

Attachment # 419  
 Fy 1978  
 Egypt

PD-AAR-080  
 1201 39363

**AIRGRAM**  
**CONTINUATION**

**DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

**AIRGRAM**

POST: AIDTO CIRC A -	NO.	UNCLASSIFIED	CLASSIFICATION	PAGE 2	PAGE 7
----------------------	-----	--------------	----------------	--------	--------

**PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY**  
 (Submit to MO/PAV after each project evaluation)

1. Mission or AID/W Office Name USAID/CAIRO			2. Project Number 263-0015		
3. Project Title Strengthening Rural Health Delivery					
4. Key project dates (fiscal years)			5. Total U.S. funding - life of project		
a. Project Agreement 76 Signed	b. Final Obligation 81	c. Final input delivered 82	\$ 8,470,000		
6. Evaluation number as listed in Eval. Schedule 1	7. Period covered by this evaluation From: 9/76 TO: 9/77		8. Date of this Evaluation Review 11/3/77		
9. Action Decisions Reached at Evaluation Review, including items needing further study (Note--This list does not constitute an action request to AID/W. Use telegrams, airgrams, SPARS, etc., for action)		10. Officer or Unit responsible for follow-up	11. Date action to be completed		
1. Revise project paper extending project completion date based on implementation plan and in depth evaluation O/A 18 months after implementation of project.		R. Britanak	12/80		
2. Clarification of relationships and coordination of MOH, USAID, Technical Advisory Committee.		Britanak/Shutt	11/77		
3. Clarification of project source and accounting of local currencies.		Britanak/Flores Gendron	6/78		

12. Signatures:	
Project Officer <i>Dr. Rose A. Britanak</i>	Mission or AID/W Office Director <i>Dr. Stanley Applegate</i>
Signature	Signature
Typed Name Dr. Rose A. Britanak	Typed Name DIR. Donald S. Brown
Date 11/16/77	Date

AID-9-9A (10-82)

UNCLASSIFIED  
 CLASSIFICATION

Dr. Stanley Applegate, Assistant Director for Technical Assistant

**Continuation**  
**CONTINUATION**

POST AIDTO CIRC A -	NO.	CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	PAGE 3	PAGE OF 7
------------------------	-----	--------------------------------	-----------	--------------

13. SUMMARY - Summarize in about 200 words the current project situation, mentioning progress in relation to design, prospects of achieving purpose, major problems encountered, etc.

Grant Agreement was signed September 30, 1976. The Project implementation has been delayed for reasons outside of the direct control of the Mission and the implementing agency (MOH): (1) Soon after the Grant Agreement was signed, AID policy directives required changes in the proposed contracting mode to "Host Country Contracting," thus requiring initiation/education of Mission & MOH personnel to an unfamiliar process; (2) Delays were encountered in securing the required legal opinion from the GOE to meet a conditions precedent and; (3) Mission was not fully staffed to facilitate implementation. USAID & MOH project personnel are now actively involved in implementing the project with good cooperation and leadership from the MOH. The Mission is optimistic that the project can overcome initial delays and achieve primary outputs as programmed. However, the delays mentioned will extend the project completion date at least one year. This extension will be documented in a revised project paper to be undertaken O/A October, 1980 to take advantage of the results of a planned extensive technical evaluation scheduled for 18 months after project field activities are implemented.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY - Describe the methods used for this evaluation, i.e. was it a regular or special evaluation? was it in accordance with the Evaluation Plan in the PP with respect to timing, study design, scope, methodology and issues? What kinds of data were used and how were they collected and analyzed? Identify agencies and key individuals participating and contributing.

This evaluation is as scheduled in the Mission Evaluation Plan. The Mission's Project Committee reviewed the project objectives and status noting issues to be addressed in the immediate period. The project committee meeting was followed by a second meeting which included the Program Evaluation Officer. It should be noted that a detailed project evaluation plan will be part of the implementation plan to be developed by the Contractor 90 days after beginning field work or due O/A March 1978. This will serve as term of reference for following evaluations.

15. Documents to be revised to reflect decisions noted page 1 (other side:)

Project Paper (PP)  Logical Framework  CPI Network  Financial Plan  
 PIO/T  PIO/C  PIO/P  Grant Agreement  Other

This evaluation brought out ideas for a new project -- a Project Identification Document (PID) will follow.

