS CONTACTED

Office of the President

Don Muthengi
David Muriithi
Andrew Tench
Ralph Campbell

Ministry of Economic Planning & Development

Francis Masakhalia - Permanent Secretary
Leonard Ngugi
John Kidenda
Elphas Njeru
Esther Keli

Available Planning Officers and Planning Assistants

Field Staff

Four DDOs and One PPO.

Advisors: MEPD

Richard Hook (HIID)
David Lewis
Judy Geist
Clay Wescott
Emery Roe
Klaus Bethke
John Carlsen
Oliver Bommelear
Antonio Royer
Dr. Ed Edwards

Advisors: Outside MEPD

Nils Isaksoon

Subramaniam Ramakrishnan

Lester Gordon

Carlos Zurberti

In addition to Kenyan offices listed in Annex A of the TAP II Evaluation with whom we discussed the response to District Focus.

ANNEX B

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

I append the document list for Kenya Rural Planning Project Phase II, which includes the major documents prepared in whole or part by the RPD since June 1981, all of which I have read extensively or intensively.

In Addition

Government of Kenya , Report of the Working Party on Government Expenditure (Ndegwa Report), 1982.

....., Arid and Semi Arid Lands in Kenya : the framework for Implementation, Programme Planning and Evaluation, 1979.

District Focus for Rural Development, Report on Plans for the Implementation of District Focus Policy, 1983. Ministry of Livestock Development; Ministry of Works and Housing; Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Lands and Settlement and Physical Planning.

Njoroge, J.W., "Provincial Accounting System and Expenditure Control for the Implementation of District Focus". Task Force Paper No X, MOA-MLD, April 1983.

Wescott C., and Z.E.N. Acharia, "District Focus and Financial Management in the Ministries of Livestock Development and Agriculture" , April 1983.

MOA-MLD, Minutes, Task Force on Budget and Financial Management Processes. Workshops Nos. 3 and 4.

Working files :
Dr. Judy Geist
Dr. Clay Westcott
Dr. David Lewis
Mr. Emery Roe
Mr. Klaus Bethke

Draft District Plans : Samburu, Baringo, Kitui, Isiolo, among others.

Draft, Rural Planning Project : Progress Report, January - August 1983.
(September 28, 1983)

USAID, PID, Agricultural Management and Human Resource Development Project Outline, (Draft 1983).

RSCTU, Training District Development Teams : A Planning Workshop 1979.

.....: Curriculum Guidelines

.....1981

ANNEX C

ALL DISTRICT PLAN STATUS REPORT
(plus examples of individual district status sheets)

4/1

ANNEX D

TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR DISTRICT FOCUS

Details of Training Components

September 1983

KENYA RURAL PLANNING PROJECT
PHASE II

DOCUMENTATION LIST

June 1981 - September 1983

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

412

12th September, 1983

KENYA RURAL PLANNING PROJECT
PHASE II

DOCUMENTATION LIST

June 1981 - September 1983

The Rural Planning Project, Phase II, is designed to assist the Government of Kenya in improving its capacity for decentralized planning of economic development activities. It is a continuation of the Rural Planning Project, Phase I, which commenced in 1976, and it extends and expands the activities undertaken by that project. This documentation list concentrates on reports, memoranda and major project administrative documents from Phase II, which began in June 1981. However, references to previous documents are also included where these are of particular importance to ongoing activities.

The documentation list is divided into three sections.

Section I includes documents which have been prepared by the staff or consultants of the Rural Planning Project for the Rural Planning Division. These documents and memoranda have been prepared in collaboration with officers in the Rural Planning Division, with co-authors as indicated, or for review by the staff of the division.

Section II includes other Government documents to which Rural Planning Project staff have had major inputs.

Section III includes relevant documents from Rural Planning Project, Phase I.

