

SN-33468

PD-AAN-868

6080154/15

XD-AAN-868-A

NEAR EAST EVALUATION ABSTRACT

PROJECT TITLE(S) AND NUMBER(S)

SOCIAL & ECONOMIC RESEARCH  
608-0154

INDIVIDUAL/OTHER SERVICE

USAID/MOROCCO

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION** The Project's purpose is to encourage and support Moroccan experts to undertake social and economic research which can help provide an analytical basis for economic and social development programs, and to develop an institutional basis for continuation of this effort. Ideally, this was to have been achieved via the support of at least 60 development-oriented social and economic research projects strengthening the administrative capacity of the research center and synthesizing and disseminating research findings in a form useable by decision makers.

<b>AUTHORIZATION DATE AND U.S. LOP FUNDING AMOUNT</b> May 20, 1979... \$450,000	<b>PES NUMBER</b> 608-84-02	<b>PES DATE</b> January, 1984	<b>PES TYPE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<b>ABSTRACT PREPARED BY, DATE</b> Ursula Nadolny Evaluation Officer 1/4/84	<b>ABSTRACT CLEARED BY, DATE</b> Robert C. Chase, Mission Director 1/1/84		<input type="checkbox"/> Special <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal

The original project called for annual evaluations. Nevertheless, none were held, on the rationale that no completed studies were available to be judged. The present evaluation, held just prior to the PACD, was to provide an accounting of project status and implementation progress vis-a-vis PP and ProAg guidelines and general AID procedures; to determine actual potential outcomes of project activities vis-a-vis intended outcomes; and to provide information which would be used to help determine the desirability of extending the PACD.

**Status:** At present thirty-eight research projects have been selected for funding under the project. Of these, seventeen are from "Phase I" and should be complete at various times within the coming year. Twenty represent new efforts, seven of which are scheduled to end next year, five in 1985, and nine in 1986. Some of these, (those with short periods), are actually on-going efforts that the project is assisting in some particular phase (e.g. printing), but the majority are long-term efforts associated with research in connection with candidates fulfilling their requirements for "licence" (BS), "troisième" (M.S.), or "Doctorate d'Etat" (Post-Graduate) degrees.

The project began as a three year effort, under the direction of the Rectorate of Mohamed V University, and was designed to obtain approximately sixty short-term studies focused on development issues. However, various political and administrative problems internal to the Rectorate, not the project, forestalled actual implementation until at USAID's insistence, the Rectorate transferred responsibility to the newly created National Center for the Coordination and Planning of Scientific and Technological Research. (C.N.C.P.R.S.T.).

The Center has revived the project in ways that contribute more to its mandate to build its institutional capacity for multidisciplinary research coordination than for the single focused purpose of obtaining a series of individual research studies.

**Key Findings:** The conclusion of this evaluation is that the project, at the eleventh hour, has become something more significant, promising and relevant than originally planned. The project has actually become an effort at institution building and represents an immediate opportunity, at minimal additional cost, to make a significant contribution to the orientation, development and institutionalization of applied research in Morocco. In light of the negative consequences of termination in contrast to the benefits of continuation, the evaluation recommended prolonging the activity, but using some remaining funds in ways that will reinforce the institutional capacity of the center, rather than merely augment and complete the number of ongoing research activities per se.

POAAV 868

Lessons Learned (from Evaluation Report)

1. For a project to succeed, the appropriate institutional context must be properly defined at the outset and kept in perspective as project activities evolve.

2. In development projects, timing is crucial to success, and waiting until opportunities arise is a legitimate development strategy. There is too much pressure to do things "on time", rather than developing a timing strategy that is justified as long as it promises a winning performance in the end.

3. The value of a project to a country, USAID, or development in general, cannot be measured in dollars and cents. Many such small projects become highly cost effective in comparison to more grandiose efforts, and oftentimes, are deserving of more attention than they get.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH

608-0154

MOROCCO

84-02

REGULAR EVALUATION  SPECIAL EVALUATION

<b>6. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES</b> A. Final In-CAS or Equivalent: FY <u>79</u> B. Final Obligation Expected: FY <u>79</u> C. Final Input Delivery: FY <u>84</u>			<b>8. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING</b> A. Total \$ <u>600,000</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>450,000</u>	<b>7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION</b> From (month/yr.) <u>MAY, 1979</u> To (month/yr.) <u>OCTOBER, 1983</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>DECEMBER, 1983</u>
--	--	--	--	---

**9. 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
1. Extend PACD by three years to December 31, 1986	USAID; AID/W (AA/NE)	December 31, 1983
2. Revise project budget for future years; esp. use remaining research funds to finance fewer but larger research projects of more direct relevance to USAID's and NE Bureau's Research priorities.	USAID	January, 1984
3. Reorient project to put renewed emphasis on the institution building element of the project during the extended LOP.	USAID	January, 1984
4. Establish criteria for payment of honoraria within the project.	USAID CNCPRST	January, 1984
5. Schedule an internal evaluation for December 1984 and a formal external evaluation for early 1986 to consider performance and impact of the project.	USAID, CNCPRST	January, 1984

**5. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/T	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____

**10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT**

A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
E. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

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

James T. Smith, Jr. Program Economist

*James T. Smith, Jr.*

**12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approves**

Signature	<i>Robert C. Chase</i>
Typed Name	Robert C. Chase
Date	11/6/84

111

XD-AAN-862-A  
608 0154/17  
ISN-33465

EVALUATION REPORT

USAID / RABAT

SOCIO-ECONOMIC RESEARCH PROJECT 608-0154

NOVEMBER 10, 1983

W

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
I. Chronological History of Project Evaluation	1
II. Evaluation Findings	5
III. Responses to Specific AID Management Questions	15
IV. Recommendation and Conclusions	20

APPENDIX I - Conclusions reached by the Project Review Committee which differ from the Findings of the Evaluation.

ANNEXES

✓

## INTRODUCTION

This report is divided into four sections:

Part one is a chronological history of events as documented by the official files. It demonstrates the project's evolution, from the project paper concept of financing three years of short-term development oriented studies, to the present reality of its becoming enmeshed in a significant effort to upgrade Morocco's insitutional capacity for coordination of research through the creation of a new research center.

Part two are my conclusions presented in accordance with the standard format of AID Project Evaluation Summary Form 1330-15A (Handbook 3).

Part three represents specific responses to USAID Rabat questions expressed in the scope of work, but not fully covered under the PES format.

Part four represents my own personal conclusions and recommendations. I do not consider them definitive in any way, but rather as a contribution to what will be an indepth review and consideration of the final actions to be taken.

### I. Chronological History of Project Evolution:

#### Critical Events and Documents Recorded in Project File

<u>Date:</u>	<u>Event and Importance:</u>
AUG 1976:	Royal decree (dahir) approving law No. 1-76-503 authorizing the creation of the National Center for the Coordination and Planning of Scientific and Technological Research. This law outlines the pivotal liaison role the Center is supposed to play between Moroccan national research institutions and international and foreign research organizations. It specifically calls for the creation of both an administrative and a scientific council.
JUL/AUG/1978:	Dr. Amal Rassam's report on "Development of Small Research Grant." [ No copies located. Referred to in Project Paper].
NOV 1978:	Project Identification Document (PID) submitted.
FEB 1979:	Dr. Amal Rassam's report: "Local Research Development Grant-Project for Social Science Research in Morocco." [ No copies located. Referred to in Project Paper]
FEB 1979:	Project Paper submitted. The paper describes the intent of the project to be; (Part I-Description of Project), "to encourage and support Moroccan experts to undertake social and economic research... (for) development programs... (for) the poor majority... in the form of small, short-term research grants.., (and is) expected to provide basic data on key sectors... and to anticipate... USAID's needs for social soundness analysis... (and to identify) strategic priorities... (and) constraints. "The logframe describes the project purpose as to: "Encourage and support Moroccan experts to undertake social and economic research... and develop institutional basis for continuation." The project goal is to: "Strengthen economic and social development programs... (for) poor majority."

- MAY 1979: Project Agreement signed. It describes the purpose as encouragement and support (for) Moroccan experts. It makes no mention of providing basic data or identifying strategic priorities and constraints.
- AUG 1979: USAID submits list of suggested topics for short-term research grants.
- JAN 1980: NEAC retrospective review of project paper, (State 016123), supports the project, but suggests clarification and tightening up of implementation schedule, and an evaluation of project status.
- FEB 1980: Memorandum to AID/Dir H. Fleming from M. Ward, Program Officer, reporting on project status. Ward notes continued slow progress due to numerous factors, including political circumstances and administrative reorganizations that seem to have reduced the Rector's ability and volition to take decisive action to get the project moving. At the same time, the Rector is reported to have expressed hope to activate the Scientific Committee soon.
- FEB 1980: C.N.C.P.R.S.T. publishes a brochure of the dahir outlining its responsibilities and functions. It is the beginnings of the Center actually becoming functional since its legal authorization in 1976.
- MAR 1980: USAID replies to NEAC recommendations, (Rabat 1660), stating belief that evaluation should wait till 2nd or 3rd year and that... "although logframe naturally must slip as a result of implementation delay... any effort at this stage to make it more precise would unfortunately be an exercise in sheer speculation. Causal linkages will remain sketchy and end of project status will remain vague until the Rectorate goes through a cycle of inviting proposals, awarding grants... and evaluating the results. At that point, about November 1980, we will have a record of performance on which to base a concrete projection of results."
- MAY 1980: M. Ward memorandum to AID/D Fleming reporting that the Rector is at last requesting proposals.
- JUN 1980: Rector requests proposals be submitted to Scientific Committee.
- SEP: 1980: First indepth evaluation scheduled.
- OCT 1980: M. Ward memo to AID/D Fleming. Memo optimistically notes that: 1) thirty proposals, many of distinct interest to USAID, have been submitted, and ten so far selected; 2) that it was mutually agreed that more than 20 grants be made immediately, due to implementation delay; 3) that, in contrast to the Scientific Committee, USAID feels PhD candidate research should be considered for financing; and, 4) agreeing that Scientific Committee members who act as research counselors could be paid for this work from the project budget.
- MAY 1981: AID/W, (State 130249), asks about evaluation plans.
- MAY 1981: USAID/Rabat, (Rabat 3668), suggests October 1981 evaluation. (never occurs).
- SEP 1981: Project Implementation Letter #1, from AID/D Fleming to Rector:

1) approves phase II research; 2) notes that AID can only advance funds up to 12 months, but is obligated to give \$450,000 during life of project; 3) informs Rector that... "We will, provided AID/W concurs, extend that date (PAC) to June 30, 1984 in order to fund all of the research activities proposed... We would prefer not to extend further the PACD beyond June 1984 and therefore request that all additional activities to be considered comply with that date.

