

AN INVENTORY AND ASSESSMENT OF SO16 IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS' MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Submitted to:

**USAID/Egypt
Strategic Objective 16
Environmental for Trade and Investment Strengthened**

Under:

**MOBIS Contract No. GS-10F-0185K
Task Order No. 263-M-00-03-00006-00**



Prepared by:

**Results Reporting Support Activity Team
Development Associates, Inc.
20 Aisha El-Taimoreya St.
Garden City, Cairo**

April 10, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Executive Summary	iii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Introduction and Purpose of the Report	1
Background	1
Methodology and Definitions of	
Evaluation and Monitoring Functions	2
Monitoring and Evaluation Plans and Systems	2
Organization of the Report.....	3
Chapter 2 Status of M&E Systems.....	4
Status of Partners' M&E Systems	4
IR 16.1.....	4
IR 16.2.....	5
IR 16.3.....	6
M&E Systems	6
IR 16.1.....	7
IR 16.2.....	8
IR 16.3.....	8
Chapter 3 M&E Systems Assessment	10
General Findings.....	10
Conclusions.....	11
Chapter 4 Recommendations for Enhancing Existing Systems	13
 ANNEXES	
Annex 1 M&E Assessment Summary of On-Going Projects	A-1
Annex 2 M &E Inventory Forms	A-16
Annex 3 Interviews Conducted.....	A-44
Annex 4 Bibliography.....	A-48

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

USAID and its Partners have expended considerable effort monitoring and evaluating programs involved in economic growth activities. Significant progress has been made, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems in many programs have become more sophisticated, comprehensive, and reliable. However, work remains to be done to further improve extant M&E systems, and to establish them in programs where they do not yet exist. The first step to enhancing M&E functions is to make a comprehensive inventory and assessment of current data gathering and reporting systems.

This report aims to assess the completeness, validity, and reliability of existing monitoring and evaluation systems of SO 16 Partners, as well as the quality of the data used for reporting results. The report is divided into three primary sections. Chapter 1 lays out the basis for the study, and defines key M&E terminology that have been utilized in the process of researching and assessing Partner M&E systems. Chapter 2 presents a brief “snapshot” of the current status of M&E systems, disaggregated by IR. In this section, we discuss the range of M&E systems, their role in management decision making, and issues of data quality and availability. Chapter 3 builds on this analysis and outlines general findings relating to Partners’ M&E functions overall. Based on these findings, the chapter also highlights some of the challenges and opportunities for enhancing existing systems. Chapter 4 concludes the report, recommending actions for enhancing the existing M&E systems. Details of specific projects’ M&E systems and recommendations are located in Annex 1 and Annex 2.

The RRSA team has found that while some Partners have developed sophisticated and comprehensive M&E systems, others have not implemented any formal system of information gathering and analysis. Partners questioned about whether or not they have an M&E system are generally not required by USAID to have such a system. Partners in IR 1 generally do not have M&E systems in place, while Partners in IRs 2 and 3 range from having highly organized systems with staff dedicated solely to M&E activities, to decentralized, less structured systems.

Based on numerous structured interviews with Partner staff and management, it is clear that all recognize the importance of data gathering and analysis to improve project performance and results reporting. While no M&E system is “perfect,” important lessons can be derived from several Partners’ innovative approaches and best practices followed as they relate to M&E. Additionally, many Partners face the same challenges in implementing M&E activities. RRSA will support Partners to establish formal M&E plans which delineate functions to collect data and evaluate activities on a regular and on-going basis.

USAID and its Partners in economic growth need to work together to learn from programs’ successes and identify solutions to commonly shared obstacles. Through collaborative effort and creative thinking, Partners’ M&E systems can improve. With an enhanced ability to monitor ongoing activities, assess progress, and estimate impact, program management will be able to reorient activities, hone in on key objectives, identify unmet needs, and improve program performance overall.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

USAID and many of its Partners have made significant progress in refining systems of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of economic growth activities in recent years, but there is still a need to improve the scope, quality, efficiency, and coordination of existing efforts, and to make better use of the M&E information generated. The starting point in addressing these needs is to make an inventory and assessment of existing information and reporting systems.

This report reviews existing monitoring and evaluation systems currently utilized by Partners under SO 16, *Environment for Trade and Investment Strengthened*. The purpose of this review is to provide a comprehensive inventory of Partner M&E functions, analyze linkages to performance reporting, review the strengths and weaknesses of the M&E systems in place, and provide recommendations for enhancing existing M&E activities. As such, this report aims to form the basis upon which modified and comprehensive monitoring and evaluation systems can be designed for all activities under SO 16.

BACKGROUND

USAID Strategic Objective 16 aims to promote economic growth, specifically through strengthening the environment for trade and investment. SO 16 incorporates three intermediate results (IRs) under which there are several major activities. IR 16.1 focuses on strategies to improve the policy environment for trade and investment. Activities under IR 16.2 aim to increase private sector competitiveness, while IR 16.3 encompasses initiatives to enhance opportunities for business growth.

SO16's monitoring and evaluation support contract aims to improve reporting of results to meet USAID requirements, improve data quality and analytical products, and improve utilization of information for program management and planning related to SO16 activities. Known as the Results Reporting Support Activity (RRSA), such M&E support is intended to contribute to improved quality of SO16 results.

METHODOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

In preparing this Report, each of the SO 16 Partners' M&E activities were individually reviewed, with a focus on: monitoring and evaluation systems design; data quality and collection methodologies; and usage of M&E systems for program planning as well as reporting. From this, strengths and weaknesses were analyzed, and recommendations were made.

Relevant documents were collected and analyzed for each of the SO 16 Partners. They included: scopes of work within the contractual agreements with USAID, the activity's Quarterly Reports, as well as any other relevant documents available such as Client Satisfaction Reviews, Mid-term Assessments, and Impact and/or Process Evaluations.

A questionnaire was also developed and utilized as a discussion guide for interviews with all Partners. Interviews were conducted with those staffers charged with managing M&E systems. In some cases this was with the M&E specialist with full-time M&E responsibilities, while in others it was with the executive director or supervisor of any decentralized M&E functions. In projects where no dedicated M&E systems or staff are in place, meetings were held with Chiefs of Party.

In this assessment and inventory of the status of partner monitoring and evaluation functions, plans and systems, RRSA applied specific definitions in posing interview questions to implementing partners. In this context, RRSA employed USAID's usage as to what precisely comprises the terms 'evaluation' and 'monitoring'. A brief description of this usage follows.

EVALUATION AND MONITORING FUNCTIONS

Evaluation in USAID is essentially a management tool for use in decision-making, accountability reporting, and for organizational learning. Along with performance monitoring data, evaluation serves as a key source of information on performance of USAID activities, programs and strategies. Ultimately, evaluation and monitoring should lead to improved quality of USAID activities and programs.

According to recent USAID ADS guidance, "evaluations may be conducted by specially contracted external experts, SO Team members, or partner organizations." Four types of evaluation are defined by this same guidance: internal or self-evaluations (by the USAID Operating unit or implementing partner); external evaluations by independent experts; collaborative evaluations performed by more than one agency or partner; and participatory evaluations performed by multiple stakeholders. While mid-term and final evaluations are no longer mandatory in USAID, many activities still include them in scopes of work or contractual agreements.

Monitoring includes tracking of primary and secondary data for both operations management purposes and for performance reporting. Tracking data for operations is used by management for decision making in program administration and prioritizing resource allocations. Performance information derives from a variety of sources. These include performance indicators, partner progress reports, periodic evaluations or assessments, and portfolio reviews. In assessing progress toward planned results, according to ADS guidance "...Operating Units should rely more on performance indicator data in the Performance Management Plan for each SO." Partners contribute to both performance indicators and to other performance measures used in annual Performance Management Plans.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLANS AND SYSTEMS

While not specific to USAID guidance, RRSA used the terms 'plan' and 'system' in posing questions to partners about the level and scope of their M&E activities. The term plan refers to an activity's broader management operational scheme and evaluation of issues or results achieved. This might include any one of the earlier-mentioned types, e.g., internal, external, collaborative, or participatory evaluations—performed at different points in time. The phase or point in time of an activity shapes whether the evaluation is defined as a process, summative, or impact assessment.

The term ‘system,’ is used in a sense that brings all of the elements of M&E together as a knowledge management tool. This tool includes, among others, information for decision-making, results or accountability reporting, and as a means to enhance organizational learning. It comprises evaluation conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations for their enhancement. These combine to provide a major source of information essential to informed activity management and performance reporting. Finally, in the context of SO 16 and its implementing partners, proactive use of such a system can lead to improved activity and program performance.

Finally, a caveat about use of the term M&E system: Partners questioned about whether or not they have an M&E system are generally not *required* by USAID to have such a system. Most do not have their M&E activities systematized nor should they necessarily be expected to. It simply represents a standard against which to gauge the scope and level of M&E functions and activities under SO 16. In this context, one of RRSA’s major functions under SO 16 is to assess evaluation needs of implementing partners towards the end of supporting them in improved M&E data collection, analysis and reporting.

ORGANIZATION OF THE REPORT

In organizing the body of this Report, it was important to attempt to achieve the proper balance between describing specific M&E systems of all SO 16 Partners with the need to underscore overall findings. The Report has therefore delineated findings in the text of the document by IR, not by individual project. The Report has maintained distinctions between the IRs due to the fact that the activities—and consequently the M&E systems—are highly divergent between IRs. Examples of specific activities are provided periodically in the text in order to illustrate overall findings, and detailed descriptions of M&E systems by project are located in the report Annexes.

The remainder of the report is divided into three chapters. In Chapter 2, we discuss the current status of Partners’ M&E systems, by IR. Activity systems are evaluated based on their comprehensiveness, the level of staff dedication, and the quality and availability of data. This Chapter furthermore examines the use of M&E systems in reporting and managing, with an eye to assessing the extent to which evaluation findings and performance information are used to inform management decision making.

Chapter 3 is a critical assessment of M&E systems by IR. Based upon findings presented in Chapter 2, we outline the strengths and weakness of existing M&E functions, and highlight opportunities for enhancing extant systems. Chapter 4 builds on the above findings and presents overall conclusions and recommendations.

CHAPTER 2

STATUS OF M&E SYSTEMS

STATUS OF PARTNERS' M&E SYSTEMS

IR 16.1

IR 16.1, *Policy Framework for Trade and Investment Improved*, encompasses 13 active projects. While Partner activities focus on areas as diverse as customs and trade reform; privatization; national accounting modernization; and intellectual property rights, all IR 16.1 projects share the common goal of aiming to inform and improve GOE public policy essential to promoting economic growth. As such, IR 16.1 Partners work with Government officials, advocacy groups, and private sector stakeholders in order to influence macro-level policy formulation—a process characterized by both progress and limitations wherein quantifiable achievements are often difficult to define.

M&E SYSTEMS

Given the nature of Partner activities and goals, defining and implementing effective monitoring and evaluation systems has proved to be a significant challenge. Overall, IR 16.1 Partners have not established formal M&E systems, they have not allocated staff members to M&E activities, and they have not earmarked project resources for this purpose. Furthermore, most Partners' Scopes of Work (SOW) do not require formal M&E systems, nor do they require external evaluations.¹

However, many IR 16.1 Partners do engage in informal periodic oversights of project activities in order to ensure that activities are implemented in accordance with their defined scope of work and that project goals are being met. Several projects, such as the Corporate Tax Activity (CTA) and the Technical Assistance for Intellectual Property Rights (TAIPR), for example, have general and specific performance standards against which the Partners evaluate their progress. These standards cover performance areas such as technical competence and client satisfaction, as well as progress indicators such as the passage and implementation of laws.²

Evaluations

Most IR 16.1 Partners have not had external impact or process evaluations conducted. There are four exceptions: 1) an evaluation of the Corporate Tax Activity was conducted in 1991;³ 2) a Semi-Annual Evaluation of the USAID Privatization Project was completed in 1998;⁴ 3) an

¹ An exception to this is the Data Access and Transmission Activity (DATA). The technical proposal, which now forms part of the DATA contract, states that DATA shall conduct M&E on a periodic basis. These requirements, however, have not yet been implemented.

² See Annexes 1 and 2 for disaggregated information on specific projects.

³ Neither RRSA nor the Contractor has received a copy of this report. RRSA is therefore not in a position to comment on the contents nor the recommendations.

⁴ The evaluation report is of only limited value, as it does not provide a critique of the program and does not give recommendations for program management.

external evaluation of the Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES) was completed in 1998; and 4) an external evaluation of DATA was conducted in September 2002.

IR 16.2

Five Partners operate within IR 16.2, *Private Sector Competitiveness Increased*. These programs focus on promoting private sector-driven economic growth through a number of complementary activities such as analyzing constraints to increasing horticultural exports, developing innovative post-harvest and marketing technologies, and enhancing production efficiency in the livestock industry.

