CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Rural Planning I	615-0162	USAID/Kenya

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 615-82-0

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 76	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 80	C. Final Input Delivery FY 82	A. Total $5,882,000 B. U.S. $2,648,000	From (month/yr.) 12/77 To (month/yr.) 6/81 Date of Evaluation Review August 1981

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
None. The evaluation was done after the project was completed.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

AGR:TJWorrick TJWorrick
PROG:WSLefes
D/DIR:CECostello CEC

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name Allison B. Herrick

Date 5-20-82

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

/

Project Evaluation Summary (Final)

1. USAID/Kenya

2. Project 615-0162

3. Rural Planning I

4. Key Dates: (a) Project Agreement Signed FY 76.
   (b) Final Obligation FY 80.
   (c) Final Input Delivered FY 82.

5. Total U.S. Funding: $2,648,000.

6. Period Covered: 12/77 - 6/81.

7. Date of Evaluation: August 1981.

8. Project Officer: T.J. Worrick,
   Agriculture Economist.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Note: This evaluation summary was completed prior to receipt of new Africa Bureau guidelines contained in State 018077.

I. The Project attempted to change an overly centralized "top down" development, planning process.

II. The new "technology" promoted was a decentralized "bottomup" planning process.

III. The new planning process is an ongoing one based on District Development Committees whose role is to review and coordinate local input into the national development budget and development plan. The Committees also are asked to coordinate the implementation activities of various national ministries at the local district level.

13. SUMMARY

On June 30, 1976 USAID/Kenya signed a project agreement with Government of Kenya that identified two closely related technical assistance activities. The first activity responded to constraints identified in the agriculture planning process, particularly in the setting of priorities, identification of programs, gathering of data, and monitoring and evaluation of programs and projects. Secondly, the project supported within the Ministry of Economic Planning and Development (MEPD) a Rural Planning Unit, which implements Government's decision to decentralize development planning to the District Level through the use of 40 District Development Committees (DDC's). The two activities are related in that the MOA effort focuses on sector-wide program planning and evaluation techniques, and the MEPD assistance defines policies and procedures for participatory planning and implementation at the District level. The project financed two GOK contracts with Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID). The first provided assistance to the MOA, as part of a multi-donor effort towards which the U.S. contributed 37.6 percent of total funding. The second, fully funded by AID, provided technical assistance and training to upgrade the skills of MEPD personnel. The MEPD advisors developed guidelines for district inputs into the 1979-83 Development Plan, analyzed performance of the GOK rural development fund, and designed a training program for MEPD planning personnel. The MOA advisors developed policies and procedures for agricultural program planning and assisted Kenyans in preparing project proposals for external financing.

The project with the MOA is being continued with other donor funding. Assistance to MEPD is continuing under the USAID financed Project 615-0189 Rural Planning II. This PP should be consulted by those seeking a detailed review of project activities under Rural Planning I 0162.

Several major problems surfaced in the mid-term projects evaluation in late 1978:

(a) The assignment of qualified GOK counterparts to each (HIID) advisor did not proceed as scheduled because of Government's inability to recruit and retain the required critically skilled professional staff personnel.

(b) The Ministry of Agriculture's Management Systems Evaluation Unit (MSEU) did not achieve operational status, although two HIID advisors were working in this functional capacity.

(c) Contractor's Semi-Annual progress reports for the MOA "Pool" component were not sufficiently comprehensive in scope and content to enable project donors to realistically assess problems and progress of this AID-supported activity. Additionally, the requirement that GOK clear each HIID MOA "Pool" report prior to its submission to the donors, significantly delayed transmission of these reports to the donors.

(d) Recurrent inability of Government to submit quarterly project reimbursement claims to USAID in a timely manner has slowed disbursements to Government of project funds.

These points will be reviewed in detail below but it can be noted here that significant improvement have been made.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This final project evaluation is initiated in accordance with USAID/Kenya project management procedure and AID's requirement for periodic evaluations. Major sources of data used in this evaluation included contractor's semi-annual progress reports and annual Work Plans; Rural Planning II PP; Discussions with (HIID) Senior Rural Development Advisors and the (HIID) "Pool" Senior Advisor/Administrative Director and Senior GOK officials of MOA and MEPD.