- JUN 1982: USAID/Rabat informs AID/W (Rabat 4554) that: "Project effectively dead in the water"... and, per AID/D conversations in AID/W, USAID will move to partially deobligation unless real activity shown."
- JUL 1982: AID/W expresses support for project, but concurs in plans to deobligate by end of September, unless some results are seen. (State 194419).
- JUL 1982: A/DIR Petrequin letter to Rector, expressing seriousness of situation due to inactivity, and that USAID, since it would rather not end project, is hoping to see quick action to reactivate project activities.
- SEP 1982: Letter from Rector to AID/D, announcing plan to turn project over to C.N.C.P.R.S.T., "where it should have properly been placed in the beginning if the Center had been operational at that time."
- DEC 1982: Agreement signed transferring project to C.N.C.P.R.S.T.
- DEC 1982: Memo from A/DIR to AID/DIR, requesting extension of PACD and outlining causes of project delay.
- DEC 1982: Original PACD date arrives. AID/D Chase memos extends PACD to DEC. 83, but notes: need new implementation plan; need for research geared to current areas of development interest to AID; and, project carries a heavy burden of proof to justify any further extension.
- APR 1983: C.N.C.P.R.S.T. provides new list of Scientific Committee members.
- APR 1983: PIL #2, extends PACD to 31 Dec. 1983.
- MAY 1983: AID/D letter to C.N.C.P.R.S.T. Director asking for clarification of costs for the Center's administration of project.
- MAY 1983: C.N.C.P.R.S.T. Director's letter to AID/D, clarifying their position on administrative costs of project.
- MAY 1983: Payment to C.N.C.P.R.S.T. of second advance to continue funding ongoing research, and to fund beginning of new research studies.
- JUN 1985: C.N.C.P.R.S.T. holds research evaluation and methodology conference.
- SEP 1983: Memorandum from AID/D Chase, calling for prompt tough-nosed evaluation.

- SEP 1983: C.N.C.P.R.S.T. requests project funds to send Bouazza, C.N.C.P.R.S.T. project administrator, for R and D Project management seminar in U.S.A.
- OCT 17: USAID reject sending Mr. Bouazza at this time, due to limitations in Project Agreement on travel and upcoming evaluation.
- NOV 1983: First evaluation held. The following individuals interviewed provided specific input to findings:

AID Personnel:

Benabdesselam, A. - USAID Project Officer

Erdahl, Wm. - Former USAID Rabat Program Officer (Interviewed at AID/W)

Petrequin, H. - A/Dir USAID/Rabat

Smith, J. - USAID/Rabat Economist, Present Project Officer

Ward, M. - Former USAID/Rabat Program Officer (Interviewed of AID/W)

Williams, A. - RCO, USAID/Rabat

C.N.C.P.R.S.T. Administrative Personnel

Ben Sari M. Driss, - Director, C.N.C.P.R.S.T.

Bouazza, M. - Project Administrator, Researcher, C.N.C.P.R.S.T.

Members of C.N.C.P.R.S.T. Scientific Committee

Alaoui, Tahar - Physician, Maternite de Rabat

Benjelloun, M. Abdelaziz - Dean, Faculty of Law, Rabat

Cherkaoui, M. Abdelmalek, - Ministry of Plan

Pascon, Paul, - Prof. Hassan II University

Researchers Receiving Project Grants

Arrif, Ahmed - Researcher - Student, Hassan II University

Bouazzaoui, Dr. Naima, - Chief of Premature Infant Service,  
Rabat University Hospital Center

El Gallag, - M. Mohamed - National Economic Development Bank (B.N.D.E.)

Kabbaj Mustapha - Professor, Mohamed V University

Laouina, M. Abdallah - Professor, ENS (Teachers College)

PART II: Evaluation Findings (As Per PES Format)

A) Summary (PES Question 13)

At present thirty-eight research projects have been selected for funding under the project. Of these, seventeen are from phase I and should be complete at various times within the coming year. Twenty represent new efforts, seven of which are scheduled to end next year, five in 1985, and nine in 1986. Some of these, (those with short periods), are actually on-going efforts that the project is assisting in some particular phase, (e.g. printing), but the majority are longterm efforts associated with research in connection with candidates fulfilling their requirements for "licence" (BS), "troisieme" (M.S.) or "Doctorate d'Etat" (Post-graduate) degrees.

The project began as a three year effort, under the direction of the Rectorate of Mohammed V University, and was design to obtain approximately sixty short-term studies focused on development issues. However, various political and administrative problems internal to the Rectorate, not the project, forestalled actual implementation until at the last moment and just prior to USAID deobligation of funds, the Rectorate transferred responsibility to the newly created National Center for the Coordination and Planning of Scientific and Technological Research. (C.N.C.P.R.S.T.)

The Center has revived the project, but in ways that contribute more to its mandate to build its institutional capacity for multidisciplinary research coordination than for the single focused purpose of obtaining a one-shot series of studies. As a result, USAID, at a time when the project should normally be phasing out, finds itself with: a dynamically rejuvenated activity; approximately \$100,000 in unearmarked research funds; newly raised expectations on the part of the concerned Moroccan parties; a basket of promising but largely unfinished activities; and, several unforeseen managerial and budgetary problems that stem from the administrative practices and requirements of the C.N.C.P.R.S.T.

U.S.A.I.D. must now decide whether to precipitously end the project or to invest significant additional time (up to three years), relatively modest management effort, and an amended Project Agreement to readjust the project to new realities. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the decision taken could have important effects on both the spirit and direction of longterm cooperation between USAID and the Center, in many other domains.

Given circumstances, the conclusion of this evaluation is that by hook and by crook, plus a lot of luck, the project, at the eleventh hour, has become something more significant, promising and relevant than originally planned. The project has actually become an effort at institution building and represents an immediate opportunity, at minimal additional cost, to make a significant contribution to the orientation, development and institutionalization of applied research in Morocco. In light of the negative consequences of termination in contract to the benefits of continuation, it would seem advisable to prolong the activity, but to use some remaining funds in ways that will reinforce the institutional capacity of the center, rather than merely augment the number of ongoing research activities per se.

B) Evaluation (PES Question 14)

The original project called for annual evaluations. Despite some repeated prodding from AID/W, (see Chronological Calender of Project), none were even held, on the rationale that no completed studies were available to be judged. The present evaluation has been necessitated by the fact that the PACD date, already extended one year by the AID/D, is December 31, 1983 and any further extension requires AID/W approval.

In fact, while there is still insufficient final studies to evaluated, (only one finished product has just been submitted), the consequences of the assumption of project responsibility by the C.N.C.P.R.S.T., alone, calls for rethinking of project purpose and design. Related to this are several specific managerial questions, namely:

- 1) Should there be an adjustment in the compensation to committee members, (symbolic per diem)?
- 2) What time limits should be placed on individual research, as well as the project, itself?
- 3) Is the government, (through the center), contributing 25% of total project costs, as promised in the project agreement?
- 4) What is the meaningfulness of the research in progress?
- 5) How can the research be refocused on new AID priorities, which differ from those of 1979?
- 6) What should be done with the remaining \$100,000 of funds that were earmarked by the project agreement for research but have not yet been committed to any specific research activity?

The method used for this evaluation has been review of documentation and extensive interviews with concerned American and Moroccan parties, (see list of persons interviewed). The evaluation was planned to be done in tandem, (due to scheduling constraints), by Dr. John Grayzel NE/TECH/SARD and Dr. Amal Rassam of Queens College. Dr. Rassam, who did the preparatory studies of the project, was selected for her indepth understanding of Morocco as well as the project and personalities involved. Dr. Grayzel was chosen to represent a complementing detached judgment, based on his general experience with socio-economic research as well as management of other USAID financed research projects.

C) External Factors (PES Format Question 15)

The major situational change that has occurred over the life of project has been the creation of the C.N.C.P.R.S.T., and the assumption by it of project administration.

The original project, in its design, clearly emphasized the results of the research. Thus, the logframe project purpose states that: "That research financed under this project will yield results useful for policy decisions and program design." The paper also called for the placement of the project in the University Rectorate. The project agreement itself, downplays the need for the research to be immediately applicable to development work but rather

emphasizes the academic nature of the subjects, (ProAg. Sec I, paragraph 2). Neither document really addresses the realities of building a permanent institutional capacity. Both presume that an adequate number of Moroccan researchers exist.

