

AGRONOMIC INSTITUTE - 608-0160

PD-AAP-122

1570-34141

MISSION/AD/3/4 OFFICE

USAID/RABAT

1570-34141

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project's purpose is to create a "modern" college of agriculture appropriate to Moroccan agricultural development needs, with appropriate linkages to the rest of the technology delivery system and involving low-income farmers and herders. It provides long and short term participant training for master's and doctoral level students and faculty from agricultural schools and from agriculture sector agencies. It also provides

AUTHORIZATION DATE AND U.S. LOP FUNDING AMOUNT

PES NUMBER

PES DATE

PES TYPE

April 1980

\$9,721,000

608-84-01

January, 1984

 Regular Other (Specify)

ABSTRACT PREPARED BY, DATE

ABSTRACT CLEARED BY, DATE

 Special TerminalUrsula Nadolny
Evaluation OfficerRobert C. Chase
Mission Director

NE/TECH 3/19/84

U.S. TA from senior and junior academics in a variety of agricultural fields, who assist IAV (Institut Agronomic-Veterinaire) in institution building, and in supervision of faculty dissertation and master's thesis research projects.

This mid-point evaluation (5 year LOP) was undertaken to determine if the project design was essentially sound, whether the project should be amended to add a further 5 years and some additional activities, and to see how implementation was conforming to the original design. The project is already ahead of the 3rd cycle (student) participant training schedule established. On the whole, this element seems to be running smoothly, with some dissatisfaction expressed over the university/department selection procedure, and ultimate placement. Major problems encountered include inadequate English language capability at onset of studies, and short duration of stay (1 year) in the U.S. (adjustment; course completion)

Doctoral level participants are also ahead of schedule in terms of their departures to the U.S. Faculty participants are not, under the project, supposed to stay in the U.S. sufficiently long to complete all the requirements for the U.S. PhD, but rather return to Morocco for final work and attainment of Moroccan-equivalent degree. This has not been fully understood by U.S. faculty advisors, and has caused some confusion over Moroccan participants' status in U.S. universities. Doctoral participants are taking longer to complete their dissertation research in Morocco than originally anticipated. Weather conditions (drought), inadequate logistical support, and demands on their time for other faculty responsibilities have impeded their progress. In general, research topics have been appropriate to the Moroccan context, and the balance of "pure" and "applied" topics is considered good. However, it is felt that opportunities have been missed for placement of particular participants in the optimal department at the optimal university, given their specializations, the availability of potentially interested advisors, the departmental/school/extension mix at the university, and the ecological zone in which the university is located.

To date, the project has not put significant emphasis on exposing the participant to U.S.-style teaching methods, administrative skills, and outreach functions while the participant is in the U.S. Also, research as the main linkage to U.S. Agricultural Science may not suffice, as the expectations about continuing research activities and opportunities at IAV for returned participants and other faculty may be less than realistic given current budget stringencies. Linkages to GOM research and extension programs by faculty are also being reviewed and areas of improvement identified. Finally, for institutional development, the evaluation notes two areas in which significant additional emphasis can appropriately be placed under this project -- documentation/library facilities, and computer facilities.

In sum, the evaluation team found that this is an excellent project, and one which should be used as a model for innovative participant training projects which also have a strong institution building component for the establishment of a viable, up-to-date agronomic and veterinary training in other countries. An extended LOP was recommended.

LESSONS LEARNED: (USAID's remarks; not provided in evaluation report).

1. The Host Country Contract mechanism can work. This contract is appropriately implemented through a Host Country Contract, and even greater opportunity exists for expanding the responsibility of IAV.
2. Longterm institution building under Title XII can be successful, innovative and creative. This project shows that alternatives to classic A.I.D. participant training do exist.
3. Evaluation SOW's need to keep evaluations focused on those matters which are central to project implementation. It is not expected or even desirable that an evaluation team try to provide answers to every possible matter affecting the project.
4. The collaborative Assistance style of evaluation can be highly successful and constructive, including promoting institution building goals through open and frank dialogue. It is reasonable to suppose that the success the project has achieved, and the absence of major differences of opinion on fundamental questions of project design, were important to the success of this collaborative evaluation.