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. <u>Reports and Memoranda Prepared by the Rural Planning Project</u> | 4 |
| A. Kenya Rural Planning Project Design/ Annual Plans | 4 |
| B. District Planning Activities | 6 |
| C. District Focus | 8 |
| D. Training | 9 |
| E. Arid and Semi-Arid Lands Development Programmes | 10 |
| II. <u>Government Documents/Circulars to which the Rural Planning Project has had major inputs</u> | 11 |
| III. <u>Documentation from Rural Planning Project, Phase I</u> | 12 |

I. Reports and Memoranda Prepared by the Rural Planning Project

A. Kenya Rural Planning Project Design/Annual Plans

1. "Kenya: Rural Planning II Project: Project Paper 615-0189," Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., August 1980.
2. "Kenya Rural Planning Project: Phase II", A Proposal submitted to the Government of Kenya by the President and Fellows of Harvard College on behalf of Harvard Institute for International Development, 23rd February, 1981.
3. "Amendment to the Rural Planning Project between the Republic of Kenya and the President and Fellows of Harvard College," 29th June, 1981.
4. Original Project Documents:

Rural Planning Project: Kenya
Project Paper (615-0162)
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C.
April 28, 1976

Rural Planning Project: 615-0162.
Grant Agreement between the Republic of Kenya
and the United States Agency for
International Development, June 30, 1976.

Rural Planning Project
Agreement between the Republic of Kenya and
the President and Fellows of Harvard College,
1st April, 1977.
5. "Rural Planning II: Status of Log Frame Outputs," R.M. Hook, Rural Planning Project, 1st November, 1982.

6. "Rural Planning Project: Work Plan to 30th June, 1983," Rural Planning Project, 14th December, 1981.
(EPD/SC 237/016/5)

B. District Planning Activities

1. "A Proposed Monitoring System for District Development Activities," MEFD, September 1981. (Heneveld). (16 pages).
2. "Monitoring of District Level Development Activities in Kenya," Ward Henevelt, Rural Planning Division, September 1981. (19 pages).
3. "Implementation Scheduling and Monitoring of Development Projects," Rural Planning Division, 20th January, 1982.*
4. "Establishing a Network of District Information and Documentation Centres in Kenya: A Project Proposal," Ministry of Economic Planning and Development, February 1982. (Peter Delp). (60 pages).
5. "Preliminary Ideas: District Planning, Fifth Development Plan, 1983/84 - 1987/88," Judith Geist, Rural Planning Division, May 1982. (18 pages).
6. "District Fifth Plan Priority Identification: Assessment of Underutilized Government Assets," Judith Geist, Rural Planning Division, May 1982. (31 pages).
7. "District Monitoring System," Judith Geist, Rural Planning Division, May 1982. (30 pages).
8. "Development of the District Planning Process," R. Hook and P. Lewis, 27th September, 1982. (B.2)

9. "Format and Guidelines for the 1984-88 District Development Plans," Rural Planning Division, December 1982.
10. "Appendix I: Infrastructure Inventory and Underutilization Report: Facility Guidelines and Formats," Rural Planning Division, December 1982.
11. "Preliminary Report: Underutilization Assessment of District Infrastructure," Judith Geist, Rural Planning Division, 9th May, 1983.

C. District Focus

1. "A Strategy for Government Decentralization of Planning, Implementation and Monitoring of Development Activities." Peter Delp and Richard Hook, Rural Planning Division, June 1979.
2. "Framework and Proposals for Improving the Decentralization of Government Planning and Implementation to the District," Rural Planning Division, 16th September, 1982. (K. Bethke, E. Roe, and F. Van Buer). (First Draft).
3. "The District Focus: Proposals for Short-Term Action," Rural Planning Division, 8th October, 1982. (Second Draft).
4. "District Development," Rural Planning Division, 18th January, 1983. (Third Draft).
5. "Increasing Role of District in the Planning and Budgeting Process," F.D. Van Buer and A.U. Wandera, Rural Planning Division, (no date).
6. "Microprocessors and Financial Management for District Focus in Kenya," Clay G. Wescott, Rural Planning Division, March 1983. (77 pages).
7. "Report on the Official Visits to Nyeri, Isiolo, and Laikipia Districts on District Focus for Rural Development, March 8, 9, and 10, 1983," Rural Planning Division, March 1983.
8. "The District Treasury and District Focus", F.D. Van Buer, 7th May, 1983. (Presented to Rural Planning Division Seminar, 13th June, 1983).

D. Training

1. "Improving Rural Planning in Kenya: Training Activities for the Rural Planning Project, 1981-1982," Marcia L. Odell, Report for the Rural Planning Project, Rural Planning Division, 28th August, 1982.
2. Small Projects for Rural Development: Selection and Formulation Guidelines, Klaus Bethke, Rural Planning Division, May 1983. (56 pages).
3. "Training for Implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development," Alan G. Johnston, Rural Planning Division, May 1983. (98 pages).
4. "Training for Implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development," (Executive Summary), Rural Planning Division, 10th May, 1983. (22 pages).