With the wisdom of hindsight, one can see that the last minute introduction of the Center presented a fortuitous institutional context, but also resulted in the project being implemented in ways responsive to institute's immediate needs. Thus, to build up a supporting constituency, the Center has distributed grants over a very broad range of studies, some only tenuously related to socio-economic research, (e.g. evaluations of prenatal mortality, macro-level analysis of government energy policies). It has also funded already ongoing research rather than only new topics, and basic research, meaning new contributions to knowledge, which takes years, rather than situational studies of problems which can be done in a shorter period of time.

The other external factor of major influence, which the project paper ignored, (or misinterpreted), was the reality of the institutional research setting in Morocco. In fact, the country was not yet prepared to mobilize for real applied research, not due to a lack of good minds, but, due to the inappropriate institutional configurations of research. In Morocco, basically, two types of research exist, that of the academic world and that of government research institutions, (e.g. National Institute for Agronomy and Veterinary Sciences). Due to higher pay and status, the country's best minds here tended to go either to the university or private sector, so that research institutes lack real capacity to do their job. At the sametime, neither university nor private sector people are rewarded for research, (e.g. there is no publish or perish syndrome). As a result, the private sector does almost no research, and academic research is mainly done by students; is highly theoretical; and, is done in isolation both from practical daily development activities and from other researchers and disciplines.

To make research developmentally meaningful in Morocco requires: to, first, break the described constraints; to bring it out of its academic cocoon; and to encourage cross fertilization of ideas between institutions. In fact, this is part of the purpose of the present Center, but this is not institutionally a purpose of the University Rectorate, where the project was originally housed.

#### D) Inputs (PES Format Question 16)

USAID's contribution to the project is \$450,000. Of this, 85%, (\$360,00), is be for payments in the form of research grant, and up to, but not to exceed, 15%, (\$90,000), is for translations, publication costs, organizations of conferences and "symbolic per diem" to members of the Scientific Committee, (ProAg, Annex II). The ProAg included a provisional first year budget, but also called for annual evaluations, which if carried out, would have provided a built in mechanism for review and reform. USAID, in the ProAg, reserved the right to propose, subject to the Scientific Committee's concurrence, up to 15% of the subjects to be researched. While USAID seems to have expended significant energy trying to keep the project afloat during its period of suspended animation, its actual management input to the activities themselves seems to be minimal.

In fact, it would seem USAID would be wise, for its own benefit, to somewhat increase interaction. This would result in increased contacts with some of the best minds in the country for discussing Moroccan realities and policies. Simple administrative misunderstanding, such as whether the financial limits on funding specific activities are in relation to dirhams or dollars in the event of currency fluctuations, could also be more quickly resolved by greater interaction. For example, USAID should at least receive the six month progress reports of researchers. None of this should contradict the basically wise low profile originally USAID chose to take. The low profile, however, should be seen in terms of not exerting control rather than in terms of not engaging in ongoing dialogue.

Since any USAID future inputs would continue to be funds perse, a new look, given changed circumstances, should be taken as to how remaining funds can be used to encourage strengthening of the Center as a permanent institution, and assuring that research already funded is made, to the largest extent possible, accessible and meaningful to development agents. At present, funds earmarked for publication, publicity and conferences are probably insufficient in light of projected output. There are no funds for strengthening the apparently weak administrative capacity of the center. (e.g. USAID rejected a request to send the center's project administrator to an R&D management course in the U.S.). The Scientific Committee is not receiving minimal financial recognition for its efforts. Lastly there is no funding of activities to synthesize research findings in a form useable by decision makers.

Given the above, it would be wise to reprogram the approximately \$100,000 not yet committed to research projects to the above mentioned purposes of institution building and the applied application of research finding. In fact, it is hard given time constrains, to see how these funds can be used properly for future research. Since meaningful research in Morocco seems to inevitably take two to three years, one cannot start yet another cycle unless one wants to indefinitely continue the project. If funds are used for short-term research, they will probably not serve much purpose because, as is already the case, they will go to funding already ongoing projects which, in reality, will occur anyway and which already have a fixed orientation.

It would also be unwise for USAID to try to impose some short-term research demands according to what it sees as its new or immediate priorities. First, this would weaken the center's ongoing efforts to establish its own legitimacy in the eyes of local researchers. Second, and more important, a problem of relevancy really doesn't exist in terms of the research topics. In fact the subjects under investigation, (see Appendix List), are very broad, quite relevant, and generally involve such basic concerns as to have potentially broad meaning to a vast realm of development activities. The problem is to make both the researchers and potential clients realize it is their responsibility to extract all the potential applied relevance of the findings, not to think one can do it for them by narrowing the field of investigations to a simplistic single focus, (e.g. the price of wheat, or eggs), which will be outdated before it is even completed.

ALTERNATIVE VIEW (Amal Rassam)

In the event that this option (i.e. to extend PACD for another three years) is adopted by USAID, I propose the following use of the uncommitted \$110,000. (This is, of course, only a suggestion and it must be submitted to the center and the committee members for discussion.) In order to shift the research component of the Project to a higher and more efficient level and to make it less diffuse and more responsive to USAID development strategies, a phase III of the project could be initiated along the following lines:

1. \$80,000 (of the total \$110,000) could be divided into four or five grants, each to be devoted to one large scale, two year project.

2. USAID/Rabat undertake to send the Center (by a given date) a list of several fairly well defined research problems/topics/themes. These, presumably, will reflect USAID's current priorities and country specific strategy; these topics should also be varied enough so as to involve a number of different research institutes/faculties/centers in Morocco.

3. The Scientific Committee will discuss the proposed research topics (ideally, an AID officer will be present at this meeting) and suggest others of their own. A list of ranked research problems will then be prepared; this would ideally take into account the committee's and USAID's interests as well as the research and political realities of Morocco. (By the terms of the ProAg, USAID has the right to engage up to 15% of Project funds).

4. The list of topics will be advertised and appropriate proposals will be solicited from organized groups, institutes and research centers. Research proposals should be designed for a two year maximum period (to end in mid '86) and should involve a group of researchers (attached to a specific institution) as well as an identifiable director. A scheduled yearly evaluation of the Project (as a whole) should also extend to these sub-projects.

5. At the end of the two year period, a general conference would be convened to present and discuss the results of this program. This conference could also include presentation of the best of the research projects of Phases I and II. A sum of \$10,000 could be allocated for the conference.

6. The remaining \$20,000 or so (of the \$110,000) could be budgeted for a program which would undertake to synthesize, translate and publish research reports deemed most significant and relevant by the Center/committee.

Among other things, the idea here is to involve groups of mature researchers and to anchor the activity in institutional structures of which there are several, e.g. l'Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II; Institut National des Statistiques et de l'Economie Appliquée; Ecole des Infirmiers; Institut National des Etudes Judiciaires; Institut Universitaire de la Recherche Scientifique, etc.

E) Outputs (PES Format Question 17)

The outputs of the project, as expressed in the project paper logframe, were to be: "at least 60 development-oriented social and economic research projects." These were intended to be short-term (generally one year), specifically focused, efforts, and the entire project was to have been accomplished over

three years. As already noted, had this outcome even been achieved, it probably would have done little, by itself, to rectify the procedural, conceptual and institutional blocks to meaningful applied research in Morocco.

In fact, at present 37 longer term projects are being financed, of which only one has been completed. However, in terms of person years of research, the potential situation actually exceeds what was originally contemplated. As noted in the summary, the delay in implementation was largely due to political/administrative/personal problems within the Rectorate itself, compounded by the fact that the university, with its concentration on theoretical concerns, its lack of rewards for professional staff research, its isolation from practical implementation activities, and its concerns for freedom from outside pressures, was probably an inappropriate institutional base with which to begin.

Because of their unfinished state, it is hard to judge the final contribution to knowledge the studies will make. However, since the C.N.C.P.R.S.T. has taken over the project, the more meaningful outputs are probably the present ongoing process by which it is conducting the study. The Scientific Committee has been expanded to not only include more disciplines but also representatives from the government, (Ministry of Plan), from the law, and hopefully in the future, some from the financial sector. It has begun to generate promising interaction between these people, who were previously sequestered in their own worlds.

It has also introduced socio-economic concerns into the realm of what would otherwise be more narrowly defined technical research, and has exerted pressure for studies to be more field oriented, rather than theoretical rehashing of the literature. It is this dynamic situation that should be rightfully seen as the hoped for project outcome. Within the last year the project has come to life; the question to be now answered is if this life can and will be sustained.

F) Purpose (PES Format Question 18)

At least three different versions of the project purpose exist. The objective project purpose, as stated in the project paper logframe, was: to "encourage and support Moroccan experts to undertake social and economic research which can help provide an analytical basis for economic and social development programs, and to develop an institutional basis for continuation of this effort." The project purpose, as stated in the project agreement, also is: "to encourage and support Moroccan experts to undertake social and economic research." However, the agreement makes no mention of developing an institutional basis but rather emphasizes the academic nature of the work by placing the project within the framework of the university, and by specifically stating that the grants are for "researchers, within or outside the University who wish for academic reasons (university thesis) or for publication, to work in the following fields: agriculture, education, employment, population, health and nutrition, economic development and problems of distribution, rural development, urban development, and the role of women in socio-economic development." Lastly, there is the true operational purpose of the project, which was to achieve the output of at least sixty short-term development-oriented social and economic research projects.