M&E Systems

All of the IR 16.2 Partners have established M&E systems, and all have staff who contribute to the M&E function. M&E activities range from full, well-developed systems with staff dedicated solely to M&E functions and with a separate M&E budget; to partial, developing systems with staff who spend a proportion of their time on M&E activities but without a separate M&E budget. For example, ALEB has a formal M&E unit with a full-time senior-level M&E manager and a budget for M&E activities. HEIA, on the other hand, has set up a quality control department that coordinates the organization's M&E functions. There is no formal M&E unit; rather, several departments contribute to the decentralized M&E system.⁵

Data

All IR 16.2 Partners rely on both primary and secondary data to monitor and evaluate their activities. Primary data is collected from program beneficiaries, which include private farmers, exporters, and firms. Data is collected through a number of different means, including monthly surveys delivered in the field, individual interviews, faxed questionnaires, focus group discussions, formal interviews, and mail surveys.

Overall, the quality of primary data from these stakeholders is considered somewhat reliable to highly accurate, depending upon the project, the particular data source, and the information collected. In general, all Partners agree that firms tend to be reticent about reporting accurate figures (on export and revenue, for example), because of their concerns that this information could be utilized by competitors or the government. This lack of reliability in self-reporting is particularly acute among smaller firms.

Primary data collected from farmers is considered highly accurate (AgLink and AgReform are the two primary Partners involved in this). AgLink verifies field data by conducting random evaluations at headquarters and returning suspect data to the field for verification, while AgReform cross-checks data sources through different data collection methodologies, such as questionnaires, narratives, tables, diagrams, and focus group discussions.

IR 16.2 Partners generally rely on the same sources of secondary data: CAPMAS, the Central Bank, and (at times) counterpart Ministries. While all IR 16.2 Partners recognize that there are limitations to these data, they tend to agree that these are necessary sources of information.

⁵ For disaggregated information on specific projects' M&E systems, refer to Annex 1 and 2.

Several Partners attempt to account for discrepancies in data generated by the GOE compared with international figures by comparing Government data with outside sources such as Eurostat and the World Bank.

Most IR 16.2 Partners have baseline data, but with varying degrees of accuracy and comprehensiveness. AgLink, for example, has baseline information which includes general household as well as livestock data that is disaggregated by each firm and/or farm client. AgReform, on the other hand, only has baseline data for farms that have export contracts, while ExpoLink does not collect baseline data at all.

Evaluations

Most IR 16.2 Partners have had external evaluations conducted, all by PriceWaterhouseCoopers. External mid-term process assessments were carried out for AgLink (2000), ExpoLink (2000), ALEB (2001), and AgReform (1998). AgReform additionally had an external evaluation in 2002 for an extension request. HEIA, the only project with no official external evaluation, was evaluated as part of the ATUT/RONCO evaluation conducted in 2002.

IR 16.3

IR 16.3, *Opportunities for Business Growth Enhanced*, encompasses a diverse array of activities, including small and micro-enterprise credit (SEC and SEBDO), information technology expansion (ICT), and capital market development (CMD).

M&E Systems

None of the IR 16.3 Partners has full-time M&E staff or specific budget allocations for M&E activities. However, M&E systems range from highly developed formal processes to nascent systems. The Small Enterprise Credit (SEC) and Small and Emerging Business Development Organization (SEBDO) programs, for example, follow worldwide uniform Micro-Enterprise Reporting Requirements (MRRs) developed by USAID/Washington. The MRR is based on a specialized Management Information System, termed the Loan Tracking system (LTS), which is the source of information reported monthly by each foundation to the project headquarters.⁶ These programs also utilize an Impact Tracking System (ITS) based on USAID policy implemented by both the local subcontractor EQI and an independent firm.

Capital Market Development (CMD) also has a robust M&E system, whereby staff track activities on a weekly basis (overseen by the Communication's Coordinator). The ICT project has recently begun to develop its M&E system at both result and activity levels. They have developed a well-defined comprehensive system to track progress and clarify benchmark definitions.

⁶ The LTS has gained a highly favorable reputation in the micro-credit community in Egypt, and has been purchased by some donors for the micro-credit NGOs that they fund.

Data

All 16.3 Partners track data on a regular basis with established baselines. The Partners vary in the nature and quality of data sources due to the significant variation in programmatic goals and stakeholders of the four Partners. SME activities, which target low-income borrowers at the grassroots level, only utilize primary data (collected from lending foundations, as well as from individual beneficiaries in case of impact assessments.). However, CMD, which aims to reform Egyptian capital markets at the macro-level, relies heavily on secondary data from the Capital Market Authority (CMA), the Cairo Alexandria Stock Exchange (CASE), and other project partners. ICT also collects the majority of its data from its Government counterparts (the Ministry of Information and Telecommunication, MITC, and the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority, TRA).

The quality of data collected varies from highly accurate (from program beneficiaries and intermediary lending institutions)⁷ to data that has not been validated (MITC data). CMD compares and contrasts the data compiled by CMA and CASE for accuracy purposes.

Evaluations

External evaluations have been conducted for SEC (1996) and for CMD (2002). External evaluations are scheduled for SEC, SEBDO, and ICT in 2003. Internal impact evaluations were conducted for SEC and SEBDO in 2001 and 2002.

USE OF M&E SYSTEMS IN REPORTING AND MANAGING

IR 16.1

Program Management

As indicated in the previous section, the majority of IR 16.1 Partners have not had formal evaluations, nor do they have formal M&E systems in place. It is therefore difficult, if not impossible, to accurately assess to what degree informal monitoring and evaluation has influenced management decisions concerning activity prioritization and goal setting.

The majority of managers did indicate in meetings and discussions with the RRSA team that informal input and feedback from Ministry counterparts and the Mission staff influences planning processes and program administration. This input also assists management in setting appropriate goals and timelines.

Program Reporting

Several IR 16.1 Partners provide periodic reports to the Mission, most of which are not for public dissemination. For example, the Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES) reports to the Mission on a periodic basis in which it delineates progress achieved relating to the number and nature of working papers published, distinguished public lectures held, and conferences organized. Technical Assistance to Modernize Insurance Supervision (MEIS), in turn, submitted

⁷ In a recent audit concluded for the SME activities, data from institutions was found to be 99.5% accurate.

a report on project accomplishments (“Reforming the Insurance Markets in Egypt”) to USAID on February 2001. DATA submitted a Performance Monitoring Report which covered the 2002 calendar year as required by its SOW.⁸

IR 16.2

Program Management

All IR 16.2 Partners report that they utilize recommendations made through evaluations to re-orient future activities, clarify program goals, and improve program management. In comparing recommendations laid out in evaluations with an analysis of Partners’ current practices and activities, it is evident that the evaluations have been useful overall, and that many recommendations have been implemented. For example, following recommendations from the mid-term process assessment in May 2000, ExpoLink shifted its emphasis from client- to market-driven program planning—a significant programmatic change. ExpoLink management opines that this move towards improving market intelligence and focusing on market demand has contributed significantly to increasing the client base and enhancing firm-level results.

Partners have also effectively used feedback from stakeholders to identify unmet needs and design future programs. For example, in response to complaints by firms that they needed implementation support following up training in Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP), ALEB developed a pilot program that offered a greater level of post-training assistance to companies wishing to implement HACCP.

Program Reporting

All Partners report to USAID on a quarterly basis, with the exception of ALEB which reports every trimester. These reports are not for public dissemination.

IR 2 Partners also produce several other program reports for their clients such as ALEB’s “Market Intelligence Series: World Markets and Egypt Export Opportunities: Situation & Outlook”. In addition, the Horticultural Export Improvement Association (HEIA) produces semi-annual newsletters to their clients.

IR 16.3

Program Management

SEC, SEBDO, and CMD have all been highly responsive to recommendations made both in official external evaluations as well as feedback from the field. For the SME projects, the Partner indicated that management introduces new products in light of feedback from the field. For example, small-size loans with special group lending techniques were developed for women based on reports from financial intermediaries. In the case of CMD, a number of the “suggestions for future work” proposed in Management Systems International’s evaluation of

⁸ The report evaluates GOE performance compared with the IMF’s SDDS and SNA ’93 requirements and is based on a thorough review of deliverables and management activities as well as in-depth meetings with USAID and GOE counterparts. This is an internal report.

CMD were addressed and implemented. ICT management has also responded to internal evaluation findings, and have reoriented several activities accordingly.

Program Reporting

All IR 3 Partners report quarterly to USAID. In addition to this, MRR annual reports are prepared at the end of the fiscal year by the SME projects and submitted to USAID/Washington, while CMD also provides weekly reports to USAID/Egypt in addition to the required QPRs.

CHAPTER 3

M&E SYSTEMS ASSESSMENT

GENERAL FINDINGS

In the following two sections, key overall findings are highlighted, and conclusions are derived from the assessment.

1. Partners' M&E systems range from highly sophisticated to non-existent.

As Chapter 2 illustrated, some Partners have developed comprehensive, staffed, and separately funded M&E systems, while others have not implemented any formal system of information gathering and analysis. The lack of any formal M&E system is particularly noticeable in IR 1, in which no project has developed a regular system of collecting and analyzing data pertinent to tracking program activities and progress. These programs have also not identified activity-level performance indicators, which makes it difficult for staff to evaluate on-going activities. However, many of the activities do have PMP indicators, which are evaluated on an annual basis.

2. M&E systems are generally less successful at defining qualitative indicators.

While the majority of Partners, particularly in IR 2, have made considerable effort in defining quantitative indicators (such as number of people trained, volume exported, etc.), they have been less successful overall in identifying appropriate qualitative indicators.

3. Partners have generally not adequately evaluated activities focusing on capacity building and association strengthening.

“Capacity building” means different things to different organizations. For the purpose of this report, capacity building is defined as the development of an organization’s core skills and capabilities—such as leadership, management, finance, fundraising, and evaluation—in order to build the organization’s effectiveness and sustainability. It is the process of assisting an individual or group to identify and address issues and gain the insights, knowledge, and experience needed to solve problems and implement change. Capacity building is facilitated through the provision of technical support activities, including training, specific technical assistance, and resource networking.

While many Partners, particularly in IR 2, provide technical assistance in capacity building, they have generally found it difficult to adequately evaluate their impacts. An exception to this is AgLink, which has assessed impact on firm beneficiaries participating in training activities.

4. Information dissemination activities are not well tracked.

While a number of projects disseminate information to stakeholders and the wider community, they generally do not track the outcome of this activity. This is a challenging area to monitor, but it is important, as such information can lead to direct and measurable impact.

5. Several Partners have weak project designs and/or vague Scopes of Work (SOWs), which contribute to weak M&E systems.

A review of the work plans and SOWs of Partner activities indicates that several activities, particularly in IR 1, had weakly defined project designs that did not adequately specify objectives, outputs, and benchmarks. Strong program designs should include project targets (both overall and activity-specific), from which benchmarks and indicators can be defined.

6. Many Partners have not had external evaluations and/or impact assessments.

Particularly in IR 1, most activities have not been evaluated, nor has impact been assessed.⁹

7. Of the impact assessments undertaken, several did not optimize use of the information available.

This weakness is of note particularly in IR 2 programs. Future studies, for example, should consider examining the economic impact of: technology proposed to smallholders and firms calculating rates of return; technology diffusion rates; cost-benefit analyses of investment projects; and employment effects of program activities, among others.

8. Data quality

Partners in all three IRs have experienced difficulties in acquiring accurate and reliable data, particularly from Government agencies. Data quality has also been less reliable from client firms, who face incentives to misreport export and sales figures.

9. Baseline data

A number of projects, particularly in IRs 1 and 2, do not calculate baseline data. The lack of this information makes it difficult for management to gauge progress and make an accurate assessment of results.

10. Indicators measuring project impact are not always linked to USAID's strategic objectives.

In several projects, the impact of certain activities do not link with USAID's primary strategic objectives (i.e., increase in exports, job opportunities, and competitiveness).

CONCLUSIONS

Monitoring and evaluation activities are designed to measure achievements in relation to USAID policies, program objectives, and goals set for each activity. Monitoring and evaluations systems should be designed to provide an objective basis for assessing the performance of policies, programs, projects, and processes. M&E should further aim to improve programs by identifying and disseminating the lessons learned from experience and by making recommendations drawn from evaluation findings.

This study has aimed to provide an assessment and inventory of the status of SO 16 Partner monitoring and evaluation functions, plans, and systems. M&E systems have been analyzed individually, and findings presented by IR. Based on these findings, we have reviewed the strengths and weaknesses of the M&E systems in place

⁹ As stated in Chapter 2, however, four projects in IR 1 have been externally evaluated.

Due to the diversity of activities and goals of the Partners, it is not surprising that their M&E systems span the gamut from sophisticated, comprehensive systems to highly informal, ad hoc activities. Many activities face similar challenges in terms of defining appropriate indicators, measuring qualitative progress, and acquiring accurate and timely data. It is therefore essential that USAID and Partners collaborate in order to capitalize on lessons learned and brainstorm to develop solutions to shared difficulties.

Partners in IR 1 face a particular challenge, as the policy reform process is typically not easily quantified, tracked, or monitored. Not only are reform processes difficult to capture, but also the evolving environment in which they are being carried out makes the reforms themselves more elusive. Because all Partners in IR 1 (as well as some others in IRs 2 and 3) face this challenge, collaborative efforts are particularly useful. Monitoring the process of implementation of legislative reform is important to keeping implementation on track and can also yield insights on the effectiveness of the strategy used to prompt reform. Furthermore, information from a comprehensive monitoring system can promote useful discussion on the reform process among stakeholders, and is essential to reporting milestones on progress to USAID.