E. Arid and Semi-Arid Lands Development Programme

1. Review of Progress and Management Issues of the Machakos Integrated Development Programme," by a joint GOK/EEC Review Committee, June 1980. (Rural Planning Division Coordination and Participation).
2. "Draft Suggestions and Recommendations of ASAL Workshop," Rural Planning Division, 17th August, 1982.
3. "MEPD Follow-up of the Kitui Water Resources Development Study," Rural Planning Division, November 1982.
4. "A Mid-Course Correction of the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands Programme," E. Roe (First Draft), Rural Planning Division, 4th February, 1983.
5. "Possible Project Ideas for an Arid and Semi-Arid Lands Programme in Taita-Taveta District," Rural Planning Division, February 1983. (E. Roe).
6. "Ministry of Agriculture: ASAL Development-NDPV," M. Thiongo, E. Weiss, and E. Roe, 16th April, 1983.
7. "Report of Government Representatives on a GOK/DANIDA Fact-Finding Mission to Identify Potential Project Components for an ASAL Programme in Taita-Taveta District," E. Roe, J. Carlsen. A.U. Wandera and I. Asmon, July 1983.
8. "MEPD's ASAL Development Programme and its Links to Other Activities within the Ministry's Rural Planning Division," Rural Planning Division, September 1983. (E. Roe).

II. Government Documents/Circulars to which the Rural Planning Project has had major inputs.

1. 1979-83 District Development Plans, 40 Districts, January 1980.
2. "District Focus for Rural Development: Briefing Seminar, Kenya Institute of Administration, April 1983," Office of the President, Development Co-ordination and Cabinet Office, April 1983.
3. "District Focus for Rural Development," Office of the President, Development Co-ordination and Cabinet Office, 10th June, 1983. (23 pages).
4. "Implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development: Preparation of Ministry Reports," Office of the President, Development Co-ordination and Cabinet Office, 10th June, 1983. (OP/DCO.14/12/1A/(88)).
5. "Staff Redeployment to Implement the District Focus for Rural Development," Office of the President, Directorate of Personnel Management, 10th June, 1983. (DPM.52/22/13/1A Vol.II/(21)).

III. Documentation from Rural Planning Project, Phase I.

1. "The Rural Planning Project: Rural Planning Section: Ministry of Economic Planning and Community Affairs: A Mid-Term Evaluation," John T. Saywell, March 1979.
2. "Rural Planning Project, Rural Planning Division, Ministry of Economic Planning and Development: Response to Mid-Term Evaluation," March 1980.
Annex A: "Work Plan, Rural Planning Project: 1st July, 1979 - 31st December, 1980," 1st November, 1980.
3. "Rural Planning Project, Ministry of Finance and Planning: Semi-Annual Report: 1st July to 31st December, 1977."
4. "Narrative Report and Future Work Plans, Rural Planning Project, Ministry of Finance and Planning," 29 August, 1977.

* * * * *

ANNEX C

ALL DISTRICT PLAN STATUS REPORT
(plus examples of individual district status sheets)

DISTRICT SUMMARY REPORT

30 September, 1983, PM

Districts with Chapt 1 and 2
reasonably complete (17)

BARINGO
BUNGOMA
BUSIA
GARISSA
KAKEMEGA
KISUMU
KITUI
LAIKIPIA
MANDERA
MERU
MURANGA
NANDI
SAMBURU
TURKANA
UASIN GISHU
WAJIR
WEST POKOT

Districts with partially
completed plan (8)

EMBU
ISIOLO
KISII
MOMBASA
NAROK
NYANDARUA
NYERI
SOUTH-NYANZA

Districts for which DDOs
claim that plans complete
and in transit to MEFD or
plans already received by
MEFD but being revised by
DDO (13)

ELGEYO-MARAKWET
KAJIADO
KERICHO
KIAMBU
KILIFI
KIRINYAGA
KWALE
LAMU
MACHAKOS
NAKURU
NYANDARUA
SIAYA
TANA RIVER
TRANS-NZOIA

Districts for which very
little received (2)

MARSABIT
TAITA-TAVETA

ALL DISTRICT STATUS REPORT

30 September, 1983, PM

BARINGO WP delivered 5 Xerox copies 23 Sept.; copies sent to PFO. DDO yesterday; response expected by 14 Oct. latest; Roe has edited his copy once more. Annex, section 3 missing. Edited copy to NSP for second page proofs.