In terms of both current AID policy and priorities, as well as generally development experience, the proper project purpose should be the building of a permanent institutional capacity. In fact, luckily, due to: Project delay; the failure of the Rectorate to live up to expectations; and the fortunate creation of the National Center for Coordination and Planning of Scientific and Technical Research, and its assumption of project management; there is now a basis of hope for institutionalization that did not previously exist. This would probably not have been the case had the project remained within the university structure, due to the theoretical orientation of faculty; the lack of any emphasis or real rewards for faculty research; and, the isolated independence that exists between disciplines and researchers themselves, as well as between them and the outside world. Nor would it have been achieved by 60 short-term studies which, even if the project had found people to do them, would have also been isolated opportunities activities, unattached to any effort to generate a new, interdisciplinary, longterm, applied research dynamic.

In fact, the Center, and the interaction of its Scientific Committee, seems to have begun to create such a dynamic, but, they have done so by using the project as much to legitimize and encourage the dynamic perse, as to achieve a specific result in terms of types and numbers of projects. Thus, they have very liberally expanded the subject matter, and funded more longterm basic research than foreseen, as well as much ongoing, rather than new, research.

This situation has probably contributed to increasing the Center's credibility and constituency, but at some cost of getting fewer and less specifically development focused studies. In this sense, it has served the purpose of institutionalization, but has taken away from the production of development research results per se. All in all, this has probably been for the best. However, because the studies, rather than the institutionalization of the process, was the real focus of project design, crucial institution strengthening activities have been either ignored or grossly underfunded. These include building up the administrative capacity of the center staff; assuring publication and publicity of its activities and research results; and addressing the whole problem of continuity after the completion of the project.

G) Goal/Subgoal (PES Format Question 19)

The project goal, as stated in the logframe, is to: "strengthen economic and social programs designed to reach the poor majority."

As with most goals, there is a logical connection between the goal and the activity but the direct connection is sufficiently far off in time as to make measurement impossible. Logically, better and more pertinent knowledge should make for stronger programs, and both the knowledge produced, as well as the new interchange of ideas the project is attempting to foster, do have relevance to a wide range of potential development polices and programs for rich and poor alike.

Unfortunately, however, there is a crucial causal connection that is missing, in that there does not exist any direct link between knowledge and policy making, in terms of policy makers being aware of, or sympathetic to the real need to apply empirical evidence to decision making. Nor is there an accepted understanding on the part of researchers of their obligation to present their findings in a form useable in the real world of quick and dirty practical decision making. This, to some extent, exists everywhere, but it is especially

true in Morocco, where good minds seem entrapped by scholastic traditions, institutional structures, and the lines of authority that act to isolate people and organizations from each other.

In one way, the project has taken steps to respond to this problem by embarking on an enlargement of the Scientific Committee to include non-academic government figures. However, much more must be done. The essence of applied research is the ability to respond to a client's immediate needs. A dialogue must be opened so that the precise needs of decision makers are recognized by researchers, and research findings must be consciously marketed in forms that are operational within the constraints of decision making, (e.g. short, clear and to the point). Unless actions to create such links are taken, either now or in the near future, little promise exists for even the most meaningful of research to effectively contribute to development policies or programs.

#### H) Beneficiaries (PES Format Questions 20)

One can logically tie many of the subjects of this project's research to development actions that, if properly caused out, would positively affect Sec 120 (d) FAA beneficiaries. Thus, for example, the research project on the relation of the nutritional state of mothers to infant mortality could be important for various health programs. The sociology of innovation in rural milieux is, in fact, directly relevant to proposed AID activities to increase agricultural production. The study of female workers in the informal artisan sector is pertinent to employment and income distribution. On the other hand, as noted, a number of the projects seem somewhat tangential, though, in part, it is largely a question of how broad an interpretation of relevancy one wished to make. In truth, however, any and all direct effects on sec. 120 (d) beneficiaries would be quite removed from the immediate efforts of this project.

The sure beneficiaries of this project are: first, the researchers receiving grant money; second, the C.N.C.P.R.S.T., which is building up its institutional constituency and experience awarding and directing the funds; and, lastly, USAID, to the extent that it would use this opportunity to make important and ongoing contacts with the very high caliber group of individuals active in the project, both as administrators and recipients of the grants.

#### I) Unplanned Effects (PES Format Question 21)

The involvement of the National Center for the Coordination and Planning of Scientific and Technical Research; the important future role it could have in achieving some meaningful collaboration between Moroccan University, research institute, and development activities; and, the significance of the present USAID project, both to the Center's institutional credibility, as well as its capacity to encourage multidisciplinary socio-economic and technical research; though not foreseen in the design of the project, now dominates the picture

The question is not only one of the future of the project, itself, but also the extent to which the Center may be the most appropriate vehicle for funneling future AID financed research funds to a multiplicity of activities. At the same time, some caution is advisable, since Moroccan reality is that behind institutional facades the influence of the specific personalities on hand dominate. At present, it is hard to separate the Center's capabilities and inclinations from those of its energetic director. One must not be fooled into seeing more institutional permanence than may really exist, especially at such an early stage of the Center's development.

At best, the situation represents a target of opportunity and a cause for cautious optimism. At the same time, the effect of project termination or continuation on the future of the Center, and the future of USAID-C.N.C.P.R.S.T. relations, must be seriously considered before any decision is made. Whether intended or not, there is a feeling that at the final moments the Center, with USAID concurrence, picked up the ball and ran with it and that it is foolish and unfair that now, after substantial investment of time, effort and promises, USAID is considering calling a halt to the game. If such a halt is called, one can expect substantial negative resentment to be directed at the Center, both by researchers promised assistance and by Committee members who have spent substantial time in assisting them. It is almost inevitable, and understandable, that much of that negative reaction will be directed or deflected onto USAID. While USAID will see the situation as one wherein the government of Morocco, through its representative the Rectorate, was responsible for the project's delay, the Moroccan parties involved will see that as a past circumstance that no longer applies. They will feel that if USAID wanted to cancel, it should have done so then, not now when the effect is to punish those who were more responsive than might have ever been hoped for.

J). Lessons Learned (PES Format Question 22)

Several broadly applicable lessons can be learned from this project, which floundered for so long and yet now seems to have excited such substantial excitement:

1. No matter how good an idea, you cannot ignore the need for a proper institutional context. In the case in point, USAID lucked out that such an institution came along.
2. In identifying a proper institutional context, USAID should pay careful attention to those processes which are waiting in the wings, or are in embryonic form, as well as to those already established. It should be willing to shelve a fundamentally good idea for a period of time, if necessary, to find the proper placement, rather than grab the best, but not necessarily proper, existing alternative.
3. Management tools are useful, but so too are the well developed instincts of experienced personnel. In the case in point, there is little to explain why the project was allowed to continue, except for the visceral feeling of USAID personnel that the idea was good and the people were good, and one should just wait out the lull. In fact, this turned out to be true. At the same time, if an evaluation had been held precisely at the time the Center took over, many project administrative and policy problems might have been resolved before being put into effect. One can surmise that, perhaps, there was a reluctance to hold an evaluation because of a feeling that under the circumstances vague instinct would not have been given enough credence to justify project continuation.
4. Timing in development, as in the game of chess, is crucial to success, and waiting and stalling till opportunities arise is a legitimate development strategy. There is too much artificial pressure to do things, "on time," "without delay" or "in the

shortest period possible," rather than developing timing strategy that is justified as long as it promises a winning performance in the end.

5. The value of a project to a country, USAID, or development in general, cannot just be measured in dollars and cents. The project in question is relatively small, but in terms of the Moroccan participation and enthusiasm it has engendered it is quite large. If cost effectiveness is judged by the quality as well as quantity of participation per dollar, many such small projects become highly cost effective in comparison to much more grandiose efforts, and deserving of more attention than they get.

K) Specific Comments or Remarks (PES Format Question 23)

A. If USAID continues this project, the person in charge should be given substantial credit on their PER for diligent involvement with the project researchers and committee members. This is not because the project requires much management input -it doesn't- but because the project has managed to assemble an amazing concentration of top intellectual power in the country, and both USAID and Moroccan personnel could profit in numerous ways from more intensive interaction among the parties concerned.

B. See Specific Comments: Part III

C. The following annexes are attached:

- 1) List of projects being funded by researcher, topic and amount.
- 2) Example of contract used between center and researchers.
- 3) Dahir, (Royal Decree), authorizing Center and outlining purpose.
- 4) Research competition requirements issued by C.N.C.P.R.S.T.

PART III: Responses to Specific AID Management Questions:

- 1) Question: Is the symbolic per diem for scientific committee members called for in the ProAg justified? Does it represent payment to Moroccan officials for doing their own jobs? If it is justified, should the amount be increased as requested by the C.N.P.R.S.T., and how should it be calculated?

The "symbolic per diem" called for in the ProAg would better be translated as honorarium - a reward for services on which, for various reasons, (custom, propriety, law, lack of funds), a true price is not set. In the case in point, there are, firstly, insufficient funds to cover the actual work costs of a growing committee over an indefinite period of time. Secondly, because participation of committee members varies, it would seem difficult and perhaps divisive to either pay all equally or, conversely, try to judge contributions in monetary sums. Thirdly, the committee serves a national function over and above the concerned project. Since in reality the Center, itself, will never have funds to pay the committee for all its work, pay for work could well become a point of dissension. It is for the last reason that the Center should be urged to carefully think out the final policy it wishes to see established.

For USAID needs, I feel, it can be said that the Scientific Committee, (as different from the managing committee), is over and above the work responsibility of any of its members. It is actual more akin to a U.S. foundation or government commission whose members are chosen based on their individual distinction, and who accept because of the honor and personal interest in taking part. Naturally, by accepting they obligate themselves to do some work. However, the direction and surveillance of a particular project, such as the one in question, is yet again over and above their normal responsibilities.