Partners in IR 2 generally face similar difficulties in acquiring exact primary data from client firms, and reliable secondary data from Government agencies. These Partners should work together to develop “talking points” and information campaigns aimed at encouraging full and frank cooperation from firms. Stakeholders’ reluctance to release data is often based on concerns that this data will be shared with the Government or competitors. These concerns can be assuaged through active discussion, and a clear description of how information is used, and to whom and in what format this data is released. In terms of secondary data reliability, several Partners have devised ways to account for discrepancies by cross-checking with outside sources, and by estimating standard errors in order to examine general trends in trade and exports over time. Other Partners can learn from these strategies.

Partners in IR 3 represent the most diverse grouping of projects, and the majority of their concerns are addressed in IRs 1 and 2. ICT and CMD both have key policy components, and therefore face the same challenges in monitoring and evaluation as those projects in IR 1. They also both have problems with secondary data validation, and can thus benefit from collaboration with some Partners in IR 2.

Overall, the best strategy for the Partners in all IRs is to identify key constraints, and work with others who are confronting similar challenges. It is through this process of discussion and exchange that creative and effective solutions develop, and that Partners’ M&E systems will improve.

CHAPTER 4

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING EXISTING SYSTEMS

The following section highlights key recommendations for improving Partners' M&E systems based on our findings and conclusions. Due to the diversity of programs and activities, every recommendation does not and cannot apply to every activity. These recommendations are intended to respond to larger trends and address problems faced by many programs, but usually not all of them. Activity-specific recommendations are delineated in Appendix I, M&E Inventory Forms, by IR and Partner.

1. Implement formal M&E systems where they do not exist

RRSA will support Partners to establish formal M&E plans which delineate functions to collect data and evaluate activities on a regular and on-going basis. This information is essential for program managers to understand how their programs are operating, who they are reaching, how, and with what impact. It is also necessary for reorienting activities and identifying unmet needs.

As stated previously in this Report, we do recognize the difficulties inherent in monitoring and evaluating policy-oriented activities. However, it is not impossible, and IR 1 Partners should collaborate in identifying effective ways to assess activities and outcomes. This includes *defining benchmarks or mileposts* to be met on a standard timetable in order to promote goal orientation and provide management with greater direction in program planning.

2. Develop qualitative indicators to measure program impact

While it is relatively straightforward to specify the numbers involved in or affected by the project, it is much more difficult to specify the effect that a project has on those involved and their opinions of this. While the Client Satisfaction Review attempts to answer these questions, it would be useful for Partners to make efforts to assess qualitative aspects of their work as well. Paying more attention to qualitative indicators should provide a more comprehensive and meaningful assessment of a program's effectiveness and impact.

Qualitative indicators are particularly important for IR 1 projects, as their activities in policy are often less amenable to quantitative indicators. One IR 1 project manager recommended that a survey be conducted of government officials and private sector stakeholders to assess perceptions of government efforts, intentions, and commitment to particular areas of public policy reform (such as trade, privatization, etc.).

3. Develop indicators that focus on the impacts of capacity building

Because association strengthening and capacity building encompass a significant proportion of several Partners' activities, it is important to collaborate with Partner managers to develop a set of indicators to evaluate impact. M&E staff as well as capacity building specialists should be actively involved in this process.

4. Devise indicators that measure the impacts of information dissemination

As with association strengthening, many Partners engage in information dissemination activities. While some activities account for the number of publications produced and/or disseminated, they have been less successful in measuring the impact of this information. M&E staff should work with those involved in information dissemination to develop indicators that capture impact.

5. Highlight and publicize lessons learned from successful M&E systems

A few of the SO 16 Partners have particularly strong M&E systems, and they can contribute useful information and set examples for other Partners with similar activities.

6. Conduct impact assessments and/or process evaluations

External assessments should be conducted for those projects that have not been evaluated. However, it is important to note that it is difficult to acquire meaningful information from very young projects. Generally, process evaluations are most effectively conducted after a period of a couple of years (such as the Mid-Term Assessments), while impact evaluations should potentially be conducted with an even greater time lag to capture benefits adequately.

7. Address issues of data quality

Project managers need to address concerns over data quality and availability. IR 1 managers reported that there is a lack of adequate and timely feedback from Ministries, while IR 2 managers stated that trade information from firms is generally not reliable. Staff should work to convince their partners and clients of the need for active cooperation in providing accurate and timely feedback through meetings and discussions. In the case of firm self-reporting, firms need to be fully informed of the necessity of their frank feedback and given clear information on where and how their data will be used.

8. Collect baseline data

Projects that do not currently collect baseline data should begin to do so for new activities/clients/firms. Without accurate and comprehensive baseline data, project impact cannot be adequately estimated.

9. Devise and implement information dissemination strategies

In order to create incentives for high quality performance, those programs that do not have established plans for reporting and disseminating evaluation findings should develop concrete timelines and strategies to do so. Information disseminated may include, among others, success stories, challenges confronted, lessons learned, and future target areas. The RRSA web page should contribute to this purpose.

ANNEX 1
M&E ASSESSMENT SUMMARY OF ON-GOING PROJECTS

IR-16.1, Policy Framework for Trade and Investment Improved

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Assistance for Trade Reform (ATR) [4/02-9/06]</p>	<p>1. Discussion with key project staff, Dr. Timothy Buehrer, Chief of Party and Dr. Sahar Tohamy, Senior Macro Economist.</p> <p>2. Informal questionnaire.</p> <p>3. Some limited materials made available by the mission.</p>	<p>1. Excellent work in developing rapport with the relevant Ministry of Foreign Trade (MOFT) staff.</p> <p>2. While the staff project has an excellent working relationship with the Central Department CD/WTO office, which provides it with a greater opportunity to affect policy reform, it also encourages the ministry to go further in formalizing the CD/WTO. A more formal structure would go a long way toward achieving key deliverables on a timely fashion.</p>	<p>1. There is a need for an assessment of effectiveness of trade reform, especially to seek feedback from policy makers on the future direction of the government and its perceptions on various elements and processes involved in trade, including WTO compliance.</p> <p>2. Public awareness is important for policy reform and organized effort using the existing media to educate the stakeholders, including the ministries and a broad range of companies and individuals who are directly involved in trade, would complement the project efforts.</p> <p>3. An evaluation of the project is essential by a third party specialized contractor that would provide technical assistance towards realigning the strategies and processes for the benefits of both the project staff and the cooperating ministries in the context of changing global and national economic conditions.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>DATA Access and Transmission Activity (DATA) 6/00 – 6/05</p>	<p>1. Discussions with the Chief of Party, Frank Szumilo;</p> <p>2. A completed questionnaire on the status of M&E functions;</p> <p>3. Review of the webpage: www.data-egypt.org</p>	<p>There is no dedicated staff for M&E functions, nor has the project earmarked resources for this purpose. However, the technical proposal, which now forms part of the DATA contract, states that DATA shall conduct M&E on a periodic basis.</p> <p>The technical assistance provided by the DATA project assists the Ministry of Planning in its efforts to develop and maintain a modern system of national accounts that is compliant with international standards established by the 1993 System of National Accounts (SNA'93). An external evaluation was conducted by an independent consultant in September, 2002 that concluded a material difference was evident in the quality of the macroeconomic statistics in Egypt over the past three years as a result of the DATA project. However, since the new National Income and Product Accounts and related data had not been released publicly until April of this year, the impact of the DATA activity on economic policy and decision-making has been limited.</p> <p>The project is also helping GOE in the preparation of a time-phased plan to meet the IMF Special Data Dissemination Standards (SDDS) and General Data Dissemination Standards (GDDS).</p> <p>The project staff prepared an impact evaluation report for the period from January-December 2002 with respect to the GOE performance p progress on Special Data Dissemination Standards (SDDS) of the IMF and the principles and procedures embodied in the SNA '93. That report assessed the degree that each task of the DATA activity had established and supported the infrastructure that is needed to ensure that data will be available for use in estimates of the national accounts.</p>	<p>Quality Assessment: The customer satisfaction survey should examine the users' perceptions with respect to data quality, relevance and timeliness and consider the impact of changes in these variables. The results of this survey will be assessed and determined as to what extent the data collected and disseminated meets the needs of its customers.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Corporate Tax Activity [7/99-7/04]</p>	<p>1. A discussion with the Chief of Party, Mr. Richard Clayton and his staff.</p> <p>2. Review of an informal questionnaire.</p> <p>3. Reports developed by Barents Group, LLC (December 1998) and a comprehensive tax reform program for Egypt (June 2000) and other related materials made available by Mr. Clayton and the CTO, Ms. Iman El Shayeb.</p>	<p>1. The joint working relationship established by the project with its partners and the inter-department working relationship between Income Tax and Sales Tax Departments are noteworthy.</p> <p>2. Contributes significantly towards strengthening the tax policy; One of the tests of a good tax policy is the introduction of efficiency and equity into the laws. This is partially reflected in the percent increase of tax filers and taxes paid. The recent data indicate a positive trend and 80 percent of tax liability has been paid on time by sector and size of the tax liability in 2002.</p>	<p>1. There is a lack of adequate and timely feedback from the ministry. There is a need to go an extra-mile in convincing the need for the policy makers' active cooperation modernizing the tax activity in an expeditious manner.</p> <p>2. The tax research department has to focus more on the tax forecasting work under various economic assumptions and scenario so that the policy makers can continuously review the tax policy and make changes to make the tax policy fiscally responsible and economically equitable with respect to individual tax payers and businesses.</p> <p>3. The USAID must share the evaluation report with the contractor so that it can review the results and incorporate the valid recommendation for improvement of the processes and management of the project.</p> <p>4. The project must take a pro-active role in encouraging the tax advocacy groups for their input, which would be useful in initiating new policies on tax and revenue.</p> <p>5. Expanded education on taxpayers, both individuals and businesses will be important as it relates to the philosophy of taxation and how is the tax revenue invested toward public good.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>The Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES) [9/93-9/03]</p>	<p>1. An external evaluation of the ECES was carried out by SRI International in May 1998. 2. A discussion session with the Executive Director, Dr. Ahmed Galal and Ms. Amal Refaat, Economist in ECES based on a prepared questionnaire. 3. Limited number of documents that were made available by the Center in addition to the review of sample publications.</p>	<p>1. Introduced policies that support the Egyptian economic stabilization and structural adjustment. 2. Succeeded in shaping views in economic issues, especially in the areas of privatization and trade policy. Public awareness has also been increased in Build-Operate-Transfer BOT, banking law reform, free zones, IPR and anti-trust reform. 3. The Center has a good package of publication and dissemination activities, 4. The center has achieved public outreach to a considerable degree.</p>	<p>1. A formal M& E function should be established within the Center. Self-evaluation can be part of a future plan for the proposed activities of the Center, 2. The Center website can include simple survey instrument to continuously seek public and specialists' opinion regarding the disseminated activities of the Center, 3. There must be an ongoing evaluation of the products and their effectiveness in order to assess the extent to which the needs of the consumers have been met and to what extent the products have helped shape the policy formulation and decision both the public and private sectors 4. More concentration is recommended on applied economic research pertaining to policy issues affecting industries and sectors as noted by SRI Int'l</p>
<p>Modernizing Egyptian Insurance Supervision (MEIS) [12/01-3/03]</p>	<p>1. Discussion with the Chief of Party, Mr. Thomas Power and his staff in addition to some documents provided by him, 2. Copies of the latest quarterly progress reports from Ingi Lotfy, the CTO at the Mission.</p>	<p>1. Significant progress has been achieved as a result of the technical assistance provided by the project. This is seen in the growth of more insurance companies, health insurance, using the principles of managed health care, removal of barriers to price competition, facilitating a consumer friendly life insurance policy for fulfilling that condition of the mortgage loan under the new mortgage law, and the introduction of ombudsman mechanism in claim disputes. 2. Best practice approaches have been used in determining the gaps in insurance policy needs and followed through with needed administrative and policy changes. 3. The project developed good working relations with the counterpart and introduced electronic reporting. 4. Capacity building efforts have been undertaken with respect to training the staff of EISA and introducing information technology.</p>	<p>It could be useful to maintain a comprehensive database to track the programs in insurance coverage by type of insurance and sector. It would be potential indicator for gauging the penetration of insurance coverage on life, property, health, etc.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Privatization & Commercialization [7/00-8/05]</p>	<p>1. A series of discussion with the project staff, including its Chief of Party, Mr. Richard Moss and some additional information collected through an informal questionnaire with the project staff.</p> <p>2. A semi-annual review made by The International Business and Technical Consultants (IBTC) under a USAID evaluation services contract for the period covering July through December 1998,</p> <p>3. The Quarterly Review of Privatization in Egypt by IBM Business Consulting Services.</p>	<p>1. The project staff has established an excellent working relationships with the Ministry of Privatization.</p> <p>2. Focus group meetings and workshops are held on a periodic basis to promote public awareness.</p>	<p>1. The processes leading to the completion of the transactions are slow and could be accelerated if the Ministry's office expedites the privatization exercises.</p> <p>2. The growth of the private sector is still limited. As long as a large number of Law 203 companies are under government ownership, inefficiencies in management and poor allocation of public scarce resources will continue to be a barrier to promoting competition and efficiency.</p>
<p>Technical Assistance for Intellectual Property Rights in Egypt (TIPRE) [9/01-3/03]</p>	<p>1. A discussion with the Chief of Party, Ms. Jaleen Moroney.</p> <p>2. The SIPER Project Final Report prepared by Nathan Associates.</p> <p>3. A reference book, entitled <i>Intellectual Property - Principles and Practice</i>, written by Judy Goans, et al and edited by Ms. Moroney</p>	<p>1. Excellent job in drafting appropriate laws in SIPRE and in following their passages through the assembly process</p> <p>2. Good rapport with the relevant ministries were developed and major tasks were achieved</p> <p>3. Training and public awareness have been accomplished as much as resources allowed under the contract.</p>	<p>1. There is a need for an external evaluation of the project, particularly relating to processes to be followed that would help the program planning and administration,</p> <p>2. Some initial effectiveness analysis of the laws can be conducted in consultation with stakeholders as to the working of the laws and identification of any sore spots in the implementation stage,</p> <p>3. Consumer satisfaction survey of businesses and public institutions should be conducted to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the laws and seek their feedback for future reform</p> <p>4. There could be better support from and coordination among ministries in initiating and implementing IPR laws.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Development Support (DSPU) Program Unit [10/00-9/03]</p>	<p>An answered questionnaire by Ahmed ELAdawy, Dr.DSPU Executive Director, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The unit has accomplished its tasks well having being involved in monitoring the economic reform indicators since the implementation of SPR in 1994. 2. The unit keeps all the records and data bank detailing the interaction with the implementing agencies and the record that can be retrieved at any time. 3. In addition, the DSPU has included the provision of the following courses in its work plan in order to enhance its M&E capabilities: negotiation and Interaction skills, project management, mastering the quantitative techniques used to evaluate the indicators 	<p>An external evaluation at least once every three years is recommended.</p>
<p>Agricultural Trade Enhancement Project (ATEP) (Under Participating Agency Service Agreement (PASA) with the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) [10/00-9/03]</p>	<p>ATEP Scope of Work</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The USDA has taken steps to rebuild a new facility to meet the growing demand for microbiology sample testing and prompt reporting the results. 2. Even though there was some staffing problem, which delayed the completion of the tasks, the USDA/FAS was able to enter into support agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Like other USAID activities under SO.16, the project should have been open for private contractors to participate in the bidding, barring any policy or procedural requirement. 2. There is a need for surveying the stakeholders of this project to know their perception and obtain their feedback, which could be used in management decision 3. Some relevant questions pertaining to the indicators of the project should be included in the customer satisfaction survey to understand the perception of the customers of PASA project.