BUNGOMA DDO has allegedly completed Chapt 1 and 2. Being typed by MEPD. Hopefully ready for NSP Fri, 30 Sept.

BUSIA Chapt. 1 and 2 to NSP 23 Sept., promised 30 Sept.

ELGEYO-
MARAkwET Received and edited Sections 1 and 2 of Chapt 1 and Section 1 of Chapt. 2. DDO expected in Nairobi next week with remainder of Chapt 1 and 2.

EMBU Chapt. 2 edited by Roe, to NSP Thurs 29 Sept. DDO has promised to bring revised section 1, Chapt 1 and Annex Sections 1 and 2 week of 3 October.

GARISSA typed by WP, edited by NSP, PFO, DDO now reviewing in Nairobi. To WP Thurs 29 Sept., hopefully delivery on Mon 3 Oct. so DDO can take back to district.

ISILOLO 5 copies edited and typeset delivered by NSP Chapt. 1 only, edited by Roe and returned to NSP. DDO claims Chapt 2 sent to MEPD but not yet received.

KAJIADO virtually nothing received; DDO claims bottleneck is typing. Kidenda will call.

KAKEMEGA Chapt. 1 and 2 to NSP 23 Sept.; promised 30 Sept. AM

KERICHO DDO says Chapt. 1 and 2 finished 2 weeks ago; working on annex. DDO will deliver to Nairobi Wed, 5 Oct.

KIAMEU DDO has completed Chapt 1 and 2, presently revising; Kidenda will call.

KILIFI Chapt 1 and 2 received, read, discussed with DDO, and work programme agreed; Carleson working with DDO in Kilifi week of 26 Sept. to integrate data from TARDAs study.

KIRINYAGA chapt 1 received but very weak, chapt 2 and annex expected next week. DDO will arrive Tues, Oct 4

with Chapt. 1 and 2.

KISII Geist working on draft.

KISUMU Geist working on chapt 1, chapt 2 received but much too long

KITUI NSP delivered 5 xerox copies 23 Sept. edited and typeset; sent to DDO, PPO yesterday; response expected 14 October latest; Roe has completed edit of new draft. Edited copy at NSP for 2nd page proofs.

KWALE Chapt 1, part Chapt 2 received but needs much work. Carleson and N'gelu visiting DDO week of 26 Sept..

LAIKIPIA First draft completed WP, edited by NSP, WP corrections completed. Sent to NSP for further edit 29 Sept.; promised Fri Oct 7, will be given then to DDO to present to DDC.

LAMU DDO scheduled to arrive Nairobi with completed Chapt 1 and 2

MACHAKOS virtually nothing received, but DDO says stencils have been prepared for Chapt 1 and 2; Roe will ensure arrives week of 3 Oct.

MANDERA typed by WP, DDO and PPO reviewing, edited copy by NSP delivered Tues, 27 Sept. Disks back from WP1 and delivered to WP 30 Sept.

MARSABIT nothing received; Bundotich will deliver Chapt 1, 2 and Annex Mon Oct. 3.

MERU NSP given revised draft yesterday; will inform us of delivery date by Fri 30 Sept. Delivery circa Oct 5-7.

MOMBASA part of chapter 1 received; ready for NSP Fri Sept. 30; Klaus will talk with DDO, PPO Thurs Sept 29.

MURANGA WP1 now printing Chapt. 1, and typing Chapt 2; Annex Section 3 received, needs 3 xerox copies, then to WP1.

NAKURU DDO says Chapt 1 and 2 complete, but not received. May arrive Nairobi via RVP 30 Sept.

NANDI Nearly completed Chapt 1 and 2 arrived 30 Sept. Ready for delivery to NSP.

NAROK Chapt 1 ready for typing; to NSP Thurs 29 Sept. Chapt 2. Sect 1 and 2 received 30 Sept., xeroxed and ready for NSP. Remainder of Chapt 2 will be

delivered by Wed 5 Oct.

NYANDARUA Remaining sections of Chapt 1 (except maps) received 30 Sept.; DDO working on Annex but says needs help.

NYERI Chapt 1 sent to NSF Thurs 29 Sept. Chapt. 2 promised by DDO Tues Oct. 5.

SAMBURU entire plan clean typed by WP, edited by NSF; maps received but not yet prepared for integration with text; PPO and DDO are reviewing; returned to WP Wed Sept 28 for cleanup. Promised Mon 3 Oct.

SIAYA DDO says Chapt 1 complete except for Cooperative's section. Kidenda will call.

