PD-AAR-005
ISN 39119

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) – PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Agricultural Management Pilot Project	931-11-190-209	USAID/Cairo

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) FY 80-8

End-of-Project Evaluation

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 1978	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 1980	C. Final Input Delivery FY 1980	A. Total $ 3.1 Million B. U.S. $ 2.4 Million	From (month/yr.) Aug., 1978 To (month/yr.) April, 1980 Date of Evaluation Review March/April 1980

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
GAI local staff to accelerate completion of Reference Book	Bruce Kratka	ASAP
GAI local staff to accelerate consultation and follow-up activities	Bruce Kratka	ASAP
USAID/Cairo/AG to prepare follow-on Project Paper following approval of PID	Jennifer Bremer	ASAP

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

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

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

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

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

Mr. Ali Dukrury, MOA Gen. Dir., Training Dept.
Mr. M. Mohmoud Dawood, GOE Minister of Agriculture
Mr. M. M. El-Salhy, MOA First Undersecy. for Admin.
Mr. Mohamed Hassan, MOA Project Manager
Mr. Bruce Kratka, GAI Chief-of-Party

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name: Owen Cylke

Date

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

memorandum

DATE: August 27, 1980

REPLY TO ATTN OF: William Steckel, Mission Evaluation Officer, DPPE

SUBJECT: USAID Special Evaluation - FY 80-8
Agricultural Management Pilot Project

Through: C. F. Weden, AD/DPPE

TO: Owen Cylke, Acting Director

1. Attached for your approval is the Project Evaluation Summary (PES) for the subject project. The project, designed to enhance the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture's ability to better serve Egypt's farmers by improving the managerial capability of the Ministry's middle managers, began in 1978. The activity was initially centrally funded by AID/W at $1.9 million, and extended from November 1979 through July 1980 with USAID/Cairo funding. This end-of-project evaluation was undertaken by an American consultant, Dr. Richard Roberts, in association with Drs. Abdel Hamid and El-Kholei, two members of the Egyptian academic community. Their individual reports, presented as annexes to the Roberts evaluation, constitute a valuable supplement to the Roberts findings.

2. The evaluation effort had the full and active support of the GOE/MOA. The Ministry assisted in setting up appointments and sent representatives who accompanied the team to the Barrage Training Center and to the governorates where graduates of the training program were interviewed on their appraisal of the program's value and its influence on their job performance.

3. The findings of the evaluation team are thorough and constructive. The team was to determine: (a) the extent that the management training program had been institutionalized within the MOA; (b) the extent that the ASIP approach, developed by the Governmental Affairs Insittute, adequately met the training needs in agricultural management; (c) the effectiveness of the contractor's operations; and (d) the advisability of continuing training in agricultural management with basically the same or a modified project. The team's summary findings and conclusions are to be found in pages 3 through 7 in the Roberts Report. Basically, the team found that: (a) at the time of the evaluation, the training program had not secured a firm institutional base within the MOA; (b) the ASIP approach had not been fully incorporated and that each training session was shorter than was originally intended; (c) that the contract staff, while dedicated and hard-working, was not thoroughly acquainted with the ASIP approach, nor thoroughly conversant with modern management theories and practices; and (d) there was a need for management training at the MOA middle management level. Further, that the ASIP approach properly applied with additional training elements, might contribute significantly in improving GOE/MOA's managerial performance.

Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

OPTIONAL FORM NO. 10
(REV. 7-76)
GSA FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.6
5010-112

4. The evaluation team concluded that the pilot project will have only generated some of the anticipated outputs by the time of the project termination date. Therefore, the end-of-project status will represent only limited success. The report states the basic reasons for these shortfalls are:

(a) The project design was made in the U.S.A.; it was Egyptianized too late, and the Egyptianization began at too low a level.

(b) Contractors' efforts at institutionalization were too narrow in scope failing to embrace the whole of the MOA and ministry top management.

(c) The contract team was too small in size, too burdened with technical and administrative problems, while lacking the multi-disciplined capacity needed to fully develop the several interrelated aspects of the ASIP approach.

(d) The team lacked, from the start, a staff member who fully grasped the ASIP approach and who could effectively transmit the ASIP concepts into Arabic.

(e) Ineffectual top level supervision by the contractor, AID/W and USAID permitted the project to wander far from its chartered course without timely, decisive action being taken.

5. In keeping with the special evaluation team's findings, the Project Paper for the follow-on project, Agricultural Management Development - 0116, contains a number of recommendations found in the evaluation report. They are:

(a) Supplement the ASIP approach with some training sessions devoted to basic management concepts.

(b) Ensure that the management training courses relate more directly to Egyptian agricultural support problems.

(c) Ensure greater concentration of training within specific geographic areas and specific organizational units within these areas.

(d) Increase counseling and follow-up activities with training program graduates.

(e) Conduct selected, special courses in management training, especially for MOA top administrators.

6. The evaluation report was one of the basic documents used in the preparation of the follow-on project's PP. The substance of the report was made known both to the Project and Executive Committees. Bringing this evaluation report before the Executive Committee, therefore, is not deemed necessary and is not recommended.