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Technical Assistance for Policy Reform (TAPR) [10/97-9/03]</p>	<p>1. A discussion and completed informal questionnaire by James Norris, Chief of Party for Chemonics International, Inc.</p> <p>2. Limited documents made available by the Mission.</p> <p>3. The draft copy of Final Report on DSP I Monitoring and Verification, shared by Jim Norris.</p> <p>4. A report by Mr. Richard Wellons for Chemonics International, Inc. who conducted an activity evaluation of Economic Policy Initiative Consortium (EPIC).</p>	<p>1. The project has accomplished its tasks well, having undertaken substantial amount of verification function in order to effect the disbursements.</p> <p>2. While there is no dedicated M&E staff, the management of the project has been very responsive to the needs of various policy initiatives emanating from the Mission and the Government.</p> <p>3. The technical assistance provided to USAID and GOE ministries, as specified in the Scope of Work, is sound.</p>	<p>1. It would be useful to have an external evaluation of the activity to examine the activities against the tasks and make recommendation for improving the verification process,</p> <p>2. The project can undertake an assessment of effectiveness of its technical assistance and other analytical support provided to the Mission and its partners.</p>

IR-16.2, Private Sector Competitiveness Increased

Name and Duration of Project	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>The Agribusiness Linkages Project (AgLink). [12/96- 9/03].</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2000 external mid-term evaluation report. 2. Questionnaire sent to AgLink. 3. Discussions with Senior M&E Specialist: Gebril Osman. 	<p>AgLink has established a formal M&E unit with full-time dedicated staff members.</p> <p>AgLink uses primary and secondary data to evaluate activities. Primary data, considered highly reliable, is collected through monthly surveys from participating farms and firms by field officers. Recommendations to participating farms and firms are well documented, and achievement indicators defined allow management to capture progress achieved. The data set are furthermore randomly evaluated by HQ, and suspect data are returned to the field for validation.</p> <p>AgLink also has baseline information which includes general household information as well as livestock data. Data are disaggregated by each firm and/or farm client.</p> <p>The reporting system is furthermore oriented toward client needs, with a large percentage of their technical information published in Arabic.</p> <p>AgLink reports quarterly to USAID, and an external mid-term process evaluation was conducted 2/00. Internal evaluations and impact assessment surveys are performed periodically.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact assessment studies do not optimize the use of the information available. More in-depth economic impact analyses of the technology proposed to smallholders and firms calculating rates of return should be undertaken. 2. AgLink should emphasize the development of indicators at the program level that show the contribution of the different services to SO16 and its sub IRs 3. AgLink should work to implement the database management system already designed.

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Agricultural Led Export Businesses (ALEB) [1/01- 12/04].</p>	<p>1. 2001 External mid-term Evaluation Report.</p> <p>2. Questionnaire sent to ALEB.</p> <p>3. Discussions with ALEB's COP: Peter Thatcher and Senior M&E Specialist: Alexandra Harrison.</p>	<p>ALEB has a formal M&E unit with full-time dedicated staff and a separate evaluation budget.</p> <p>A mid-term external process evaluation was conducted 5/01. Findings of evaluations are shared with staff, consultants, and USAID through reports on specific programs and through ALEB's trimester progress reports.</p> <p>ALEB collects annual primary data from clients through questionnaires. Data quality is considered relatively reliable from larger firms, but less-so from small firms. Data are especially reliable concerning advocacy, training, and linkages with industry support services. ALEB has developed new target milestones that track impact on clients and industry. The shift in emphasis from product to demand driven focus has contributed to the evolution of these indicators. Firm-level data on new fixed capital expenditures and changes in direct manufacturing costs are collected by ALEB. These data more accurately reflect program impact (compared with the number of firms trained, for example).</p> <p>Primary data also come from the TQM survey (monitoring clients; quality control systems) and PEP (unit cost data).</p> <p>Secondary data elements are validated by contrasting different sources; for example CAPMAS with Eurostat.</p> <p>ALEB uses feedback from firms to identify future training programs and types of TA needed.</p>	<p>1. More formal impact assessment studies of the technical assistance services provided to their clients should be done annually</p> <p>2. Data quality of the value of processed food exports (and aggregate value of clustered exports) is considered average, due to problems in firm self-reporting, particularly that of smaller firms. Participating smaller firms often do not report the precise volume of traded products because of the perception that the information provided could be used by competitors or the government. ALEB should work with those small firms to develop their level of awareness regarding the necessity of having reliable information.</p> <p>3. Baseline data: ALEB should collect baseline data from new participating firms. ALEB should also work to identify a way to derive baseline data from old clients, if possible.</p> <p>4. ALEB should collaborate with other USAID partners to gather lessons learned on how to minimize data inconsistencies due to miscoding problems and data acquisition time lags.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Agricultural Reform Project (AgReform) [8/99- 8/04].</p>	<p>1. 1998 External mid-term Evaluation Report.</p> <p>2. 2002 external Evaluation.</p> <p>3. Questionnaire sent to AgReform.</p> <p>4. Discussions with AgReform project Manager: Samir Sedky and M&E Coordinator: Khaled Mahmoud.</p>	<p>An external mid-term process evaluation was performed 10/98, and an external evaluation (for extension request) in 4/02.</p> <p>AgReform's M&E is based on a bottom-up participatory framework that encourages staff, farmer beneficiaries, and the research community to work as partners. The PM&E depends on farmers' participation in the definition and selection of indicators. Traditional M&E relies on project definitions of indicators.</p> <p>Field offices collect data (either quarterly or based on the cropping season) from members using questionnaires, narratives, tables, diagrams, and pictures. They also rely periodically on focus group discussions and community interviews. Data quality is considered good overall, particularly from farmers with contracts with exporters. Baseline data is available only for these (exporting) farmers.</p> <p>AgReform has developed milestone indicators to measure progress throughout the year and reports on its activities on a quarterly basis. The Program measures the volume of horticultural products exported, and has designed field-level indicators determining the project's impact on farmer income.</p> <p>AgReform conducts training impact workshops with board members. Indicators measuring the quality and the usefulness of training programs provided to government extension workers are in place.</p> <p>The introduction of the Participatory M&E approach into the M&E system has given the project the possibility to commission research-based impact studies to replace prior assessment methods.</p> <p>AgReform conducts a system of post-link follow-up consisting of a single visit and meeting of linked participants once a month.</p> <p>AgReform reports to USAID quarterly.</p>	<p>1. AgReform should highlight what its milestone indicators are and how they are contributing to the overall SO 16 results framework.</p> <p>2. Linkages between the project's achievement indicators and the sub IR of SO 16 should be stressed.</p> <p>3. More in depth quantitative impact assessment analyses should be done, given the quantity and the quality of data collected on participating firms. Potential studies could include technology diffusion rates and employment effects of the project.</p> <p>4. Now that data entry personnel are hired for each field office, the project should design and implement a Database Management System (DMS) for data processing needs.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Egyptian Exporter Associations (EEA / ExpoLink). [5/02- 12/04].</p>	<p>1. 2000 External mid-term Evaluation Report.</p> <p>2. Questionnaire sent to ExpoLink.</p> <p>3. Discussions with ExpoLink Export Services Manager: Sherif Mowafy.</p>	<p>ExpoLink has a decentralized, not fully dedicated M&E system using 10 persons each devoting approximately 10% of his or her time to this function.</p> <p>ExpoLink's M&E system is centered on its MIS. Information regarding clients and categories of products are managed with the Oracle Database Management System (DMS), which will be operational in the near future.</p> <p>ExpoLink tracks progress of participating firms by conducting internal ex-post periodic evaluations (formal surveys and interviews of members).</p> <p>Primary data is collected semi-annually through mail surveys (reliability low). ExpoLink attempts to validate data by conducting consistency checks between client data and secondary data.</p> <p>ExpoLink has identified milestone indicators that clarify their contribution to the results framework of SO16.</p> <p>The Program reports to USAID quarterly.</p> <p>An external mid-term process assessment of the project was performed as required by ExpoLink's scope of work in 5/00.</p>	<p>1. ExpoLink should consider the possibilities of having a fully dedicated M&E system, given the volume of their clients, the number of products that are monitored, and the potential for expanding exports for all the participating firms.</p> <p>2. ExpoLink should undertake more in-depth economic impact analyses of the export promotion projects firms using Cost-Benefit methodologies.</p> <p>3. The lack of baseline data for participating firms has been an obstacle to tracking firm progress and establishing an effective monitoring and evaluation system. Baseline data should be collected from new participating firms and, whenever possible, baseline strategies should be identified for old clients.</p> <p>4. The project should put more effort in improving the reliability of the primary data collected from the participating firms. This will involve working with those smaller firms to gain their trust.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Horticultural Export Improvement Association (HEIA). [12/98- 9/03].</p>	<p>1. 1999 External mid-term Evaluation Report.</p> <p>2. Questionnaire sent to HEIA.</p> <p>3. Discussions with HEIA's Executive and Deputy Directors: Hani El Kolaly, Wael Rafea and Quality Control Manager: Tarek Sheta.</p>	<p>In 2002, HEIA set up a quality control department that will be coordinating the organization's M&E functions. There is, however, no formal M&E unit. Rather, several departments contribute to the M&E system.</p> <p>HEIA collects both primary and secondary data according to their needs. Primary data is collected from members (reliability low to satisfactory). Evaluation of members' activities are annually performed using questionnaires in order to measure: degree of member satisfaction; extent to which HEIA's services requested by members; need for developing new services. Primary data is also collected through informal surveys and direct feedback. HEIA relies on secondary data published by CAPMAS and Eurostat HEIA crosschecks data for validation purposes.</p> <p>A Management Information System is being developed, but is not yet operational.</p> <p>HEIA provides quarterly reports to USAID.</p> <p>While no direct external evaluation or impact assessment has been conducted (it was not required in the SOW), HEIA was indirectly evaluated under the ATUT/RONCO project in 2002.</p> <p>Recommendations made by members are incorporated into management decisions and planning processes.</p>	<p>1. HEIA should accelerate the effectiveness of the M&E unit by implementing the Management Information System, which has been designed already.</p> <p>2. Dissemination of evaluation and assessment results should be fully incorporated into the internal reporting system.</p> <p>3. In the area of database design and implementation, HEIA needs to develop clients and suppliers databases.</p> <p>4. There is no baseline data for members, which make evaluation and assessment tasks more complex. HEIA should establish baselines for new participating firms and reconstruct baselines for firms who have already joined the association.</p> <p>5. Improve the reliability of the primary data collected from the participating firms by adopting data validation strategies.</p> <p>6. HEIA collects information primarily on inputs (such as number of people trained) rather than on results of the training. HEIA should work to incorporate indicators that will be more illustrative of its impact on members.</p>