Given the circumstances, I feel it is justified and proper to recognize the vital role the Committee plays and to provide at least a minimum incentive for their continued participation. At the same time, it would seem reasonable to do so in a way that furthers specific project aims. One proposal was to pay a percentage of each grant to those supervising it. This is a defacto "cost plus" arrangement that is against U.S. government regulations for the good reason that it ties self-interest to increased expenditures, and not necessarily to actual work effort. Another proposal was to pay for actual hours worked in the monthly meetings for the project. This would seem legally acceptable but I question the applicability of the formula for the precedent it would set. I question the objectivity of time keeping and, most importantly, if the project is extended, sufficient funds are available.

I would propose, for discussion with the center, the idea that each study's sub-committee (which now exist) be composed of three people, (one hopefully a non-academic from a related applied field). Each of them could be asked to write a two or three page introduction to the work explaining their perceptions of its relevance to Morocco's socio-economic development. This per se would be a valuable additive to the project's helping make the studies germane and understandable to non-academics. For each introduction I would propose a \$250 honorarium. There are presently thirty-seven studies. Thus, we are speaking of a total of approximately \$28,000, which I believe is the maximum the project can afford for this purpose. At the same time it is managerially simple way of dispensing the funds.

ALTERNATIVE VIEW (Amal Rassam)

The question of the "symbolic per diem" (an unfortunate term that should be deleted from any amended agreement and replaced perhaps with that of "honoraria") for members of the Scientific Committee remains unresolved. The initial ProAg allotted to this category a total sum of \$27,000 over a period of three years; it did not, however, specify role of recipients nor method of distribution. Despite one or two suggestions submitted by the Center, none too clear or logical, the issue remains to be worked out.

I generally agree with Grayzel's argument for keeping this category of funding and for proceeding with some form of minimal compensation of committee members who actively participate in directing and managing this Project. (See Grayzel's Evaluation p. 14). In addition to his "one lump honorarium" plan, I would also suggest submitting the following formula for consideration by the Center and committee members. (Its outlines were suggested to me by a committee member and I believe that it has already been discussed in one of their meetings):

a. Committee members will be compensated (offered honorarium) in proportion to amount of work they contribute to Project. This is to be measured in terms of hours/points that are calculated in terms of meeting attendance and research supervision. An attendance record could be kept by the Center and signed by members - each meeting to count for three hours. Those members who also serve on sub-committees supervising research will get 10-15 hours (per year) for each project they direct.

b. Each hour/point thus accumulated would be worth about 57 DH this is the standard rate for university professors in Morocco.

c. The total of \$27,000 could be divided into three parts of \$9000 each - which would constitute the ceiling level of the Center's yearly budget for this category. In effect, this gives each of the 18 members of the committee about 100 hrs of work/year, more than adequate for the purpose at hand.

2) Question: How long should the project be extended? What time limits should, and can, be placed on the studies themselves?

At present, a second phase of projects have been approved by the Center, 40% of which will not finish till 1986. To understand what is happening one must realize that there is a great deal of academic research conducted in this country each year for purposes of fulfilling various graduation requirements. Much of it is of dubious relevance to development and often little more than theoretical rehashing of previous works. The most promising is done by the more serious advanced candidates, who basically have to fund themselves, and who work around their own normal schedules, as well as the requirements of the research itself. For a 3eme Thesis, three years seems the normal length of time from commencement to presentation. For a Doctorate d'Etat, many more years are often involved.

The Center's awards for three years are usually for 3eme Thesis. The shorter awards are, in reality, assistance being given to ongoing research. From the USAID project perspective, the most promising studies are those financed for three years, because in this case the project has the greatest opportunity to influence the study to focus on more development and more field oriented research. In the case of the shorter studies, the process is already in full swing and unlikely to be dramatically changed. Therefore, despite the project's call for short-term studies, in fact it is the longterm studies that represent, in most case, the project's contribution to research; while the short-term projects are being funded to help build a research community constituency for the Center. Again, it should be understood that the time constraints on long term research - lack of basic data, work calendar, need for permission, etc, are not amenable to being speeded up simply by some additional funds.

Basically, USAID is faced with the choice of either: cancelling Phase II; merely extending the project for six months to finish Phase I; or extending it for another three years for the completion of Phase II studies, but not allowing any new studies to be funded. What this really means is that the reality of research in Morocco is that you cannot fund a three year ongoing research effort for only three years. Rather you need three years of time between the actual beginning of the last research effort and project termination.

3) Question: Is the Center actually contributing the twenty-five per cent of costs as promised by the Project Accord? Is it double counting work done by staff, and equipment also used for other purpose?

As the project was originally conceived it would have been a unique, well defined activity under the jurisdiction of the Rectorate of Mohamed V University. Now, in fact, it is one of many ongoing activities of the Research Center. Obviously, there is a tremendous commingling of both human and physical resources. Thus material or personnel being counted as contributions to the project also do other things. At the sametime, there are other Center resources not being counted, (e.g. for this evaluation substantial use of a Center vehicle, driver and gas). Unless USAID wishes to finance a seperate time/work study, it is going to be hard to really define what percentage of resources are going where.

I would propose looking at the situation akin to how AID would handle a cooperative agreement or contract with an American Institute. What we are asking the Center to contribute is to some extent general overhead in one form or another. In the case of a non-profit American institute this usually runs from 40-80%. I, therefore, feel it not an exaggeration to credit the Center with the presumption of an overhead contribution of 25% alone. In addition to this if we add those things clearly identifiable as contributions, (see letter D. Ben Sari to AID/D), it would seem that they can be seen as holding their own.

4) How can future studies be made more pertinent to present USAID priorities rather than those of the past?

While the concern expressed is understandable, I feel, as far as the subject matter goes, it is not really a substantial issue for several reasons.

First, the subject matter is so broad that, if well done, the research should contribute to numerous priorities, USAID and otherwise. The problem is not the focus of the research as much as the problem of how to extract what USAID needs from it.

Second, the problem with so many short, specifically focused studies done in Morocco is the lack of basic data. Till such basic data is collected, most focused policy research will continue to be only repetitious theorizing. For the studies now being done, the problem is not so much what subject to focus on as to insure that what is provided is basic data rather than more theory.

Third, as Japanese industry has so successfully demonstrated, regardless of what is today's product, part of the business of today is to prepare for tomorrow. All sorts of USAID activities, including those in Morocco, are handicapped in implementing solutions now because nobody in the past did the necessary fundamental research. As a result, high paid implementers end up doing elementary field research. Regardless of today's implementation priorities, some basic research for the unknown programs of tomorrow is necessary.

Fourth, ultimately the institutionalization of research in Morocco will not occur as long as it is an imposed rather than a felt need. The Scientific Committee represents a collection of high caliber thinkers. USAID should certainly enter into dialogue with these people, but should leave it to them to ultimately resolve their problems themselves. I feel they, in general, share many USAID's concerns and desires. USAID can help introduce some new perspectives but, ultimately, they themselves must recognize the validity of the suggestions for there to be meaningful acceptance.

5) How effective is the Center's Management of the Project?

I believe the Center's Management of the project is in need of significant tightening up. At the moment the Center only perceives management practices from the researchers' perspective; seeking flexibility above all. Flexibility in interpreting contract provisions, flexibility in meeting deadlines; flexibility in using funds for scientifically justifiable but not necessarily agreed upon purposes. This is all very understandable, but, as the Center more and more seeks outside support, or enters into more complex cooperative arrangements, it is going to have to become more professional in its negotiation of agreements and management of funds. To achieve this requires immediate investment in building up its managerial awareness and expertise.

For the project in question I do not believe USAID is being short changed because, in fact, most of the efforts seem to be costing more than USAID financing, as costs are being shared by the grantees, who are doing the research for personally compelling reasons. (e.g. to get a university degree) The immediate situation is, therefore, tolerable but is not what should be sought for as a permanent modus operandi. Such circumstances are surely not going to always be the case.

6) What specific budgetary changes do you recommend?

The following is a budget I would propose for the use of the \$100,000 uncommitted to present or future research projects. It is meant as a contribution to discussion with the Center and certainly should not be imposed on them.

\$25,000 (honorarium)

20,000 upgrading administrative capacity

20,000 three years additional management costs.

20,000 synthesizing, publishing and marketing of results

15,000 colloquium (including one after phase I to see how useful findings are for development purposes

---

\$100,000 [ This represents funds in addition to those already allotted for administration of the project.]

Lastly, and most importantly, USAID should be clear in asking itself what are present USAID priorities. For the activity at hand, is the present USAID priority to obtain some single focused reports germane to specific immediate projects, or to make a meaningful contribution to the institutionalization of Morocco's capacity for applied research. I, perhaps mistakenly, perceive the latter to be both the present AID/W and USAID/Rabat concern (e.g. USAID/Rabat FY 85 CDSS page 27).

**PART IV: Recommendation and Conclusion**

It seems to me that USAID has three possible courses of action:

1. It can end the project as of December 31, 1983;
2. It can extend for 6 months (as promised by former AID/D Fleming), to permit phase out.
3. It can extend the PACD for 3 years.

As to the first alternative, to kill the project now before even phase I studies are in will basically be to throw away the entire investment of time, energy and money to date. It will earn for USAID enormous ill will, and will probably seriously affect future working relations with some of Morocco's best people, both because of the embarrassment it will cause them, and the slap in the face it will be to those who did take up the challenge, admittedly at very late date. It will also be a lost opportunity at constructive institution building. Lastly, I suspect, it will be a managerial disaster, and actually impose new burdens on USAID as it tries to disentangle what ongoing research it is still responsible to pay for and which not.