15. DOCUMENTATION TO BE REVISED AND/OR PREPARED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

None.

16. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT EXTERNAL FACTORS

There were no substantive changes in project setting which has an impact on the project.

17. EVALUATION FINDINGS ABOUT GOAL

> "The goal of this project is to enhance the absorptive capacity for development activities in the rural areas, particularly agricultural programs directed towards the rural poor, and to ensure opportunities for full participation of rural people in planning and implementing these activities".

Acceptable progress was made toward goal achievement although the time originally allowed for the project was inadequate. Project staff helped prepare the 1979-83 Kenya Development Plan which focused increased attention to the development of small farmer assistance programs. Examples of specific developments are the Machakos Integrated Development Program, AID's Arid and Semi-arid Lands Project and the completion of nearly all of the 40 District Development Plans.

In addition, the team played a major role in the preparation of Kenya Food Policy Paper and will continue to backstop and assist the implementation of programs which may follow.

A comprehensive staff training program was undertaken. Both in-country and overseas training was provided.

18. PROJECT PURPOSE

> "Improve the institutional capability of the GOK to plan and implement agricultural sector policy and programs and in so doing ensure that rural people have an opportunity to participate in these processes".

The MEPD Rural Planning Unit advisors, with assistance from the MOA conducted training programs and prepared standardized systems for infrastructure inventories, information flow and project identification and analysis. This was followed by the District Planning Exercise. As expected, given the uneven spread of manpower resources, the plans ranged from quite good to poor. Participation by District Development Committees as varied greatly. Many of the plans, however, were not completed in time to be used in the formulation of the National Plan.

In the early stages of the project there was a shortage of counterpart staff. The Rural Planning Division now has 9 Kenyan officers, compared to 3 in 1976.

The Project Paper for Rural Planning II 615-0189 contains a more detailed discussion of accomplishments and can be used by those parties interested in more in-depth analysis.

Assistance provided to MOA, Development Planning Division was to assist in formulating and defining agricultural development strategy and monitoring and evaluating agricultural projects. Initial problems centered on lack of counterparts, diversion of staff to short term operational needs and lack of access to policy level Kenyan officers. While the dynamic private sector continues to lure staff to better paying jobs, most of the more difficult problems have been addressed. Two reorganizations have resulted in functioning sections dealing with Strategy Planning Commodity Analysis, Policy Planning, Project Preparation and a management Systems Evaluation Unit.

Perhaps as a result of poor performance in the agriculture sector the advisors hitherto layered down in the bureaucracy now have access to policy makers. This has been evidenced by the major inputs provided to the Food Policy Paper and the clearly changed activities of the advisors detailed in the past two semi-annual reports.

19. LESSONS LEARNED

(a) In the case of the MEPD District Planning activity the attempt to prepare 40 plans simultaneously was unfortunate. There was not the data base, the capability of District staff was limited and some central ministeries were not cooperative. The rigidities of existing systems were probably under-estimated. However, progress has been made and a process begun. Data disagregation and a slow buildup of District Level responsibility for activities are important first step.

(b) There is no clear division between the advisor role and the operational line ministry positions. The

advisors have spent considerable time in line capacities particularly in planning and implementation of the integrated district level projects. This has the positive effect of increasing the advisors knowledge of actual processes but does reduce time available for other tasks.

(c) Authority over money is the key to decentralization. Under this project not enough effort was placed on determining the set of conditions that would need to be met to convince the central authorities that substantial funds could be allocated and used effectively at district level. This is the focus of the follow-on project.

(d) Counterparts for advisors continue to be a problem, mostly at MOA. This problem will not go away and project designs need to over compensate with additional training etc.

(e) There is a strong advantage to donors when they have close contacts with high level advisors such as provided in this project. While their loyalty is clearly with their Kenyan employers (as it should be) they can improve the flow of information and ideas with the many contacts developed between donors and government.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS

USAID determined that further assistance to the MOA was not warranted based on the level of performance in mid-1978. Subsequent performance, however, was much improved but other priority claims on USAID resources precluded continued USAID grant funding. With the reorganization and improved functioning we agreed to the use of local currency generations to support a Phase II while other donors have made initial contributions of foreign exchange. AID may program some additional support for this project in the future.