IR-16.3, Opportunities for Business Growth Enhanced

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Small Enterprise Credit (9/91- 9/05) and Small & Emerging Business (9/97- 9/05)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarterly Progress Report, July-Sept. 2002 2. Quarterly Progress Report, Aug.-Oct. 2002 3. Micro-enterprise Reporting Requirements (MRR) 4. Impact Assessment: 'Old Clients' Study' 5. Impact Assessment: 'New Clients' Baseline Study' 6. Impact Tracking Study for Bashaer El Kheir Program (Poverty Lending) 7. Financial Audit (a sample report for one of the foundations was reviewed) 8. Interviews: -Mr. Rizkallh El Zayyat and Mr. Magdy Khalil, USAID Team Leader and CTO -Mr. Bill Tucker, COP -Ms Neemat Genena, 	<p>Monitoring relies on worldwide uniform reporting requirements for micro-enterprises (MRRs) annually done for each implementing foundation. MRR data is collected monthly from the various foundations that act as financial intermediaries for the program. The MRR is based on a specialized MIS used as a Loan Tracking system (LTS) installed in each foundation for its monthly reporting to the project. In each of the foundations, the LTS is installed containing a uniform system for loan tracking, and the staff members in concern acquire the necessary training to use the system. The LTS has gained a highly favorable reputation in the micro-credit community in Egypt, and has been purchased by some donors for the micro-credit NGOs that they fund.</p> <p>The Impact Tracking System (ITS) relies primarily on information obtained directly from borrowers through field interviews.</p> <p>Data quality is excellent as judged by auditors (found to be</p>	<p>In the follow-up study, it is preferable if evaluators attempt to select a control group who did not participate in any micro-lending program (i.e. not only non-participants in the program under study). In this way the study would isolate the effects of the SME program specifically without the distorting effects of other programs.</p> <p>It is advisable that the next impact study considers including a sample of 'inactive' or 'former borrowers'. While data as of end Sept. 2002 indicate a total number of active clients of 121,682, the cumulative # clients i.e. both active and inactive (or present and past) borrowers was 281,186. Interviewing only present borrowers may lead to a sample selection bias wherein only those most successful remained in the program. Interviewing a sample of inactive borrowers would provide information concerning reasons for dropping out of the program; both for those who voluntarily left and those who were unable to continue regular repayment of loan installments.</p> <p>In Bashaer El Kheir study, the control group was selected prior to loan approval. In future studies, it may help if evaluators consider selecting controls after loan approval. This will ensure that controls are more comparable to treatment groups in terms of similar creditworthiness.</p> <p>It may be useful in future impact studies if control and treatment groups are selected from different neighborhoods (with similar socioeconomic characteristics). In the Bashaer El Kheir study, control individuals were selected from the same neighborhoods as the treatment individuals. However, enterprises in the same neighborhood may be negatively affected as they experience a more limited ability to compete compared with their lending counterparts who may be taking away their market share.</p> <p>The New Clients Baseline Study's survey was during Oct. 2001 to Feb. 2002, while the survey for the follow-up study starts in March 2003.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Small Enterprise Credit</p> <p>and</p> <p>Small & Emerging Business</p>	<p>Socio-Economic Research Director</p> <p>-Ms. Lamia Bulbul, Socio-Economic Research Dept. Consultant</p>	<p>99.5% accurate as advised by partners).</p> <p>Management responsiveness: Management introduces new products in light of feedback from the field e.g. small loans were introduced to cater for women needs, with special group-lending techniques.</p> <p>Comprehensive QPRs and Impact studies are prepared. MRR annual reports are prepared by the USAID-CTO at the end of the fiscal year and reported to USAID Washington.</p>	<p>The project could in future consider extending the time between baseline and follow-up studies (to greater measure long-term impact and reduce costs).</p> <p>In order to assess employment creation, future studies could consider acquiring information about the status of the new employees at the time they joined the enterprise: employed, unemployed, employed but at lower wage or benefits than present job, etc. Otherwise it could simply be a shift of employment from some enterprises to the borrower-group of enterprises with no net employment increase in the economy as a whole.</p> <p>In order to account for temporary/seasonal jobs, evaluators may consider exploring ways to incorporate a weighting system (1/3 or 1/4, for example) to measure non-permanent employment. This would provide a more robust measure of full-time employment equivalents.</p> <p>It is also recommended that future studies incorporate a section on the relevance of study findings to program management.</p> <p>In previous reports, a couple of foundations (Sharkeya and Aswan) had relatively poor rates of loan repayment and sustainability ratios. Future reports could give a briefing on reasons for poor performance and the corrective action pursued, if any.</p>

Name and Duration of Projects	Sources of Information	Strengths/Status of M&E System	Areas Requiring Additional Focus; Recommendations
<p>Capital Market Development (8/98- 9/03)</p>	<p>1. Quarterly Progress Report, 2002 third quarter</p> <p>2. Quarterly Progress Report, 2002 fourth quarter</p> <p>3. External Evaluation</p> <p>4. Interviews: -Mr. Jun Labadan, Deputy COP -Mr. Kevin Haupt, Executive Officer - Ms. Mona Kaldas, CTO</p>	<p>The Communications Coordinator oversees all M&E functions, internally, assisted by one officer.</p> <p>Activities are tracked on a weekly basis. A work plan tracker is utilized by all staff and updated through weekly staff meetings.</p> <p>A final evaluation of the project was conducted by an external contractor in 6/02, and referred to excellent contributions by the project.</p> <p>CMD provides weekly reports and QPRs to USAID.</p>	<p>The partners have suggested that a feasible measurement of CMD's impact could be carried out through a survey of a number of local as well as international investment institutions enquiring about their perception of the developments in the investment environment in Egypt insofar as capital markets are concerned. This sort of survey could be repeated for a number of years in the post-project period.</p>
<p>Information and Communications Technology (2/02- 2/06)</p>	<p>1. Quarterly Progress Report of Dec. 2002 to Feb. 2003</p> <p>2. Extract from the "M&E System Report" on the 'Result-level' M&E</p> <p>3. Interviews: -Mr. Hossam El Sherif, Automation Advisor and M&E Officer in charge -Mr. Mahmoud Refky, Automation Expert - Ms. Mona Kaldas, CTO</p>	<p>The project developed an M&E system in Dec. 2002 that allows for tracking work progress at both the result level and the activity level. It is currently used in producing the QPRs, in an improved format. Performance indicators were developed for a number of results. Both quantitative and qualitative data is collected (e.g. transparent and fair regulations, strengthening of the ministry and compliance with WTO, implementation of e-commerce, implementation of pilot projects, change in number ICT start-up companies, finance to ICT, number of companies for assessment and gap analysis, number of assessors, number of companies certified to international standards, etc)</p>	<p>The QPR states, under the performance M&E system, that the task activities require better indicators for ICT success stories. This, according to the QPR, will be addressed in the next quarter. (We also note here that with regard to PMP indicator, USAID advised that they will be formulating a new indicator (s) in coordination with the Partner.</p> <p>As regards data validation problems, the Partner suggests to have a third party hired by USAID to conduct a field survey addressing the various areas of achievements under the different tasks e.g. actual number of licensed ICT-firms, actual number and quality of trained and qualified professional IT staff in the Telecommunications Regulatory Authority (TRA), actual number of companies certified for CMM, etc.</p> <p>In view of the multitude of tasks and activities in the QPR, it may be useful to have a timeline chart for at least one year ahead. Reasons for postponement (if any) of specific activities for later quarters could thus be summarized at the end of each quarter.</p>

ANNEX 2

M & E INVENTORY FORMS

IR-16.1, Policy Framework for Trade and Investment Improved

Assistance for Trade Reform (ATR) , Nathan Associates, Inc.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no M&E System currently in place, and no assessment of the effectiveness of trade reform has been conducted.
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no staff dedicated to M&E functions specifically nor is the function stipulated in the original statement of work. However, Nathan Associates engages in periodic oversight of project activity to ensure that project goals are being met. Nathan's home office is involved in the evaluation of project performance on a periodic basis.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	n/a
4) Use of performance data	n/a
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	The project staff uses the internal evaluation results for program planning and administration of the project to ensure that the objectives and tasks are met on a timely basis. This is reflected in periodic reports to the Mission
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	The internal evaluation reports are not disseminated nor are they shared with the Mission
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The lack of an M&E system makes it challenging for program management to adequately measure the progress of activities and their consequent impact.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<p><u>Impact:</u> An assessment of the effectiveness of trade reform is needed. This assessment should incorporate feedback from policy makers on the future direction of trade policy and WTO compliance.</p> <p><u>External Evaluation:</u> An external evaluation of the project should be conducted. This evaluation should provide technical assistance in realigning the strategies and processes of ATR, for the benefit of the project staff and the cooperating ministries in the context of changing economic conditions.</p>

Corporate Tax Activity, Barents Group

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no formal M&E System currently in place (the SOW does not require one).
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no staff dedicated to M&E functions specifically.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	An evaluation was conducted in 2001
4) Use of performance data	The project does have general performance standards against which the contractor is evaluated. These include technical competence and client satisfaction. There are also specific performance standards relating to measures to be enacted in the Corporate Tax Law and Administration, the General Tax, and Individual Income Tax.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	n/a
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	n/a
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The lack of a formal M&E system makes it difficult for program management to adequately measure the progress of activities and their consequent impact.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Corporate Tax Project’s managers may evince additional efforts to seek an active cooperation in providing accurate and timely feedback through meetings and discussions. • The USAID must share the evaluation report with the contractor so that it can review the results and incorporate the valid recommendation for improvement of the process and conduct of the program. • Enhanced efforts need to be focused on the area of tax research, including revenue forecasting and distribution effects of changing tax rates, using equity and efficiency as guiding forces. • The project may also encourage the formation of tax advocacy group(s), and its input would be helpful in initiating new policies on tax and revenue.

Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES)

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no M&E System currently in place, and no impact evaluation has been conducted.
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no formal for M&E unit.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	<p>The M&E system of ECES is limited mainly to reporting its activities. As noted by SRI international, this is due in part to the nature of the mission and goals, in that the impact of policy research and advocacy is inherently difficult to measure. ECES frequently conducts informal internal evaluations to ensure that the goals and objectives are being met and that deliverables are completed on a timely basis. The Center also maintains a website and its use is evaluated monthly. ECES reports to the Mission on a periodic basis on the progress achieved on its activities regarding the number and nature of working papers, books, policy analysis, distinguished public lectures (DLS) and conferences organized.</p> <p>An external evaluation was conducted in May 1998 by SRI international</p>
4) Use of performance data	There is a lack of performance indicators that can adequately measure impacts in this area. Currently, ECES's accomplishments are compared with the planned tasks.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	n/a
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	n/a
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The lack of a formal M&E system makes it challenging for program management to adequately measure the progress of activities and their consequent impact. However, the quality of ECES activities is difficult to assess.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
<p>8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>M&E System</u>: ECES should establish a formal M&E activity within the Center. This system should attempt to assess the extent to which ECES activities have helped in shaping policy formulation and decision-making. 2. The Center website can include simple survey to seek public and specialists' opinion on the disseminated activities of the Center. 3. <u>Performance indicators</u>: ECES does not have any performance indicators, which makes it difficult for staff to monitor on-going activities. ECES should consider developing benchmarks to be met with a standard timetable in order to promote goal-oriented activities and provide management with greater direction in program planning. 4. <u>Client Satisfaction</u>: The customer satisfaction survey should include questions to gauge the perceptions of consumers of ECES services concerning ECES' effectiveness in influencing public policy and decision-making. These questions should also aim to identify potential areas for future research, assisting the Center to direct its resources and focus its activities.

Modernizing Egyptian Insurance Supervision (MEIS), Barents Group

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no formal M&E System currently in place nor is it part of the SOW, but it does contain performance standards against which the contractor is evaluated.
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There are no staff dedicated to M&E functions specifically nor has it budget included for this purpose. However, the COP conducts his own internal evaluation of the project as to complying with the quality checks of the process and outcome.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	While no formal M&E activity takes place, the Managing Director of Barents Group does review progress against the task order. In addition, the project utilizes various generally accepted insurance and pension methodologies for assessing best practices: Core Principles of Insurance Supervision established by the International Association of Insurance Commissioners, Generally Accepted Actuarial Standards of the Society of Actuaries, and Statement of Principles of the International Network for Pension Regulators and Supervisors. The project also provides periodic reports highlighting the progress to the Mission.
4) Use of performance data	n/a
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	n/a
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	The Partner provides periodic reports highlighting progress to the Mission (none for public dissemination).
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The lack of a formal M&E system makes it challenging for program management to adequately measure the progress of activities and their consequent impact.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	It could be useful to maintain a comprehensive database to track the programs in insurance coverage by type of insurance and sector. It would be a potential indicator for gauging the penetration of insurance coverage on life, property, health, etc.