As to the second alternative, it will allow the finalization of most phase I reports but otherwise will still engender all the negative consequences of alternative one.

The third alternative is in fact the easiest managerially as it will require no new funding, some work on a project amendment, and then very little managerial input. It will contribute to the center's advancement as well as the integration of socio-economic concerns into development research. It will allow completion of phase two projects: and, lastly, it will hopefully foster increased cooperation between USAID and the research community, which over time can be directed more precisely to immediate USAID project needs.

It would seem, if the above premises are correct, that the third alternative is by far the one to be preferred.

## APPENDIX I

### CONCLUSIONS REACHED BY THE PROJECT REVIEW COMMITTEE WHICH DIFFER FROM THE FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

There are two issues for which the project review committee reached conclusions which differed from those of the evaluators as expressed above in the P.E.S. These are: (1) the relative emphasis to be placed upon new research initiatives on one hand and institution-building measures on the other hand (P.E.S. Format Question 16, pp. 7-9 and AID Question 4, p.16) and (2) the method of payment of honoraria to members of the scientific committee. (AID Question 1, pp. 15-16)

#### I. Project Inputs:

The committee found merit in aspects of suggestions put forward by both evaluators with respect to the use of uncommitted funds during the project extension.

The committee decided that the evaluators' separate proposals could be combined by scaling each one down to manageable proportions so that the institution-building activities described by Dr. Grayzel in broad terms would complement and be reinforced by the institution-based research described by Dr. Rassam.

Neither evaluator used a precise figure to define uncommitted funds. Since project figures are in dirhams, the value of dirham commitments in dollars changes with fluctuations in the exchange rate. Our estimated commitments and the budget alternatives considered by the committee are presented in the table below.

	Original	Committed	Recommendations		
	Budget		Grayzel	Rassam	USAID
Research Grants	380,000	270,000	270,000	270,000	270,000
Institution-based Resear.	-	-	-	80,000	55,000
Special Allowances	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	5,000
Honoraria	27,000	27,000	52,000	27,000	35,000
Other Expenses	40,000	40,000	60,000	60,000	40,000
Evaluations	-	-	-	-	10,000
Colloquia	-	-	15,000	10,000	15,000
Improve Admin.Capacity	-	-	20,000	-	20,000
Additional mgmt. costs	-	-	20,000	-	-
Unearmarked	-	110,000	10,000	-	-
	<u>450,000</u>	<u>450,000</u>	<u>450,000</u>	<u>450,000</u>	<u>450,000</u>

The committee agreed there should be no more small research grants since this could put USAID in the undesirable position of having to extend the project once again. The committee noted additional money would be required for special allowances and honoraria if the project were extended. The committee also decided, consistent with AID policy, the project should finance its own external evaluation. Finally, the committee decided the other expenses category would not be affected by an extension since expenses had not yet been incurred against this category.

21

The committee discussed at length the ideas of conducting institution-based research and improving the Center's administrative capacity. The committee felt that Dr. Rassam's proposal for four or five short-term research projects was too ambitious and should be limited to two or three projects lasting no longer than two years. These projects could serve both USAID's interest in promoting research in priority areas such as fuelwood and in new initiatives such as urbanization and urban development. At the same time, a few research projects of this nature could help the Center promote an interdisciplinary approach to research on development problems. This type of research is high on the agenda of the Center's Director. Experience in coordinating this type of institution-based research would also contribute to the project's institution-building purpose.

The committee felt that Dr. Grayzel's emphasis on institution-building measures was well founded, but decided that some continuing efforts in research as proposed by Dr. Rassam were an integral part of the institution building process. The committee could not find appropriate rationale for the additional management costs proposed by Dr. Grayzel and thus decided to limit directly identifiable institution-building items to the improvement of administrative capacity.

The budget listed under Recommendations-USAID will be communicated to the Center in a Project Implementation Letter as well as suggested topics for institution-based research to be proposed for adoption by the Center's Scientific Committee.

## II. Payment of Honoraria:

Both Drs. Grayzel and Rassam agreed that the contribution by members of the Scientific Committee to the project should be recognized through payment of an honoraria. They proposed two different methods of payment and the project committee decided upon a third method. Summarized briefly, Dr. Grayzel proposed a lump-sum payment to Scientific Committee members who would write introductions to research as it was published. Dr. Rassam, on the other hand, proposed payments be made for attendance at committee meetings and supervision of research.

The review committee decided first, that a ceiling on the U.S. contribution to this payment be established and second, that the Center adopt whatever method of payment it deemed to be equitable and in its interest. The review committee felt that USAID should not seek to impose any particular formula on the Center, but should instead make the decision about this matter part of the Center's decision making with its future in mind as an institution. The review committee directed the project officer to inform the Center of the proposals put forward by the evaluators as alternatives to be considered in adopting a final formula.

## II. Other:

The review committee was in general agreement with the Evaluation's assessment of the project and its conclusions about the utility of continuing this project.

22

LISTE DES CHERCHEURS ENGAGES AU P.A.R.S.E.

N°	NOM - PRENOM	TITRE DE LA RECHERCHE	DOTATION	DEBUT DES TRAVAUX	FIN DES TRAVAUX
1/01	LAARIBI Abderrahim	Le secteur minier et son impact sur l'emploi au Maroc	35.100,00	1 / 10 / 1980	31 / 08 / 1983
1/02	BENELKHADIR Jawad	La promotion immobilière au Maroc	40.000,00	1 / 03 / 1981	31 / 10 / 1984
1/03	DENAMOR Nezha	La problématique énergétique au Maroc	40.000,00	1 / 03 / 1981	1 / 03 / 1984
1/04	EL GALLAF Mohamed	Système productif marocain	45.180,00	14 / 02 / 1981	Janvier 1984
1/05/1	SAADANI Rhalil	Le travail des femmes et des enfants à Fès et ses implications socio-économiques	33.333,00	1 / 04 / 1981	1 / 04 / 1984
1/05/2	EL MERGHADJ Mohamed		33.333,00		
1/05/3	AMRANI SOUILI Mahdi		33.333,00		
1/06	CHAOUNI Mohamed	Les investissements hydrauliques: impact socio-éco. problème et perspectives	38.600,00	1 / 03 / 1981	8 / 12 / 1984
1/07	DOUJENOUJ Ameer	Essai d'évaluation des politiques d'initiation à l'investissement industriel au Maroc depuis l'indépendance.	40.000,00	1 / 01 / 1981	31 / 12 / 1983
1/08	EI.MIADI ZINEB	Le travail de la femme et la famille patriarcale	60.000,00	1 / 03 / 1981	1 / 03 / 1984
1/09	AKIBIB Mustapha	La petite bourgeoisie dans les villes marocaines.	51.216,00	21 / 02 / 1981	30 / 11 / 1984
1/10	BEN SAID Driss	L'Etat et le pouvoir au Maroc	46.740,00	20 / 02 / 1981	20 / 02 / 1984
1/11	BOURQIA Rahma	Le statique et le dynamique dans les relations entre le Maghzen et le système tribal depuis la moitié du 19 <sup>e</sup> Siècle	50.715,00	02 / 1981	02 / 1984
1/12	AL HARRAS Mokhtar	Processus de changement chez les Anjaras	45.520,00	02 / 1981	31/04/1984
1/13	LAMRANI ALAOUI Kenza	La structure de la famille et la scolarisation de la femme au Maroc	59.857,00	24 / 02 / 1981	24 / 02 / 1984
1/14	BENNIS Najat	L'adolescente et la dynamique familiale en milieu casablançais	58.060,00	02 / 1981	12 / 1983

23

N°	NOM - PRENOM	TITRE DE LA RECHERCHE	DOTATION	DEBUT DES TRAVAUX	FIN DES TRAVAUX
1/15	BEN CHERIFA Abdellatif	L'Elevage au Maroc:géographie économique	51.000,00	10 / 02 / 1981	30 / 09 / 1984
1/16	HERZENNI Abdallah	Developpement régional:cas des centres ruraux des primètres de Tassaout	60.000,00	1 / 01 / 1981	31 / 12 / 1983
1/17	KABBAJ MUSTAPHA	Pédagogie spontannée et didactique intentionnelle.	60.000,00	09 / 1981	11 / 1984
2/02	Berriane Mohamed	Le tourisme interieur et son impact spatial et socio-économique	58.400,00	1 / 06 / 1983	1 / 06 / 1986
2/04 ✓	LAOUINA' Abdallah	L'exploitation agricole du sol dans la plaine des Triffas	65.202,00	27 / 07 / 1983	30 / 06 / 1985
2/07	REFFAS Mohamed	L'Organisation urbaine de la peninsule Tingitane	60.000,00	1 / 07 / 1983	30 / 06 / 1986
2/14	DOUNOU Abdelali	Aspects socio-économiques de l'interventionnisme de l'Etat post-colonial	8.030,00	30 / 05 / 1983	28 / 02 / 1984
2/16	EL OTMANI Rachid	Rôle de l'action commerciale dans la croissance des entreprises au Maroc	13.800,00	1 / 10 / 1983	31 / 12 / 1986
2/22	HIAJJI Asmaa	Les caractéristiques de la main d'oeuvres feminine dans le secteur informel des unités de production artisanales de Rabat-Salé	42.260,00	7 / 06 / 1983	30 / 11 / 1985
2/24	ARRIF Ahmed	Sociologie de l'innovation en milieu rural marocain, sur les fonctions sociales des leaders officieux.	46.880,00	18 / 06 / 1983	18 / 06 / 1985

.../...