C,
11

6080140/15

AGRONOMIC INSTITUTE

2. PROJECT NUMBER
608-0160 127

3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
USAID/RABAT

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No., beginning with No. 1 each FY) 84-01

REGULAR EVALUATION SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRC-AG or Equivalent FY 80	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 84	C. Final Input Delivery FY 85		A. Total \$13,528,000	From (month/yr.) 4/80
			B. U.S. \$9,721,000	To (month/yr.) 8/83	Date of Evaluation Review 2 December 1983

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Amend Project to increase LOP to 10 years with consideration of specific recommendations and or changes (funding, design, etc.) made in evaluation report. The principal of these recommendations to be considered are: 1. Increase Resident TA Staff. 2. Widen placement of faculty at other US universities, enhance "Partnership" and funding of it and promote decentralized and widened departmental linkages to U.S. Universities. 3. Provide increased commodity support (Agadir, Library, Computer, etc.).	M. Purvis	3-31-84
2. Implement recommendations for current project management improvement by USAID, IAV and University of Minnesota. These are principally: 1. Improve IAV pre-departure English and orientation particularly of 3rd cycle students during 1983-4. 2. Require IAV and U of M to develop written guidelines for return visits to U.S. and disbursement of commodities. 3. Exercise closer USAID management and financial oversight of project through increased staff time to project & use of USAID management information systems coming on stream.	M. Purvis M. Purvis M. Purvis	Ongoing to 6-30-84 12-31-83 Ongoing

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____
<input checked="" 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
B. <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 RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Dr. Malcolm J. Purvis, ADO Project Officer

[Signature]

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature *[Signature]*

Typed Name R. CHASE

Date JAN 12 1984

PART II

13. Summary

This mid-term evaluation of the project found that the project design is sound, the project is on or ahead of schedule in its implementation, and that no major problems have been encountered. This Title XII Collaborative Assistance Institution building project has some innovative features, of which the most notable is the conduct of in country research and granting of degrees to participants by IAV as a part of the institution building process, and the use of a single University contractor to build broad linkages to U.S. agricultural science, not just one U.S. university campus.

The executive summary of the project concludes "In sum, the evaluation found that this is an excellent project, and one which should be used as a model for innovative, participant training projects which also have a strong institution-building component for the establishment of viable, up-to-date agronomic and veterinary training institutions in other countries". Although 60 specific recommendations were made in the Executive Summary, the vast majority are suggestions for the future: exhortations to carry on or do more, or to include (and fund) new activities in a project extension. No major issues or "clouds of doubt" were raised by the evaluation.

14. Evaluation Methodology

This was a special mid-project evaluation and was conducted prior to proceeding with a planned second 5 year phase of the project. Given the collaborative assistance mode under which the project was designed and is being implemented, the project's institution-building emphasis, and the host country contract relationship between the Institute and the University, this was a collaborative evaluation.

The team members were Mr. Larbi Firdawcy, IAV's Secretary General; Dr. Donald Johnson, U of M Resident Team Leader; Dr. John Stovall, Research Director on the BIFAD Staff in AID/Washington, and Dr. Alice Morton, representing the U.S.A.I.D. and serving as team leader. The evaluation extensively interviewed faculty and students and past and present participants in the project, as well as University of Minnesota team members and USAID staff.

15. External Factors

The current (and recent) tight budget situation in Morocco is being felt by the IAV, along with all other parts of the GOM. However, the Institute is continuing to receive minimum necessary support and USAID has directed PL. 480 Title I funds to the capital budget of the Institute in 1984.

16. Inputs

Inputs have been provided on schedule and of appropriate quality. Minor improvements in e.g. pre-departure language training and orientation were suggested.

17. Outputs

Outputs (trained faculty and completed Third Cycle programs) are ahead of target. However, the in country research is taking longer than projected - a minimum of three years rather than two years will be needed, at least for the first "generation" of doctoral students. This confrontation of the realities of doing quality research in Morocco remains a highly desirable output.

18. Purpose

The project purpose is the creation of a "modern" college of agriculture appropriate to Moroccan agricultural development needs, with appropriate linkages to the rest of the technology delivery system and involving low-income farmers and herders. Evidence of progress towards EOPS are: the return of trained faculty to IAV, working on applied research problems; IAV's recent reorganization and creation of new Directorates of Research and Outreach ("Development") and growing linkages to U.S. and international agricultural science and technology.

19. Goal

The program goal is "to increase trained managers, technicians and scientists to staff programs and projects and formulate development policy to aid Moroccan agriculture in the implementation of a broad based participatory agricultural development and aimed at increased output and employment". The Evaluation Report had preliminary results of a Tracer Study of IAV graduates which showed that in 1971 there were 27 Moroccans with University degrees in agriculture. Since 1971, IAV has graduated 1,126 students who are widely dispersed throughout Morocco and in the public and private sectors. (The Tracer study is now in the final draft and confirms these findings).