Privatization and Commercialization, IBM

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	M&E is part of IBM's scope of work. IBM does its own evaluation every three months (Four times per annum).
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no staff dedicated to M&E functions specifically. However, internal M&E functions are carried out by the project staff
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	An internal evaluation every three months
4) Use of performance data	There are two PMP indicators: the value of sale proceeds from privatized Law 203 companies and the cumulative number of qualified joint venture companies and banks divested. The first one is a valid indicator, which can be tracked. The second one is problematic in the sense that they function under the private company laws, which operate with more independence from government line authority. Moreover, the government often invest in joint venture companies, owing anywhere between 5% and majority shares in some cases and at the same time sell some of its equity to buy shares in other joint-venture companies. In this sense, government's participation in joint-venture companies will have limited impact on the partnership for competitiveness. Hence this indicator is not relevant.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	The results of the internal evaluation are used in planning and program implementation. IBM report to the USAID of the evaluation recommendations and conclusions.
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	IBM reports for the use of its website for public dissemination.
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	To some extent, there is a free and easy access for the relevant data from MOFT website and IBM also subscribes to CAPMAS database. It is not easy to access data from other sources. Data are not always very reliable and it may take three to five weeks to get data.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<u>Impact Assessment</u> : There is a need to monitor privatized enterprises by tracking progress in several key areas, such as financial sustainability, operational effectiveness, capital investment, and job creation. These issues should be addressed in the up-coming Socio-Economic Impact Assessment. <u>Public Perception</u> : In assessing the socio-impact analysis of SO 16 program, some specific questions should be addressed in the area of public awareness and the pros and cons of privatization. In the Customer Satisfaction Survey, questions should be included to gauge the perception of the business community of privatization policy issues. Information should also be gathered to measure the general awareness of the privatization campaign. This will assist program management in measuring the effectiveness of its activities and focusing future efforts.

Technical Assistance for Intellectual Property Rights in Egypt (TIPRE), Nathan Associates, Inc.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no M&E System currently in place, and no impact evaluation has been conducted.
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no staff dedicated to M&E functions specifically.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	Informally the Partner does collect information on evaluating process. TAIPR maintains data regarding its responsiveness to the USAID and GOE officials, ability to assemble effective expertise and providing good quality technical assistance, and ability to deliver well targeted training, based on the execution of the work plan. It maintains the number of people trained (including lawyers and journalists). TAIPR also measures the extent of public awareness of IPR by compiling editorials and newspaper articles from the Egyptian media.
4) Use of performance data	<p>The project activities are mainly related to providing technical assistance in drafting appropriate laws and decrees, public awareness, and training.</p> <p>Legal: This is mainly related to collecting copies of draft laws and regulations and evaluating them for Trade Related Intellectual Properties (TRIPS) consistency and their ability to promote private sector growth. In this regard, TIPRE collected copies of all drafts that were made public and submitted each for legal analysis by its experts. These results were used in determining work to be undertaken by the project.</p> <p>Public awareness: TIPRE has collected newspaper clippings, editorials and news articles from the news media. This is useful to measure the degree of public awareness of the intellectual property rights.</p> <p>Training: The project maintains data on number of people trained, including lawyers and journalists.</p>
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	n/a
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	n/a
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The lack of a formal M&E system makes it challenging for program management to adequately measure the progress of activities and their consequent impact.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<p><u>External Assessment</u>: An external evaluation of the project should be conducted, particularly relating to processes followed that would help the program planning and administration,</p> <p><u>M&E of IRP implementation</u>: While some lag time may be necessary in order to gauge the full effectiveness of the IPR legal framework, a preliminary analysis can be conducted. This analysis should focus on progress (and problems) in the IPR law implementation process</p> <p><u>Customer feedback</u>: Consumer satisfaction survey of businesses and public institutions should be conducted to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the laws and seek their feedback for future improvements</p>

Technical Assistance for Policy Reform (TAPR), Chemonics International Inc.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no M&E System currently in place, and there is no dedicated M&E staff. Furthermore, no impact evaluation has been conducted. While the scope of the project permits it to undertake an economic impact study of the policy reforms, such a study has not been pursued because it was not included as part of the tasks or deliverables.
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no dedicated M&E staff.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	n/a
4) Use of performance data	TAPR relies on data gathered by the Sector Policy Program (SPP) projects and other secondary data produced by CAPMAS and appropriate ministries for TA needs assessments, providing recommendations to the GOE to inform the policy agenda, tracking and verifying the progress of each policy, and carrying out the disbursement function.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	The management of the project has been very responsive to the needs of various policy initiatives emanating from the Mission and the government. While no formal evaluation on TAPR was conducted, it is difficult to say, however, if it would have made any significant change in program planning and administration of the project if there was such an evaluation. However, the informal assessment by the Mission (EG/SPP Division) of the DSP II in general and TAPR in particular, led to the modification of the scope of work of the project in terms of objectives and indicators for FY 2002 and 2003
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	n/a
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The project has accomplished its tasks well, having undertaken substantial amount of verification function in order to effect the disbursements. Though there is no M&E staff, the project management has been very responsive to the needs of various policy initiatives emanating from the mission and the government.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	There are no activity-level indicators or deliverables established for the project. An external evaluation would be useful to examine the program activities against tasks and make recommendations for further improvement of the verification process. The project can also conduct an assessment of its technical assistance and other analytical support provided to the Mission and its partners.

DATA Access and Transmission Activity (DATA), Booz Allen Hamilton

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no current M&E system in place. However, the technical proposal, which now forms part of the DATA contract, states that DATA shall conduct M&E on a periodic basis.
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no dedicated staff for M&E functions, nor has the project earmarked resources for this purpose.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	<p>An external evaluation was conducted by an independent consultant, Thomas Millar in September, 2002 with the purpose of verifying the success and critically assesses plans for a second phase.</p> <p>The project staff prepared an impact evaluation report for the period of January-December 2002 as required in its SOW. The report evaluates GOE performance compared with the IMF's Special Data Dissemination Standards (SDDS) and System of National Accounts (SNA) '93 requirements and is based on a thorough review of deliverables and management activities as well as in-depth meetings with USAID and GOE counterparts. This is an internal report that aims not only to assist management in its program planning and effective administration of the project, but also to independently verify (or challenge) the presumed success, and critically assess plans for a second phase.</p>
4) Use of performance data	The lag time for publication of GDP data is the current indicator, and the actual lag time has been progressively reduced.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	The impact evaluation report is divided according to the five tasks of DATA. The first deals with the compliance of the GOE with IMF's Special Data Dissemination Standards (SDDS). The second reflects the requirements for compliance with the 1993 System of National accounts (SNA'93). Each section includes a gap analysis between existing and required data as well as plan for bridging those gaps. The report shows that there are significant data gaps in the areas of SNA'93 and SDDS compliance. These gaps though do not hinder the compilation of accounts; do have an effect on the accuracy and reliability of the final numbers. To fill these gaps, DATA team works with the DATA GAP Committee responsible for supervising the required sample surveys for National Accounts, and the SDDS Steering Committee. Coordinating with different agencies in the compliance with SDDS requirements is considered a positive step in this regard. These committees enhance all lines of communications with all key personnel and engage them in group discussions that serve as a channel for the exchange of information and an open arena for problem solving.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	The impact evaluation report is an internal report shared with USAID and the counterpart.
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The lack of a formal M&E department makes it challenging for program management to adequately measure the progress of activities and their consequent impact.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. Incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To maintain sustainability, all costs of data development and analysis should be recouped from users of data through subscription to periodicals and the payment of access fee for obtaining soft or hard copy data. 2. There should be increased public awareness of the availability, quality, and frequency of data with data major producers. 3. There should be a coordination effort among data producers and users of data. This could be produced by forming a data producers and users exchange mechanism by which users' needs can be identified. 4. Periodic conferences and workshops may be conducted focusing on educating the users, particularly with respect to the definition of the data sets, how they are collected, purpose for which they can be used, and limitation of the data. 5. Quality Assessment: The customer satisfaction survey should examine DATA's data quality by assessing to what extent the data collected and disseminated meets the needs of its customers.

Development Support Program Unit (DSPU), Ministry of Foreign Affairs/ Sector of International Cooperation (SIC)

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	The DSPU's main functions are to follow up and monitor the implementation of DSP I and II, review the verification documents submitted by the Implementing Agencies (IA) to ensure their compliance with the Terms of Disbursement (TOD), and to evaluate the implementation status of the DSP indicators. Thus the evaluation activity is not explicitly built in the SOW, but is implied in the sense that DSPU carry out regular assessment for the implementation status of DSP indicators
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no staff dedicated to M&E functions of DSPU
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	The evaluation process is limited by the nature of the DSPU's SOW and the evaluation of the implementation of DSP indicators.
4) Use of performance data	The performance standards are the indicators' means of verification. The DSPU is internally evaluating the implementation of the indicators on monthly basis to compare actions taken by the implementation agency against Terms of Disbursement (TOD) in order to verify their status, compliance and gaps.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	The implicit evaluation results are compared to the TOD to verify the Implementing Agencies (IA)'s status, compliance and gaps. This is among DSPU's objectives: 'following up the implementation of DSP indicators and evaluating the implementation status of the DSP indicators'
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	The evaluations are done monthly in the form of implementation status matrices, which are sent to the USAID.
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	The unit has accomplished its tasks well having being involved in monitoring the economic reform indicators since the implementation of SPR in 1994. The unit keeps all the records and data bank detailing the interaction with the implementing agencies and the record that can be retrieved at any time. In addition, the DSPU has included the provision of the following courses in its work plan in order to enhance its M&E capabilities: Negotiation and Interaction skills, project management, mastering the quantitative techniques used to evaluate the indicators
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	

United States Department for Agriculture (USDA), Agricultural Trade Enhancement Project (ATEP), Participating Agency Service Agreement (PASA)

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	There is no formal M&E evaluation for this project
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is no staff dedicated specially to M&E.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	The primary contractor, USDA/FAS has hired three private technical consultants and entered into a support agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers to evaluate the Dekhela facility, which had space constraints. They are in the process of designing and constructing a new meat and poultry inspection facility at Dekhela. This is a clear case of upgrading the service facility to meet the growing need for an estimated 1,200 microbiology tests per year as compared to about 500 tests currently being done
4) Use of performance data	N/A
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	N/A
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	N/A
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The USDA has taken steps to rebuild a new facility to meet the growing demand for microbiology sample testing and prompt reporting the results. 2. Even though there was some staffing problem, which delayed the completion of the tasks, the USDA/FAS was able to enter into a support agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Like other USAID activities under SO.16, the project should have been open for private contractors to participate in the bidding. The project would have been completed within the stipulated time period had it been given to a private contractor. 2. There is a need to survey the stakeholders of this project in order to know their perceptions and obtain their feedback, which could be used in management decisions. 3. Some relevant questions pertaining to the indicators of the project should be included in the customer satisfaction survey to understand the perception of the customers of PASA project.

IR-16.2, Private Sector Competitiveness Increased

Agribusiness Linkages (AgLink), ACDI/VOCA

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E system, plans, and activities	--M&E data used interactively in reporting and managing performance --Approach to M&E systematized at firms and farm levels. Each participant has a baseline. --Firm and farm levels baseline data collected systematically in the livestock industry (meat and dairy)
2) Brief description of M&E staffing	--Formal M&E unit with dedicated, fulltime staff --Numerous M&E functions supported by above staff
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	--Required external mid-term and end-of project evaluations --Mid-term evaluation conducted Feb 2000 --Periodic internal 'ex-post' process impact assessments of participating firms --Follow up visits of participating firms, farms and associations --Field visits (Egypt, US) of participating firms and farms
4) Use of performance data	--Intermediate results level data collected on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aggregated value and/or volume of exports of participating companies --Activity level achievement data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology transfer • Association and Trade development
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	--Macro level indicators reported to SO 16 as part of its performance management process --Activity level indicators used as achievement indicators for monitoring progress --internal evaluation results shared with clients, staff and USAID --Focus in market strategies, geographic spread and consensus building to develop new programs --Introduction of sustainability issues by transferring knowledge and know how to local organizations.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Trimester reports on current client's exports --Periodic marketing newsletters --Trimester reports to USAID including achievement indicators
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Effective system for M&E in reporting results and managing performance in place --Organizational learning approach rooted in M&E system is used continuously
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Annual impact assessments of technical assistance services to clients should be performed --emphasize how their milestone indicators fit USAID PMP --Implement the already designed Database Management System (DMS)
9) RRSA Follow-on Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Provide periodic/occasional TA on impact assessment methodologies and DMS as needed

Agriculture Led Export Businesses (ALEB), Abt Associates

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E system, plans, and activities	--M&E data used in reporting and managing performance --Approach to M&E systematized at all levels --Micro-level or firm level baseline data collected systematically on agricultural processing companies --Macro-level baseline and targets level data collected systematically on horticulture exports from CAPMAS
2) Brief description of M&E staffing	--Formal M&E unit with dedicated, fulltime staff --Numerous M&E functions supported by above staff
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	--Required external mid-term and end-of project evaluations --Mid-term evaluation conducted May 2001 --Periodic Internal 'ex-post' process impact assessments of participating firms --Site visit observations of participating firms --Training to participating firms in monitoring the quality control system for food processors --Total quality management survey implemented periodically to monitor clients' quality control system --Production efficiency program survey implemented periodically to generate unit cost data
4) Use of performance data	--Macro level data on goal level results collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • value and/or volume of Egyptian private sector food exports --Intermediate results level data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aggregated value and/or volume of exports of companies in ALEB targeted product clusters --Activity level achievement data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • policy advocacy indicators • industry support service linkages --Key cost effectiveness and financial management procedures indicators introduced as result of evaluation --Implementation of more self-sustaining Market Information Services by participating firms introduced as result of evaluation