SOUTH NYANZA Chapt 1 received but needs work; Geist is editing, separating out material that should be in Chapt. 2

TAITA TAVETA nothing; N'Gelu drafting with DDO this week.

TANA RIVER parts of Chapt 1 and 2 received, but need much work. Carleson assisting DDO this week.

TRANS NZOIA DDO has prepared handwritten drafts of a few sections; promised to deliver remainder to Nairobi by 20 Sept, but failed. DDO will arrive Nairobi Thurs 6 Oct. with entire plan.

TURKANA Abridged handwritten version of Chapt 1 and 2 received and being typed by MEFD

UASIN GISHU Second, edited version received from WP Thurs Sept 29, and sent on to NSF for further edit. promised Oct. 7.

WAJIR WP has typed, NSF edited; PPO and DDO have reviewed. WP working on second version, promised Mon 3 Oct., will be given to DDO to take back to district.

WEST FOKOT promises to deliver corrected copy later on this week. Maps expected week of 3 Oct..

ANNEX D

TRAINING PROGRAMME FOR DISTRICT FOCUS

Details of Training Components

September 1983

61

STATUS OF RSCTU PROJECTS

I.

- A. (i) Training at District and Divisional levels. The Project is to assist in up-grading the capabilities of the field personnel and the development committees in managing local level development. Consultation and Planning Workshops have been held in the past (1979 and 1981). Training of Trainers Workshops (7) have been held. Training Needs Assessments and Training Workshops have been done in 9 districts. Training Needs Assessments have been done in 5 divisions.
- (ii) In consultation with other members of the Rural Planning Division, it is now necessary to work out guidelines for District and Divisional level training incorporating the emphasis on the District focus for Rural Development Strategy. This includes the development/preparation of training materials, involvement of relevant training institutions, and drawing up of a training schedule.
- B. (i) The District Socio-Cultural Profiles (DSCPP) was started in 1980/81, when Phase I was done covering Turkana, Elgeyo Marakwet and Machakos Districts. Phase II was done in 1981/82 and covered Busia, South Nyanza, Samburu and Marsabit. Work on Phase III started in July 1983 and is on Taita Taveta, Kajiado, Baringo and Kisii. At the end of each phase an inter-ministerial seminar is held to present and discuss the findings and their relevance to development planning and implementation. The last such seminar was held in July 1983 on Phase II.

6/16

- (ii) Professional editing is currently underway on the Phase I reports, and if the necessary funds can be found these reports should be printed and distributed by June 1984.
- (iii) The F.P.P.I. has made available funds to cover Meru, Embu and Kitui Districts in the period 1984/85. It is necessary to identify other willing donors. So far the funds spent on this project have been GOK with some assistance from UNFPA.
- (iv) One of the immediate steps to be taken is to identify and assign a small team of experts to develop some training material on this project's findings, to be fed into regular ministry training programmes.

C. Inventory of Personnel Establishment and Supportive Facilities

is an exercise that is to record the number of personnel, their training/expertise, transport - number of vehicles serviceable and otherwise, housing/office accomodation, training institutions etc. on a district basis. All the districts in the country will have been covered by the end of September, 1983. Initially, the report on this activity will be produced on a provincial basis, of which three provincial drafts are ready; work on the other four is at an advanced stage. When produced, the reports will be made available to all districts, provinces, ministries and any other relevant agencies.

D. (i) Work on the DIDC Clearing House has in the last few months concentrated on locating and collecting district specific material/data relevant to district planning. This is to continue. The information available has been made accessible to the officers involved in the current planning exercise.

(ii) Recruitment of a documentalist or deployment of an officer from the Division (familiar with the required information and capable of generating some) is an urgent need funds from which this officer could be paid have been made available by IDA. Negotiations with the DPM need to be revived for the necessary authority to recruit.

(iii) A small working group is necessary to identify the materials which should be reproduced, extracted etc. and sent to the districts to form the beginning of the DIDC's.

(iv) MIDP (EEC) has made available funds to construct the Machakos DIDC. Other Donors are being requested to integrate this in the Integrated Development Programmes in which they are involved.