20. Beneficiaries

The impact of the project on beneficiaries was not directly studied by the evaluation, but the increase in trained manpower in agriculture has been a significant factor in GOM ability to implement agricultural development programs and projects benefiting Moroccan families (80% of whom have holdings of less than 5 hectares).

21. Unplanned Effects

The supply of technically competent (and English-speaking) graduates of IAV has been a major factor in the implementation of other AID agricultural projects.

22. Lessons Learned

1. The Host Country Collaborative Assistance Contract mechanism has, in this instance, been highly successful, due to the mutual respect and understanding built over many years between IAV and the University of Minnesota.

2. Long term institution-building under Title XII can be not only successful, but innovative and creative. Although the evaluation did not address questions of cost-effectiveness in any detail, this project also shows that alternatives to classic AID participant training do exist.

23. Special Comments

The Evaluation Report of 129 pages is attached.

Part III

SPECIFIC RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a response to all of the sixty recommendations made by the Evaluation in its Recommendations Section, pp 4-9. They are listed under the main headings of the PES Face Sheet.

1. Amend Project

The Evaluation strongly endorses the amendment of the project to increase the LOP to 10 years. The Evaluation concludes that, in sum, it is an excellent project. Although no radical design changes are proposed by the Evaluation, a number of specific suggestions for the future amendment were made in recommendations A1, A2, A3, A6, A7, A8, A9, A10, A11, A12, A14, A17, A19, A20, B1, B2, C1, C2, C7. Each of these recommendations will be considered at the time of preparation of the Project Amendment. All of the recommendations have implications for increased LOP funding and USAID will act upon them on basis of cost-effectiveness to the realisation of project purpose. The proposals for the Amendment made by the Evaluation are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 : Agronomic Institute Project : Evaluation Recommendations to be acted upon by USAID in Process of Amendment Preparation

Recommendation No.	<u>Description</u>
A 1	Increase LOP to 10 years, and add funding in certain additions to project design.
A 2	Increase financial support to IAV faculty research through competitive grants.
A 3	Continue commodity support to Agadir.
A 6	Procure additional <u>local</u> expertise in statistics, computer science, etc.
A 7	Continue Junior Scientist Component.
A 8) A 9,) (also C7)	Expand Partnership and fund to assure increased placement of doctoral participants to Universities other than Minnesota and to establish Departmental linkages between INAV and other U.S. Universities.
A 10	Expand 'Faculty Visits' Program.
A 11	Significantly increase funding to Library.
A 12	Fund Computer Center.
A 14	Increase Resident TA.
A 17	Increase Research Support to \$11,000 per returned faculty participant.
A 19	Fund Manpower Demand Analysis.
A 20	Fund Spouses Program.
B 1	Review Curriculum.
B 2	Review Structure.
C 1	ESL Program at IAV - TDY analysis.
C 2	Balance and level of Junior scientists

2. Improvement of Current Project Management (A5, B4, B14, C3, C5, C9, C10, C12, D1, D2, D3, D5, D6)

- A5 Further improvement of English language and pre-departure training especially for 3rd Cycle students (IAV, U of M - monitored by U.S.A.I.D.; ongoing.)
- B4 Addressed in FY 84 Work Plan for Project but as project evolves will need ongoing adjustment (IAV, U of M - monitored by U.S.A.I.D.; ongoing).
- B14 USAID concurs, and raised issue at FY 84 Annual Review. IAV has stated that it intends to do so. (U.S.A.I.D. will monitor during FY 84).
- C 3, C 9 Matters have been brought to attention of U of M Project Management for their guidance. U.S.A.I.D. judges these to be very minor matters and receiving proper care from U of M Team Leader. No further action.
- C4 The FY 84 Work Plan addresses this matter in large part. Evaluation is correct in stressing institution building role of faculty and already U of M is spread very thin. (Issue can also be seen as one of Team size and composition and will be taken up by Amendment). (U.S.A.I.D. will monitor - ongoing).
- C 10 This is an evolutionary process but U.S.A.I.D. will insist that IAV assume growing burden of Host Country Contract Management (U.S.A.I.D. - ongoing).
- C 12 This was addressed in FY 84 Annual Work Plan and written Guidelines are being prepared by IAV at U.S.A.I.D.'s request. (IAV, December 31, 1983)
- D 1, D2, D3 These recommendations together deal with internal Project Management at the Mission and Division level and are being addressed with the arrival of almost entirely new (and enlarged) Mission team and notably of additional Agriculture Division Staff. (U.S.A.I.D. on-going).
- D 5, U.S.A.I.D. is open to S + T and other centrally funded activities but will continue to exercise its management responsibility not to accept additional, marginal and diffusing activities. However, addition of new Agriculture Division Staff will substantially expand capacity to manage additional activities (U.S.A.I.D.; on-going).