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Macro level indicators reported to SO 16 as part of its performance management process --Activity level indicators used as mileposts for monitoring progress towards higher level results --Post hoc evaluation and site observation findings shared with staff and USAID --Evaluation-driven implementation of (i) business organizational and management structure plan, (ii) an implementation strategy, and (iii) a demand-driven resource allocation alternative --Changes in management organization structure and functions made on basis of mid-term evaluation --Introduction of data collection on firm level fixed capital expenditures and tracking changes in direct manufacturing cost as result of mid-term evaluation
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Trimester reports on current processed food statistics --Periodic marketing newsletters --Hosts website including a market Information System (called 'Market Pulse-Egypt') --Trimester reports to USAID include activity level monitoring data
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Effective system for M&E in reporting results and managing performance in place --Organizational learning approach rooted in M&E system is used proactively
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Annual impact assessments of technical assistance services to clients should be performed --Need to provide TA to small firms on more accurate measures of traded products --Develop baseline for all new participating firms and develop strategy for reconstructing baseline for existing clients
9) RRSA Follow-on Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Provide periodic/occasional TA on recommended actions if desired by ALEB M&E staff

Agricultural Reform (AgReform), CARE International

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E system, plans, and activities	--M&E data used in reporting and managing performance --Participatory M&E (PM&E) uses household level data defined by farmers themselves. --Traditional M&E (TM&E) uses data collected systematically from linked farmers.
2) Brief description of M&E staffing	--Formal M&E unit with fulltime dedicated staff --Numerous M&E functions supported by above staff
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	--Required external mid-term and end-of project evaluations --Mid-term evaluation conducted October 1998 --An external evaluation relative to a 2 years extension request was conducted in April 2002 --Continuous and Periodic Internal 'ex-post' process impact assessments of participating households
4) Use of performance data	--Meso-level data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aggregated value and/or volume of exports of horticultural exports of participating farms --Activity level achievement data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crop profitability • Technology adoptions • Market information • Farm NGO activities • Training activities
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	--Macro level milestone indicators are identified and will be reported to SO 16 as part of its performance management process --Activity level indicators used as achievement indicators for monitoring progress (PM&E and TM&E) --Ex-Post evaluation results shared with clients, staff and USAID --The project has developed Arabic equivalent expressions like Innovative Farmer, Key Innovative Farmer, Informal Marketing Group... --Training impact procedures are implemented routinely on a representative sample of NGO board and trainees.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Trimester reports on current exports of selected products and activity level monitoring data --Periodic newsletters --Hosts website including client information
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Effective system for M&E in reporting results and managing performance in place --Organizational learning approach rooted in M&E system is used continuously
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -An annual impact assessment of technology diffusion, household income and the employment effect of reform process should be conducted. -- Should clarify how their indicators contribute to the overall SO 16 and its sub IR performance measurements --Design and implement a Database Management System (DMS) to support the M&E functions
9) RRSA Follow-on Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Provide periodic/occasional TA on Impact assessment methodologies and baseline strategies if needed

Egyptian Exporters Association (EEA/ ExpoLink)

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E system, plans, and activities	--M&E data used in reporting and managing performance --Approach to M&E systematized at all levels --Micro-level or firm data collected systematically on exporting companies --Macro-level data collected systematically on exports from CAPMAS, Eurostat
2) Brief description of M&E staffing	--Decentralized M&E unit with part time dedicated staff --Numerous M&E functions supported by above staff
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	--Required external mid-term and end-of project evaluations --Mid-term evaluation conducted May 2000 --Periodic Internal 'ex-post' process impact assessments of participating firms --Study tours organized for participating firms
4) Use of performance data	--Macro level data on goal level results collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • value and/or volume of Egyptian private sector exports --Meso level data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aggregated value and/or volume of exports of participating companies of selected products --Activity level achievement data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Export marketing and development services • Technical assistance services • Policy Advocacy capabilities • Market information services
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	--Macro level indicators reported to SO 16 as part of its performance management process --Activity level indicators used as achievement indicators for monitoring progress --Ex-Post evaluation results shared with clients, staff and USAID --Emphasis is shifted from a client driven export needs towards a market led export growth --The client base is broadened, to include small and medium firms. The Start Up activity is especially designed for small and medium firms --Trade shows activities as kept in ExpoLink activities and made more cost effective

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	--Trimester reports on current exports of selected products and activity level monitoring data --Periodic marketing newsletters --Hosts website including market information
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	--Effective system for M&E in reporting results and managing performance in place
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	--Cost-Benefit assessments of Export Promotion Programs (EPP) to clients should be performed --Should considered the formalization of the M&E system with a minimum dedicated staff --Develop baseline for all new participating firms and develop strategy for reconstructing baseline for existing clients --provide technical assistance to small firms on more accurate measures of traded products
9) RRSA Follow-on Actions	--Provide periodic/occasional TA on Cost-Benefit methodologies of EPP and baseline strategies as needed

Horticultural Export Improvement Association, HEIA

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E system, plans, and activities	--M&E data used in reporting and managing performance --Quality Control System with M&E function. --Micro level firm data collected from participating firms --Macro level data collected from external sources: CAPMAS, Eurostat, other USAID projects
2) Brief description of M&E staffing	--Formal M&E unit with part time dedicated staff --Numerous M&E functions supported by above staff
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	--No Required external evaluations (indirectly evaluated through the ATUT/Ronco project during 2002 -- Periodic internal ‘ex-post’ process impact assessments of participating firms are conducted regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of member satisfaction • Extent of requested services • Need to develop new services
4) Use of performance data	--Meso level data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aggregated value and/or volume of exports of fresh horticultural products of clients --Activity level achievement data collected on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership changes • Technical assistance • Marketing activities • Advocacy groups • Training and gender activities
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	--Macro level milestone indicators reported to SO 16 as part of its performance management process --Activity level indicators used as achievement indicators for monitoring progress --Ex-Post evaluation results shared with clients, staff and USAID --The project has expanded its technical focus to cover a wider range of products --Market intelligence services are improved; the GAP program is implemented, Assistance for reaching new markets is available (Africa, Europe).

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Trimester reports on current exports of selected horticultural products and activity level monitoring data --Periodic newsletters --Hosts website including client information
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Effective system for M&E in reporting results and managing performance in place
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Annual impact assessment studies --Accelerate the effectiveness of the M&E system by implementing the Management Information System -- Dissemination of assessment results should be incorporated into the internal reporting system --Establish baselines for new participating firms and reconstruct new ones for existing firms --Adopt validation strategies to improve data quality
9) RRSA Follow-on Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Provide periodic/occasional TA on Impact assessment methodologies, baseline strategies and PMP plans for HEIA, if needed

IR-16.3, Opportunities for Business Growth Enhanced

Small Enterprise Credit (SME), Small and Emerging Business (SEBDO), NCBA / EQI.

(NB. The two projects are combined in view of common implementing institutions, as well as same COP)

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Quarterly Progress Reports are produced as per contract requirements. -Mid-term and final evaluations are also required under the agreement; this should be by an independent contractor. -Micro-enterprise Reporting Requirements of USAID Washington are to be implemented. -Impact Tracking Studies are used for self-evaluation
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	There is a socio-economic research department; they conduct the impact studies.
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Quarterly Progress Reports (periodical) 2. Micro-enterprise Reporting Requirements (periodical) 3. Impact Assessment: 'Old Clients' Study', Dec. 2001 4. Impact Assessment: 'New Clients' Baseline Study', Dec. 2002 5. Impact Tracking Study for Bashaer El Kheir Program (Poverty Lending), March 2003 6. Financial Audit
4) Use of performance data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The MRR indicate all the credit-related information for each of the implementing foundations e.g. number of loans, number of active borrowers, value of disbursements, rate of loan repayment, financial sustainability of the foundations, etc. -The Impact Studies analyze the extent to which the program beneficiaries benefited if any from the credit they obtained, with regard to growth in business, in employment, and improvement in household standard of living.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -By tracking, on monthly basis, the level of outreach for each of the foundations, as well as loan repayments and cost recovery, the program management can pursue corrective measures as and when needed. -Also feedback from the field led the management to introduce new products e.g. small size loans to cater for women needs, on group-lending basis.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	Reporting is only to USAID Cairo (and in turn to USAID Washington for the MRR). No dissemination plans for the time being.
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<p>Monitoring relies on uniform reporting requirements for micro-enterprises (MRRs), based on a specialized MIS used as a Loan Tracking system (LTS) installed in each foundation for monthly reporting. LTS has gained a high reputation among various micro-credit providers in Egypt; it is sometimes purchased by some donors for the micro-credit NGOs that they fund.</p> <p>2. Data quality is excellent as judged by auditors.</p> <p>3. Targets are exceeded for the performance indicators such as the value of disbursed SME-loans and #poverty loans.</p> <p>4. Comprehensive QPRs and Impact studies are prepared.</p> <p>5. The Impact study of the Poverty Lending program sought feedback on the frustrations of both clients and staff, and made relevant recommendations in this regard. Also the hypotheses used were quite relevant.</p>
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<p>1. It may be useful if the control group is selected in a way to be not only non-borrowers of the program but also non-borrowers of any other program.</p> <p>2. It is advisable to select a sample of 'inactive' borrowers i.e. 'past borrowers' to enquire and analyze reasons for drop-out from the program.</p> <p>3. In Bashaer El Kheir study, the selection of a control group of new applicant-clients, two points that may be useful to consider for future evaluations' sampling are as follows: --'The control individuals were selected such that their first loan was not yet approved (thus not received)'. It may be advisable to select the control units such that their first loan was approved, so as to ensure that they are as creditworthy as the existing borrowers. --'The control individuals were selected such that their residence is in the same neighborhoods as the clients i.e. to be from the same social strata like the existing clients'. It may be advisable to select the control units from locations of similar social strata to those of the clients' neighborhoods rather than the same neighborhoods. The rationale is that people in the same neighborhood may be already negatively affected by the fall in their market share as well as their labor supply due to some taking over by the clients.</p> <p>4. It may be worth exploring the concept of assigning weights of one third or one quarter to temporary/seasonal jobs created as opposed to permanent or full-time jobs, in order to compute the full-time employment equivalent.</p> <p>5. It is useful to compute the cost of creating one new job, and to compare the information by economic sector.</p> <p>6. It is useful at the end of each impact study to have a section on the usefulness of study-findings to program management.</p> <p>7. It would be useful if M&E reports briefly highlight the reasons for relatively poor loan repayment rates and sustainability ratios in two of the foundations.</p>
9) RRSA Follow-up Actions	Will review an upcoming Performance Audit and provide recommendations if any. Otherwise all the M&E function undertaken by the partner is of excellent quality and the project performance is outstanding.

Capital Market Development (CMD), Chemonics International Inc.

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	<p>---Quarterly Progress Reports are produced as per CMD's contract requirements addressing the four primary areas of the work plan as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Institutional Development -Legal and Regulatory Development -Public Outreach and Education -Primary and Secondary Markets for Fixed Income Securities <p>---Weekly reports are presented to USAID as an update to a work plan tracker through weekly staff meetings.</p>
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	<p>Internal evaluations are done by the project staff; but M&E is done in addition to their other tasks, they are not dedicated to his only. The Communications Coordinator oversees all M&E functions.</p>
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	<p>In addition to the progress reports and internal evaluations referred to above, a final evaluation was conducted by an external contractor, Management Systems International (MSI) in mid 2002.</p>
4) Use of performance data	<p>The external evaluation assessed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The training program: effectiveness and resulting change in trainees' performance. -The Public Outreach Program: impact on increased financial reporting in journals, cost-effectiveness of the program and appropriateness of the printed material. -Legal & Regulatory Reform: the technical assistance provided by the project in this area, the documents generated by the project, and the institutional partners' assessment of the scope and quality of the project's work.
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	<p>Many of the 'suggestions for future work' made by MSI's evaluation referred to above were actually addressed by the project during the one-year extension that took place after the evaluation. Examples are: assisting the institutional partners (IPs) in: finalizing the margin trading rules, institutionalizing the margin trading operations, the certification of employees of brokerage firms, writing the procedures for implementation of the Investors' Protection Fund, developing a procedures manual for surveillance, strengthening the regulations for the mutual funds industry, training on international accounting standards, etc.</p>

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Weekly reports and QPRs are presented to USAID -The QPRs are also distributed to the Egyptian counterparts of the project
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<p>Both internal and external M&E is effective. The external evaluation team concluded that the project had substantial contributions regarding improved efficiency and transparency as well strengthened institutions and regulatory environment. The evaluators also highlighted the difficult market conditions in which the project worked. The approaches used by the evaluators can be described as good practices, e.g. -highlighting opportunities for some IPs to become a reputable organization in the field.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -inquiring about others' perceptions of the institutional strengthening done by the project in the legal and regulatory component. -providing quantitative measures regarding the reductions in #delayed transactions due to the institutional strengthening. -highlighting the situation in other countries with regard to legal status of the similar IPs. -highlighting the constraints that are beyond project's control. -highlighting the constraints arising from changes in conditions in the market in concern throughout project lifetime thus nullifying the initial projections. -highlighting the reasons why the project's investment in particular areas may not yield adequate returns for certain IPs. -proposing alternative approaches to be pursued by the project regarding the less successful components of the project. -proposing areas for future work by the project.
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	
9) RRSA Follow-up Actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The project is ending next August (The follow-up afterwards will be only through the progress under PMP indicators which USAID said will last till 2004 i.e. one year after the project ends; but CTO and COP will be revising the reported ratios under the indicators)