24

N°	NOM - PRENOM	TITRE DE LA RECHERCHE	DOTATION	DEBUT DES TRAVAUX	FIN DES TRAVAUX
2/30	ETTARFAOUI Md Sidina	Mécanismes et groupes de décision en matière d'urbanisme	23.330,00	3/6/83	Mars 84
2/39	MEZZINE LARBI	Economie, Société et pouvoir dans le Sud-Est Marocain du XVII <sup>e</sup> au XIX <sup>e</sup> siècle	38.500,00	1/07/83	1/10/1986
2/40	AIT LAKHYAR Abdallah	Le Système éducatif marocain et le changement social	44.580,00	15/06/83	Juin 1986
2/42	BELARBI Aïcha	Les représentations de l'enfant dans la société marocaine	37.480,00	7/06/83	6/06/1986
2/43	BENJELLOUN Said	Les contes matériels pour l'éducation et la recherche	33.600,00	2/06/83	2/06/1985
2/45	DERRIJ Mohamed	Les abandons en cours d'étude: étude expérimentale de leurs facteurs et leurs conséquences au Maroc	53.000,00	1/09/83	31/10/1985
2/49	RAMI Abderrahmane	Technologie éducatif et formation des enseignants dans les nouvelles ENS marocaines (cas de l'ENS de RABAT-SOUISSI)	8.000,00	1/06/83	30/12/1983
2/53	ACHARGUJ Mohamed	Poids et rôle du Premier Ministre dans le système gouvernemental et administratif marocain	44.400,00	1/06/83	31/05/1986
2/54	MAIDI Mohamed	Essai monographique sur la tribu des Irguitas du haut-Atlas	10.620,00	16/06/83	15/12/1983
2/55	Mosdik keltoum	Stratégie familiales et système d'alliance chez les chorfas du Tazerwalt	27.600,00	28/06/83	28/06/1985
2/58	ZIZI Shehrazade	Les problèmes soulevés par le contrat de travail dans les établissements publics	35.800,00	Sept 83	Sept 85

N°	NOM - PRENOM	TITRE DE LA RECHERCHE	DOTATION	DEBUT DES TRAVAUX	FIN DES TRAVAUX
2/60	Fadil Mohamed	La prostitution au Maroc du point de vue social et juridique	20.220,00	1 / 09 / 83	31 / 08 / 1986
2/62-1	DOUAZZAOUI Naïma	La mortalité perinatale au Maroc	30.000,00	29 / 07 / 83	28 / 07 / 1984
2/62-2	" "	Etat nutritionnel de la mère et poids de l'enfant à la naissance	30.000,00	29 / 07 / 83	28 / 07 / 1985
3/06	BEL ABBES Maria	Application du modèle d'analyse coût-bénéfices à l'éducation et à la formation professionnelle au Maroc.	25.000,00	24 / 09 / 1983	1 / 01 / 1985

CONTRAT D'ENGAGEMENT

Contrat conclu le \_\_\_\_\_, entre le Centre National de Coordination et de Planification de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique d'une part, et M \_\_\_\_\_, domicilié :

\_\_\_\_\_

d'autre part.

Les parties au présent contrat sont convenues de ce qui suit :

Article I : NATURE DES TRAVAUX DE RECHERCHE

Le contractant accomplira les travaux suivants, conformément aux détails ci-dessous : \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Article II : DUREE DES TRAVAUX

Le présent contrat prendra effet à dater du \_\_\_\_\_.

Il viendra à expiration lorsque les travaux décrits ci-dessus auront été menés à bonne fin, et au plus tard le \_\_\_\_\_.

Article III : DROITS ET OBLIGATIONS DU CONTRACTANT

a.- Droits :

A titre indicatif, la dotation globale correspondant prévisionnellement aux frais de la recherche est de \_\_\_\_\_ Dirhams ( \_\_\_\_\_ dirhams) (1), sous réserve de présentation des pièces justificatives.

\* Le calendrier budgétaire s'établit comme suit :

- Un sixième (1/6) de la dotation est versé à la signature du contractant.
- Trois sixièmes (3/6) sont versés au fur et à mesure du déroulement des travaux, conformément au calendrier de travail effectué ;
- Deux sixièmes (2/6) sont versés à la remise du document final.

Le contractant ne pourra prétendre à aucun avantage, paiement, indemnité, rémunération ou droit qui ne serait pas expressément stipulé dans le présent contrat.

\_\_\_\_\_

(1) Somme en toutes lettres.

b.- Obligations :

- 1°- Réaliser sa recherche en adéquation totale avec le projet soumis pour sa candidature. Pour toute nouvelle orientation de recherche il devra solliciter l'avis du Comité Scientifique.
- 2°- Respecter le calendrier du travail soumis.
- 3°- Faire un rapport sur l'avancement du travail
  - a) un rapport succinct, six mois après l'obtention de la dotation
  - b) un rapport détaillé qui comprend en outre un état financier six mois après le premier rapport.
- 4°- Faire des communications dans les colloques organisés dans le cadre du programme.
- 5°- Fournir 5 exemplaires des résultats de ses travaux au Comité Scientifique.
- 6°- S'engager à rembourser la totalité des sommes perçues dans le cas où les engagements ne sont pas tenus.

IV/ - LES DROITS DE PROPRIETE : DROITS D'AUTEUR ET DE REPRODUCTION

Le Centre National de Coordination et de Planification de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique se réserve le droit de reproduire et publier les travaux qu'il jugera utiles.

Toutefois les résultats du travail financé par ce projet sont la propriété des chercheurs qui les ont exécutés.

En foi de quoi les parties ont conclu le présent contrat et y ont apposé leurs signatures.

Le Directeur du  
Centre National de Coordination  
et de Planification de la Recherche  
Scientifique et Technique

Le Contractant  
(Signature légalisée)



Royaume du Maroc  
**Centre National de Coordination et de Planification  
de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique**

**dahir**  
**portant loi n°1-76-503**  
**portant création du Centre**  
**National de Coordination et de**  
**Planification de la Recherche**  
**Scientifique et Technique**

**Rabat - Février 1981**

Dahir portant loi n° 1-76-803 du 8 chaabane 1396 (8 août 1976)  
portant création du Centre National de Coordination et de Planification de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique.

**LOUANGE A DIEU SEUL!**

(Grand Sceau de Sa Majesté Hassan II)

Que l'on sache par les présentes — puisse Dieu en élever  
et en fortifier la teneur !

Que Notre Majesté Chérifienne,

Vu la constitution, notamment son article 102,

A DÉCRÉTÉ CE QUI SUIT :

**ARTICLE PREMIER.** — Il est créé, sous la dénomination de « Centre national de coordination et de planification de la recherche scientifique et technique », un établissement public doté de la personnalité morale et de l'autonomie financière, placé sous la tutelle administrative du ministre chargé de l'enseignement supérieur.

Son siège est à Rabat.

**ART. 2.** — Dans le cadre de la politique définie par le gouvernement, le Centre national de coordination et de planification de la recherche scientifique et technique a pour mission de développer, orienter et coordonner les recherches scientifiques et techniques de tous ordres.

A cet effet, il est notamment chargé :

1° d'établir et tenir à jour, l'inventaire du potentiel scientifique et technique national, ainsi que le bilan des réalisations dans ces domaines ;

2° d'effectuer toutes études permettant de dégager les options prioritaires, compte-tenu des impératifs des plans de développement économique et social du pays et de définir les axes de recherche ;

3° de définir, compte-tenu de ces options prioritaires et en liaison avec les différentes institutions de recherche publiques et privées financées en tout ou en partie par l'Etat, les grandes lignes des programmes de recherche, de veiller à la mise en œuvre de ces programmes et d'en contrôler l'exécution ;

4° d'effectuer ou faire effectuer, soit de sa propre initiative, soit à la demande des organismes publics ou des entreprises privées, les études ou recherches présentant pour l'avancement et l'application de la science et de la technologie ou pour l'économie nationale un intérêt reconnu ;

5° d'encourager et faciliter les recherches entreprises par les services publics et les particuliers notamment par l'octroi de subventions aux organismes de recherche, par l'attribution de subventions pour missions scientifiques ou pour séjours de

chercheurs dans les laboratoires ou centres de recherche nationaux ou étrangers, par la publication et la diffusion de travaux scientifiques dignes d'intérêt et par l'organisation de stages et séminaires ;

6° de promouvoir, en liaison avec les départements ministériels concernés, la coopération avec les organisations internationales ou étrangères de recherche et de donner son avis sur tout projet de contrat ou convention passé par des organismes publics de recherche nationaux avec ses organisations ;

7° de proposer les mesures législatives et réglementaires se rapportant aux missions prévues ci-dessus.

ART. 3. — Pour permettre au centre d'accomplir les missions qui lui sont imparties, les organismes de recherche scientifique et technique relevant des administrations publiques, des établissements publics et des entreprises privées financées en tout ou en partie par l'Etat, sont tenus :

de faire parvenir périodiquement, au centre, un exemplaire de tous les travaux intéressant la recherche scientifique et technique réalisés par eux ou sur leur demande, à l'exclusion, toutefois, des travaux revêtant un caractère confidentiel ;

de soumettre au centre un rapport annuel, concernant leurs activités dans le domaine de la recherche ;

de soumettre à l'avis du centre tout projet de création d'unités de recherche ;

et, d'une manière générale, de permettre au personnel du centre d'effectuer, sur place, toutes investigations entrant dans le cadre de sa mission de coordination.