UNCLASSIFIED

POST AIDTO CIRC A.-	NO.	CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	PAGE 4	PAGE OF 7
------------------------	-----	--------------------------------	-----------	--------------

15. Evaluation findings about EXTERNAL FACTORS - Identify and discuss major changes in project setting which have an impact on the project. Examine continuing validity of assumptions.

The project's organization and objectives remain as stated in the project paper. Assumptions given remain valid and GOE support for health activities remains strong.

17. Evaluation findings about GOAL/SUBGOAL - For the reader's convenience, quote the approved sector or other goal, (and subgoal, where relevant) to which the project contributes. Then describe status by citing evidence available to date from specified indicators and by mentioning progress of other projects (whether or not U.S.) which contribute to same goal. Discuss causes--can progress toward goal be attributed to project, why shortfalls?

The health sector goal that this project supports is "to improve the commitment and capacity of the MOH to provide broad access to preventive and curative health services at acceptable levels of quality." The project has experienced delayed implementation as mentioned in Item 13 above; future evaluations will be able to discuss specific progress toward attaining the goal. Recently approved Family Planning Project and proposed FY 1978 funded Urban Health Delivery Project will be complementary.

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

POST	NO.	CLASSIFICATION	PAGE	PAGES
AIDTO CIRC A -		UNCLASSIFIED	5	7

18. Evaluation findings about PURPOSE - Quote the approved project purpose. Cite progress toward each End-of-Project Status (EOPS) condition. When can achievement be expected? Discuss causes of progress or shortfalls.

The Project purposes remain valid and are: (1) to identify and validate through field testing replicable methods to reduce or eliminate communication, management/supervision, motivational and incentive issues as factors limiting production of the rural health services - particularly as these issues impact on prevention and outreach, (2) to mobilize greater support and commitment of resources to the rural health program within the MOH. (See Items 13 & 17 above)

19. Evaluation findings about OUTPUTS and INPUTS - Note any particular success or difficulties. Comment on significant management experiences of host contractor, and donor organizations. Describe any necessary changes in schedule or in type and quantity of resources or outputs needed to achieve project purpose.

Accounting and source of local currencies is to be clarified since Mondale Pogue funds are now available for Project use; heretofore plans were to convert dollars for local currency needs. Therefore (1) are Mondale-Pogue funds to be sole source of local currencies or are they new funds additive to dollar funded local currency approved in project paper? (2) new estimates of local costs would increase overall budget above amount approved in PP (3) if Mondale-Pogue funds are source of funds should new budget be forwarded to Washington "informing" them of new dollar and new local cost requirements? (See Items 13 & 17 above.)

**Not Available Document**

UNCLASSIFIED

4

POST	AIDTO CIRC A -	NO.	UNCLASSIFIED	CLASSIFICATION	Page 6 of 7
------	----------------	-----	--------------	----------------	-------------

20. Evaluation findings about UNPLANNED EFFECTS - Has project had any unexpected results or impact, such as changes in social structure, environment, technical or economic situation? Are these effects advantageous or not? Do they require any change in plans?

The host country contracting mode, while delaying implementation, has resulted in significantly increased involvement and commitment on the part of the GOE Project Officials.

21. CHANGES in DESIGN or EXECUTION - Explain the rationale for any proposed modification in project design or execution which now appear advisable as a result of the preceding findings (items 16 to 20 above) and which were reflected in one or more of the action decisions listed on page 1 or noted in Item 15 on page 2.

The project paper called for the formation of a Technical Advisory Committee to periodically review the design, scheduling and results of the project tests. External Advisory Committee members have been named and approved. The relationships and coordination of the MOH, USAID and the Advisory Committee members required clarification, which has been worked out during the evaluation process.

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

5

NO. AIDTO CIRC A -	CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED	PAGE 7 OF 7
--------------------	-----------------------------	-------------

LESSONS LEARNED - What advice can you give a colleague about development strategy-- e.g., how to tackle a similar development problem or to manage a similar project in another country? What can be suggested for follow-on in this country? Similarly, do you have any suggestions about evaluation methodology?

See Item 20 above

SPECIAL COMMENTS or REMARKS (For AID/W projects, assess likelihood that results of project will be utilized in LDC's).

None to be noted

CHRISTOPHER

Clearance: HPD: MShutt ( in draft )  
PRM: GFlores ( in draft )  
PRM: Glaudato (in draft)  
LEG: JPhippard  
CONT: DGendron, (info)  
DD: JRoleson

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

6