Information and Communication Technology (ICT), General Dynamics

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
1) Brief description of M&E work, activities, plans	<p>-Quarterly Progress Reports are produced as per contract requirements.</p> <p>-The project developed an M&E system based on a number of results, as related to one or more of the three IRs of SO16.</p> <p>-The contract does not call for external evaluation. The project recommended to have it for the benefits of having a third party, and offered to help in setting the scope of work of the external evaluator, given the inherent technical aspects.</p>
2) Brief description of M&E system/staffing	<p>Three staff members are handling M&E, including the Automation Advisor. This is not on full dedication basis but besides other tasks.</p>
3) Types of monitoring and evaluations implemented	<p>1. Quarterly Progress Reports (periodical; last one available covers the period from Dec. 2002 to Feb. 2003)</p> <p>2. The M&E system developed by the project, as referred to above, was recently approved by USAID and is now used for producing the QPRs in an improved format in a way that tracks progress on both result-level and activity-level.</p>
4) Use of performance data	<p>The M&E system developed by the project is in an improved format so as to monitor the task-level activities and the contract-level performance.</p>
5) Use of M&E data for activity management	<p>-The project was successful in handling unforeseen situations thus an indication of benefiting from M&E for management use and/or change of plans if needed. As an example, in view of the limited number of applications received for grants for pilot project implementation, they launched an awareness campaign to introduce the grant program to targeted beneficiaries. And again, as the expected outcome of such campaign did not materialize, they made a re-evaluation of ways to use the grants and developed a concept paper on using it for upgrading NGO ICT-capabilities.</p>
6) M&E reporting/dissemination plan	<p>-Reporting is only to USAID Cairo</p> <p>-No dissemination plans for the time being.</p>
7) Conclusions on status of M&E functions/system	<p>-The M&E system developed by the Partner is quite comprehensive and addresses the detailed set of tasks and activities in various areas of accomplishments by the project.</p> <p>-There are data validation problems as stated by the Partner.</p>

M&E System Status Criteria	Present Status
8) Recommendations (practical recs. incl. possible TA, etc.)	<p>-The QPR states, under the performance M&E system, that the task activities require better indicators for ICT success stories. This will be addressed in the next quarter. (We also note here that with regard to PMP indicator, USAID advised that they will be formulating a new indicator (s) in coordination with the Partner.</p> <p>-As regards data validation problems, the Partner suggests to have a third party hired by USAID to conduct a field survey addressing the various areas of achievements under the different tasks e.g. actual number of licensed ICT-firms, actual number and quality of trained and qualified professional IT staff in Telecommunications Regulatory Authority (TRA), actual number of companies certified for CMM, etc.</p> <p>-In view of the multitude of tasks and activities in the QPR, it may be useful to have a timeline chart for at least one year ahead. Reasons for postponement (if any) of specific activities for later quarters could thus be summarized at the end of each quarter.</p>
9) RRSA Follow-up Actions	<p>Follow-up on the formulation of a new indicator (s) for the PMP as promised by USAID to do in cooperation with the Partner.</p>

ANNEX 3

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

IR-16.1, Policy Framework for Trade and Investment Improved

Assistance for Trade Reform (ATR)

Buehrer, Timothy
Chief of Party
Ministry of Foreign Trade

Tohamy, Sahar
Senior Macro Economist
Ministry of Foreign Trade

Corporate Tax Project

Clayton, Richard
Chief of Party, Barents Group

The Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES)

Galal, Ahmed
Executive Director

Refaat, Amal
Economist

Modernizing Egyptian Insurance Supervision Project

Power, Thomas
Chief of Party, Barents Group-KPMG Consulting

Privatization and commercialization Project

Moss, Richard
Chief of Party, Business Consulting Services, IBM Global Services.

Holmes, Torence
Business Consulting Services, IBM Global Services.

TIPRE Project

Moroney, Jaleen
Chief of Party, Nathan Associates, Inc.

TAPR Project

Norris, James
Chief of Party, Chemonics International Inc.

Data Access and Transmission Activity

Szumilo, Frank
Chief of Party, Booz Allen Hamilton

Development Support Program Unit (DSPU)

El-Adawy, Ahmed
Executive Director
Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Foreign Agricultural Service, USDA

Chaudhry, Asif
Agricultural Counselor, U.S. Embassy, Cairo

U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID

Chan, Tony
Partnership for Competitiveness Team Leader, Sector Policy Program

El Samadony, Manal
Senior Economist – ATR and TIPRE CTO, Sector Policy Program

El Shayeb, Iman
Partnership for Economic Reform Team Leader, Sector Policy Program

Fikry, Mervat
Technical Assistance to Monitor and Evaluate So16 Activities CTO

Kamel, Ali
Senior Economist and TASER Team Leader, Sector Policy Program

Lotfy, Ingi
Senior Economist – TAPR&MEIS CTO, Technical Assistance to Support Economic Reform

Rogers, Glenn
ACTF Team leader and DATA CTO, Sector Policy Program

Shaker, Femihan
DSPU CTO, Sector Policy Program

Talaat, Remah
Project Manager – ECES and Privatization CTO, Sector Policy Program

Williams, Ann
Participating Agency Service Agreement (PASA) for Food Inspection CTO

IR-16.2, Private Sector Competitiveness Increased

Agribusiness Linkages Project, AgLink

Osman, Gebril
Senior M&E Specialist, ACDI/VOCA

Agriculture Led Export Business, ALEB

Harrison, Alexandra
Senior M&E Specialist, Abt Associates

Thatcher, Peter
Chief of Party, Abt Associates

Agricultural Reform Project, AgReform

Mahmoud, Khaled
M&E Coordinator, CARE

Sedky, Samir
Project Manager CARE

Egyptian Exporter Association, EEA

Mowafy, Sherif
Export Services Manager, ExpoLink

Horticultural Export Improvement Association, HEIA

El Kolaly, Hani
Executive Director

Rafea, Wael
Deputy Director

Sheta, Tarek
Quality Control Manager,

U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID

Omran, Mohamed
Agriculture Policy Reform Program CTO

Osman, Adly
AgLink & HEIA CTO

Robbins, Gary
A/ Chief of Division Competitiveness and Agricultural Development (CAD)

Shata, Tarek
ALEB & Expolink CTO

Williams, Ann
AgReform CTO

IR-16.3, Opportunities for Business Growth Enhanced

Small Enterprise Credit & Small Emerging Business Development Organization, SEC/SEBDO

Bulbul, Lamia
Socio-Economic Research Dept. Consultant, EQI

Genena, Neemat
Socio-Economic Research Director, EQI

Tucker, Bill
Chief of Party, NCBA/EQI

Capital Markets Development Project, CMD

Haupt, Kevin
Executive Officer

Labadan, Jun
Deputy Chief of Party

Information and Communication Technology Program, ICT

El Sherif, Hossam
Automation Advisor and M&E Officer in charge, General Dynamics

Refky, Mahmoud
Automation Expert, General Dynamics

U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID

El Zayyat, Rizkallh
Small Enterprise Credit & Small Emerging Business Development Organization Team Leader

Kaldas, Mona
Capital Markets Development Project Team Leader & CTO
Information and Communication Technology Program, CTO

Khalil, Magdy
Small Enterprise Credit/ Small Emerging Business Development Organization CTO

ANNEX 4

BIBLIOGRAPHY

IR-16.1

POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR TRADE AND INVESTMENT IMPROVED

The Data Access and Transmission Activity (DATA)

- Thomas Miller. An External Evaluation, September 2002
- Booz Allen Hamilton, Impact Evaluation Report (Performance Monitoring Report), January 2003.

Technical Assistance for Intellectual Property Rights in Egypt (TIPRE)

- Goans, Judy et al. Intellectual Property Principles and Practice. Edited by Jaleen Moroney. Nathan Associates, Inc. 2003

Privatization & Commercialization

- IBM Business Consulting Services, Privatization in Egypt, Quarterly Review (July-September 2002), November 2002.
- International Business and Technical Consultants, Inc. Evaluation Services Contract. Semi-Annual/ Quarterly Review for the period 1st of July to 31st of December.

Assistance for Trade Reform (TAPR)

- Chemonics International Inc. Draft Evaluation Report. USAID Economic Policy Initiative Consortium (EPIC), Administered by the International Center for Economic Growth (ICEG), Submitted to USAID, November 2000
- DSP I Monitoring and Verification Final Report, March 3, 2003

The Egyptian Center for Economic Studies (ECES)

- ECES Business Barometer, January 2003, Issue no. 10
- SRI International, Growth Through Globalization Results Package, An External Evaluation for 'Egyptian Center for Economic Studies', May 1998.
- SRI International, ECES Monitoring and Evaluation System Manual, USAID Egypt GTG RP, November 1998.

Modernizing Egyptian Insurance Supervision (MEIS)

- Barents Group of KPMG Consulting, ‘Reforming the Insurance Markets in Egypt’. Project Accomplishments, Submitted to United States Agency for International Development, February, 2001.
- Barents Group of KPMG Consulting, Second Quarterly Report of Project Status:. Submitted to United States Agency for International Development and the Egyptian Insurance Supervisory Authority. August, 2002.
- Barents Group of KPMG Consulting, Third Quarterly Report of Project Status: Submitted to United States Agency for International Development and the Egyptian Insurance Supervisory Authority. October, 2002

Corporate Tax Project

- Barents Group LLC, “ A Comprehensive Tax Reform Program for Egypt” A Report to the Ministry of Finance, U.S. Agency for International Development, June 2000.

Agricultural Trade Enhancement Project (ATEP)

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Scope of Work (Appendix A), PASA No. 263-P-00-01-0003-00, 2000.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Justification for No-Cost Extension, 2002.

IR-16.2 PRIVATE SECTOR COMPETITIVENESS INCREASED

Agribusiness Linkages (AgLink)

- Extension Project Outcome, 2002.
- “Grant Extension Proposal, Scope of Work”.
- PriceWaterHouseCoopers (PWC), "Mid-Term Assessment", GTG, Agribusiness Linkages (AgLink), Feb. 2000

Agricultural Reform (AgReform) Extension Project

- “Project Implementation Report, Oct- Dec, 02”.
- Powerpoint Presentation of PM&E.
- PriceWaterHouseCoopers (PWC), “Mid-Term Assessment”, GTG, Agricultural Reform (AgReform), April, 2002
- Two Year Cost Extension Proposal for the AgReform Project, Cooperative Agreement Scope of Work, May 2002.
- Saad, R. et al , "Low Income Farm Household Responding to Agricultural Reform, AgReform Project, October 1998.

Agriculture Led Export Businesses (ALEB)

- “Trimester Report”, July 9, 2003.
- Scope of Work: Period March 2002 – Feb 2005.
- PriceWaterHouseCoopers (PWC), "Mid-Term Assessment", GTG, Agriculture Led Export Businesses (ALEB), May 2001.

Egyptian Exporter Association EEA/Expolink

- “Work Plan, May 02 – April 03”.
- “Cooperative Agreement Scope of Work”.
- PriceWaterHouseCoopers (PWC), "Mid-Term Assessment", GTG, Egyptian Exporter Association (ExpoLink), Sept 2000.

Horticultural Export Improvement Association (HEIA)

- “Quarterly Report, October 2002- Dec 2002”.
- *Newsletter*, Issue No. 19, July 2002.
- Jabarin, A., "The Second Annual Horticulture Program Monitoring Report," Agricultural Technology Utilization and Transfer (ATUT), Jan 1999.

IR-16.3 OPPORTUNITIES FOR BUSINESS GROWTH ENHANCED

Small & Emerging Business Development Organization (SEBDO) & Small Enterprise Credit (SEC)

- Environmental Quality International (EQI) and Weidemann Associates, Incorporated (WAI), “Study on Old Clients,” SEBDO, Dec. 2001.
- Environmental Quality International (EQI) and Weidemann Associates, Incorporated (WAI), “Baseline Study for New Clients: Impact tracking of lending programs on small and micro enterprises (SMEs),” SEBDO, Dec. 2002.
- National Cooperative Business Association (NCBA), Environmental Quality International (EQI), and Weidemann Associates, Incorporated (WAI), “Bashaer El Kheir: An Impact Tracking Study,” SEBDO, March 2003.
- “Quarterly Progress Report,” July-Sept. 2002.
- “Quarterly Progress Report,” Aug.-Oct. 2002
- USAID, Micro-enterprise Reporting Requirements
- USAID, Financial Audit (a sample report for one of the foundations was reviewed)

Capital Markets Development (CMD)

- Evaluation by Management Systems International, May 2002
- QPR of Third Quarter 2002
- QPR of Fourth Quarter 2002

Information and Communication Technology (ICT)

- Quarterly Progress Report, February 2003

RRSA Final Draft M and Eval. Assess't..doc/Mobis-Egypt 1