D. The Community Action for Disadvantaged Rural Women (CADRW) in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL)- was started in May, 1982. Initially, it has been implemented in three pilot districts (West Pokot, Isiolo and Taita Taveta). It will be extended to another 3 districts in 1984. (Baringo, Kajiado, and Kitui). This project, ^{is very closely related to (a) and (b) above,} and it is intended that it benefits from the experiences and findings of the two projects. Presently there is a working Group carrying out Women Leadership training and

II. Review of Government Training Institutions and their potential contribution to training in management and planning skills relevant to District Focus

This review would consist of a compilation of information on the major training institutions in Kenya which sponsor long or short courses for civil servants and an analysis of their potential contribution to training for District Focus. This review would concentrate on training related to planning, project development, management, financial management and budgeting, communication skills and the training of trainers. Two distinct types of training would be considered:

- 1) Long or short courses to civil servants specifically devoted to one of the above topics; and
- 2) The addition of a segment or a component on the above skills (particularly planning and management) to existing technical training programmes. For example, in a technical training course for Water Engineers a component on planning skills might be added. Another example might be the addition of a session on the Socio-Cultural Profiles to a training programme for any of the department heads.

This review will concentrate on only the major training institutions which have a significant contribution to make to the District Focus. It is not meant as an up-date to the Directory of Extension Training Institutions (1981). However, such an up-date is important and will be programmed during 1984/85. This review and report will serve as the basis for preparation of training materials and for other consultations

III. Review of Ministry Training Programmes.

This report will be based on the Ministry Reports on the Implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development. An initial review of these reports indicates that the sections on training are variable in quality and in level of detail. Where the reports are insufficient, additional contact will be made with the training divisions in the relevant ministries.

The assessment would include an inventory of all ministerial training programmes which include components on planning and management skills.

IV. Preparation of Training Materials to Feed into the Training Institution and Ministry Programmes

The major role of the Rural Planning Division and R.S.C.T.U. would be to insure that materials related to District Focus training needs are fed into these Training Institution and Ministry training programmes. This would involve four specific tasks:

- A. Seminar of Staff Development Division Officers from the major operating ministries to discuss training for District Focus. This seminar would review the report prepared under (III) above and assess needs for training materials and other support.
- B. Conference of Heads of Training Institutions on training for District Focus. The agenda for this conference would include:
 - a. a detailed orientation on District Focus;
 - b. assessment of District Focus training needs;
 - c. assessment of existing training addressing

these needs; and

- d. identification of additional training materials needed.

C. Establishment of a Coordinating Committee for Training for District Focus. Following the Seminar for Staff Development Division Officers and the Conference of Heads of Training Institutions, a Coordinating Committee would be established, with representatives from the Rural Planning Division, Directorate of Personnel Management, and KIA to coordinate training for District Focus.

D. Preparation of Training Materials for District Focus.

This would include:

- a. identification of specific materials/modules needed;
- b. establishment of small working teams (composed of one RSCTU staff member and two technical officers from MEPD, Treasury, or elsewhere) to prepare the training modules, introductions to circulars, training materials based on the Socio-Cultural Profiles, etc.;
- c. review of draft training materials;
- d. dissemination of the training materials to the Training Institutions and Ministry programmes.

(Note: All of the above would require close coordination between our Division and the Staff Development Division in DPM)

V. Training Seminars for Planning Officials

An important component of the overall training programme will be a continuation of the specific training activities for planning officials (D.D.O.s, P.P.O.s, P.P.A.s). This would include, at a minimum:

- A. A series of three regional seminars/workshops during March-May 1984 for all the above officials to concentrate on Preparation of Annual Work Programmes (the Annex to the District Development Plans). The seminar would include on the agenda:
 - a. presentation of detailed guidelines;
 - b. analysis of problems with the 1983/84 annual work programmes; and
 - c. sessions on various relevant planning skills, e.g. preparation of implementation schedules.
- B. An assessment of additional training possibilities for each group of planning officials.
- C. This would also include provision of additional materials to the training programme for District Commissioners being organized by OOP.

* * * * *

Annex E

DISTRICT FOCUS FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

This is essential reading for all those concerned about the new thrust towards decentralized planning control and implementation strategies and tactics.

Written with substantial inputs from the RPP advisors in the RPD, it helps to answer several of the questions in my terms of reference, such as:

- b) Have the objectives been taken over by the GOK desire to achieve them earlier ?
- h) ... recognising the difficulty caused by resource constraints - what has been the recent history in district level control of expenditures ?
- i) ... What role has RPII played in the formulation of guidelines and operational procedures for the implementation of the District Focus for Rural Development .
- o) The need to co-ordinate between the Ministry of Finance and the Office of the President was recognised. What efforts have been made at co-ordination ? Successes and problems ?