ART. 4. — Le centre est administré par un conseil d'administration composé comme suit :

Le Premier ministre, président ;

Le ministre chargé de l'enseignement supérieur, vice-président ;

Le ministre chargé des affaires culturelles ;

Le ministre chargé de la coopération et de la formation des cadres ;

Le ministre chargé des postes, des télégraphes et des téléphones ;

Le ministre chargé des finances ;

Le ministre chargé de l'agriculture et de la réforme agraire ;

Le ministre chargé de l'urbanisme, de l'habitat et de l'environnement ;

Le ministre chargé de la santé publique ;

Le ministre chargé de l'industrie et des mines ;

Le ministre chargé des travaux publics et des communications ;

Le ministre chargé de l'enseignement primaire et secondaire ;

Le ministre des affaires administratives, secrétaire général du gouvernement ;

L'autorité gouvernementale chargée du plan et du développement régional ;

Les recteurs d'universités ;

Le directeur de l'Office national de l'électricité ;

Le directeur de l'Office chérifien des phosphates ;

Le directeur de l'Office national des pêches ;

Le directeur du bureau de recherches et de participations minières ;

Le directeur de l'Office national de l'eau potable ;

Le directeur de l'Office national des produits pharmaceutiques et du matériel médical ;

Le directeur du Laboratoire national de contrôle des médicaments ;

Le directeur du Centre national de coordination et de planification de la recherche scientifique et technique, rapporteur.

En cas d'empêchement, les autorités gouvernementales membres du conseil d'administration sont représentées par leur secrétaire général.

Le président du conseil d'administration peut convoquer aux réunions du conseil et à titre consultatif, toute personne qualifiée.

Le conseil d'administration se réunit, sur convocation de son président, aussi souvent que les besoins du centre l'exigent et, au moins deux fois par an, dont une fois avant le 31 mai pour arrêter les comptes de l'exercice écoulé et une fois avant le 30 novembre pour examiner et arrêter le budget du centre et le programme prévisionnel des opérations de l'exercice suivant.

Il délibère valablement lorsque douze au moins de ses membres sont présents ou représentés. Les décisions sont prises à la majorité des voix, en cas de partage égal des voix, celle du président est prépondérante.

ART. 5. — Le conseil d'administration dispose de tous les pouvoirs nécessaires à la bonne marche du centre. A cet effet, il règle par ses délibérations les questions générales intéressant ce centre et notamment :

Arrête le programme d'action de l'établissement ;

Arrête le budget ;

Arrête les comptes et décide l'affectation des résultats ;

Décide l'octroi de subventions ;

Décide de conclure tout contrat ou convention avec les organismes publics ou privés marocains, étrangers ou internationaux ;

Approuve les projets de marchés dont la valeur excède 1.000.000 de dirhams ;

Décide de tous achats, vente, échanges, acquisitions et aliénations de biens meubles et immeubles lorsque la valeur de l'opération dépasse 1.000.000 de dirhams ;

Elabore le statut du personnel et le fait approuver, dans les conditions prévues par la réglementation en vigueur pour le personnel des établissements publics et approuve les nominations aux emplois supérieurs.

Le conseil peut, en tout état de cause, déléguer au directeur, des pouvoirs spéciaux pour le règlement d'une affaire déterminée.

ART. 6. — Un comité scientifique est chargé, dans l'intervalle des réunions du conseil d'administration, de suivre l'activité scientifique du centre, l'exécution des décisions de ce conseil en ce domaine et de régler les questions pour lesquelles il aura reçu délégation dudit conseil.

Ce comité comprend :

Le directeur de l'enseignement supérieur et de la recherche du ministère de l'enseignement supérieur, président ;

Le directeur de la recherche agronomique ;

Le directeur de l'Institut national d'hygiène ;

Le directeur des mines et de la géologie ;

Le directeur du Centre national de la documentation ;

Le directeur du plan ;

Le doyen de la faculté des sciences ;

Le directeur de l'École Mohammedia d'ingénieurs ;

Le directeur de l'Institut scientifique ;

Le directeur de l'Institut agronomique et vétérinaire Hassan II ;

8 personnalités choisies pour leur qualification dans le domaine des sciences exactes et naturelles et dans celui des sciences humaines, sociales et économiques, nommées par le Premier ministre sur proposition du ministre de l'enseignement supérieur ;

Le directeur du Centre national de coordination et de planification de la recherche scientifique et technique, rapporteur.

Le président du comité scientifique peut inviter à participer, à titre consultatif, aux travaux du comité, des savants et des techniciens appartenant à des organismes publics ou privés.

Ce comité se réunit, sur convocation de son président, à l'initiative de ce dernier ou à la demande de l'un de ses membres ou à celle du directeur du centre, aussi souvent que les besoins l'exigent et au moins une fois par trimestre.

Il délibère à la majorité des membres présents, dont le nombre ne peut être inférieur à 10. En cas de partage égal des voix celle du président est prépondérante.

ART. 7. — Le Centre national de coordination et de planification de la recherche scientifique et technique est géré par un directeur assisté d'un secrétaire général, nommés conformément à la législation en vigueur.

Le directeur exécute les décisions du conseil d'administration et celles du comité scientifique. Il gère le centre et agit en son nom. Il accomplit ou autorise tous actes ou opérations relatifs à son objet et représente le centre vis-à-vis de l'Etat, de toute administration publique ou privée et de tout tiers et fait tous actes conservatoires.

Il représente le centre en justice mais ne peut intenter une action judiciaire qu'avec l'autorisation du conseil d'administration.

Il nomme le personnel et est habilité à engager les dépenses du centre par acte, contrat ou marché sous réserve des approbations prévues par le présent dahir. Il fait tenir la comptabilité des dépenses engagées, liquide et constate les dépenses et les recettes du centre. Il délivre à l'agent comptable les ordres de paiement et les titres de recettes correspondants. Il peut, sous sa responsabilité, déléguer une partie de ses pouvoirs et de ses attributions au personnel de direction, notamment au secrétaire général.

Le directeur établit chaque année :

Un rapport d'activités scientifique, technique, administrative et financière de l'année écoulée ;

Un projet de programme d'action pour l'année suivante.

ART. 8. — Des commissions techniques spécialisées assistent le directeur du centre dans l'étude et l'élaboration des mesures nécessaires à la mise en œuvre des décisions à caractère scientifique du conseil d'administration et du comité scientifique.

Ces commissions qui sont présidées par le directeur du centre doivent assurer la participation et la représentativité les plus vastes de la communauté scientifique nationale, des planificateurs et des utilisateurs des résultats de la recherche scientifique et technique.

Le nombre de ces commissions, leur composition et leurs modalités de fonctionnement sont fixés par décret pris sur proposition du ministre de tutelle du centre.

ART. 9. — Les ressources du centre comprennent :

Les subventions de l'Etat ;

Les subventions d'organismes publics ou privés ;

Les subventions d'organismes internationaux ou étrangers ;

Les avances et emprunts ;

Les dons et legs ;

Toutes autres ressources qui peuvent être prévues ultérieurement.

ART. 10. — Le centre est soumis aux dispositions du dahir n° 1-59-271 du 17 chaoual 1379 (14 avril 1960) organisant le

contrôle financier de l'Etat sur les offices, établissements publics et sociétés concessionnaires ainsi que sur les sociétés et organismes bénéficiant du concours financier de l'Etat ou de collectivités publiques.

ART. 11. — Le présent dahir portant loi sera publié au Bulletin officiel.

Fait à Rabat, le 8 chabane 1396 (2 août 1976).

Pour contrasiner :

Le Premier ministre,

ABDERRAHMAN OUBAN.

CP

-----  
Centre National de Coordination  
et de Planification de la Recherche  
Scientifique et Technique

-----  
B.P 1356 R.P Rabat/

-ENGAGEMENT SUR L'HONNEUR -



Je soussigné, Monsieur, Mademoiselle, Madame (1)

NOM.....

PRENOM.....Né(e) le.....

A....., Domicilié(e).....

.....

Tél. : .....

Bénéficiaire d'une bourse de recherche dans le cadre du PROGRAMME  
D'AIDE A LA RECHERCHE SOCIO-ECONOMIQUE AU MAROC,  
pour le projet (2).....

.....

.....

déclare disposer des ressources suivantes pour la réalisation de ce  
projet :

<u>Origine des ressources</u>	<u>Montant</u>
. Bourse du présent programme.....	..... DH
. Autres ressources	
.....	..... DH
.....	..... DH
.....	..... DH
	<hr/>
T O T A L .....	..... DH

Je m'engage également à déclarer toute autre ressource qui  
serait obtenue au cours des travaux de recherche, et ce par lettre  
adressée à Monsieur le Directeur du Centre National de Coordination  
et de Planification de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique.

Signature légalisée :

34

(1) Rayer les mentions inutiles

## A. CRITERES BUDGETAIRES

-----

1) Per-diem	{	Chercheur en déplacement :	200 DH par jour
		Dactylographie :	10 DH par page de définitive
		Enquêteur en déplacement :	120 DH par jour
		sur place :	70 DH par jour

2) Papeterie ( reproduction )	:	0,6 DH par page
3) Mécanographie	:	5 DH la carte
4) Dépouillement manuel	:	2 DH par questionnaire
5) Voiture	:	0,60 DH le Km
6) Contribution à l'achat de la documentation livres, photocopie	:	10 % de la dotation globale
7) Contribution à l'achat de magnétophones : matériel à écrire, cassettes, etc ..	:	10 % de la dotation globale

## B. CALENDRIER BUDGETAIRE

-----

- 1/6 de la dotation globale est versé à la signature du ...
- 2/6 de la dotation est retenue jusqu'à la remise du ...
- 3/6 de la dotation est versé échelonné selon le calendrier de travail effectué.

**Best Available Document**

20

35