D 6 U.S.A.I.D. has re-initiated (October 1983) regular meetings of A.I.D. Agricultural Program Contractor Team Leaders with ADO and Project Managers.

3. Minor Matters requiring no further action or not accepted by U.S.A.I.D. (A4, A13, A15, A16, A18, B3, B5, B6, B7, B8, B9, B10, B11, B12, B13, C6, C8, C11, D5, D7, D8, D9, D10, D11, D12, D12, D14)

- A4, D9 Mission is exploring multiple options for use of PL 480 Title I funds. This issue, however, is outside of SOW of Evaluation and U.S.A.I.D. is presently limiting use of Title I funds to capital costs of projects.
- A13 U.S.A.I.D. considers IAV has been flexible in this regard, and supports IAV decision not to use project funds for this purpose. No action.
- A15, D4 With intention of Mission QPR system and additional Division staff, this problem is resolved. However, Mission does/will not have staff to allow luxury of 2 professionals to be continually fully briefed on Project Management. Necessary delegation will, of course, be made when needed by ADO.
- A16, C8,
D 5,
D 12 U.S.A.I.D. concurs with desirability of linkages to S+T and International Center Projects to IAV. However, in regard to participant training, U.S.A.I.D. does not accept that greater effort be made, in light of time and cost implications. Linkages to Centers are desirable but may be better achieved in Post-doctoral stage. Third Country travel also creates additional management burden for U.S.A.I.D. and INS. U.S.A.I.D. notes that U of M has/is programming travel to CIMMYT, etc.
- A 18 U.S.A.I.D. does not believe that this is an issue affecting project success. Also, issue is not further addressed in the text. Further clarification being sought as to any action needed (U.S.A.I.D., December 31, 1983).
- B3, B10 Not really actionable recommendations. U.S.A.I.D. determines that IAV has been generous with release time, given need for returned faculty to be involved in day-to-day teaching, as noted elsewhere in the report. Elimination of "Prime de Recherche" may not be the right way of providing faculty incentives.
- B 5 and B 6 These recommendations make strong sense, provided IAV budget is fully funded by GOM, (which is not the case in current austerity) and that managerial capacity exists at Department level. U.S.A.I.D. not convinced that this is a high priority now - but will give greater attention as faculty come on line.

- No specific action required, but needs to be monitored.
- B 7 This is already being done, and included in FY 83 and FY 84 Project Work Plan. No further action needed.
- B 8 U.S.A.I.D. does not consider this a serious problem: reduction and/or elimination of Third Cycle training, together with increased faculty returned from the U.S., will resolve. No further action required.
- B 9, 12, 13 Agree. Is being done. (This is an exhortation to "carry on"). No further action required.
- B 11 U.S.A.I.D. understands that this is, in fact, being done, although not "formalised" because of turf problems. No action proposed.
- C 6 A "carry on" recommendation; no immediate action required. U.S.A.I.D. will monitor continued performance.
- C 11 U.S.A.I.D. encourages IAV and Contractor to send participants at whatever time of year is cost-effective. Selection criteria for 5th Year Students are well-known to U.S.A.I.D. and IAV. U.S.A.I.D. is not convinced that selection of faculty is an issue, except in terms of disciplinary balance. U.S.A.I.D. will continue to monitor.
- D 7 A.I.D. policy is to insist on Contractor responsibility for shipping, customs clearance, etc. This also speaks to use of APO by Contractors, which is not allowable. Resolution under study by Contractor and U.S.A.I.D., but no doubt that cost of A.I.D. "self reliance" policy is considerable in terms of senior TA time, as well as that of Contract support staff. No further action contemplated at this time.
- D 8 This is a Contractor, not U.S.A.I.D. responsibility.
- D 10 Idea sound, but U.S.A.I.D. has determined not practical, given time lines and other priorities. (Proper Commodity specifications will be developed

prior to procurement, if this activity is included in the Amendment).

- D 11 U.S.A.I.D. will consider, but given other project priorities, unlikely before FY 86.
- D 13 U.S.A.I.D. is respecting mandate, e.g. 0136 and in close contact with MARA. No action required.
- D 14 U.S.A.I.D. concurs. No additional action needed.