

EGYPT : THE BASIC VILLAGE SERVICES PROJECT

ANNUAL EVALUATION

BY

GEORGE R. GARDNER, TEAM LEADER
(NEAR EAST BUREAU, USAID-WASHINGTON)

ELIZABETH B. BERRY
(USDA/OICD-WASHINGTON)

DAVID E. KUNKEL
(USDA/FAS-WASHINGTON)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

MAGDI SIDAROUS (USAID-CAIRO)

REMAH A. TALAAT (USAID-CAIRO)

Agency for International Development
Cairo, Egypt
March 1981

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Agency for International Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Preface	iv
I. <u>Introduction</u>	
A. History of the Project	1
B. Present Status of the Project	6
C. Methodology of the Annual Evaluation	8
II. <u>Review of the 1980 BVS Governorates</u>	
A. Sharkia Governorate	10
B. Fayoum Governorate	12
C. Sohag Governorate	14
D. Summary of the 1980 Projects	16
III. <u>Preview of the 1981 BVS Governorates</u>	
A. Giza Governorate	20
B. Minufia Governorate	22
C. Qalyubiyah Governorate	25
IV. <u>Generalizations, Issues and Implications for AID & USDA</u>	
A. On Rebuilding Rural Infrastructure	28
B. BVS Impact on Rural Population	32
C. Decentralization: The Appropriate Level	34
D. Fayoum: Salary Incentives that Work	38
E. Village Sanitation	40
F. GOE Expectations and Support	42
V. <u>Monitoring and Evaluation for BVS</u>	
A. The Proposed System	44
B. Toward an Appropriate Design for Monitoring ...	45
C. Appropriate Technology for Financial Record Keeping	47
D. Data Collection and Analysis	47
E. Other Observations	48
VI. <u>BVS Training : Present and Future</u>	50

	<u>Page</u>
II. <u>Technical Assistance</u>	53
IX. <u>Financial Status of BVS</u>	
A. Introduction	55
B. The Loan Forgiveness Process	56
C. Implementation Actions	56
D. Problem Areas	58
E. Combining Title III and USAID Funds	59
F. Interest and Unused Funds	60
G. ORDEV Accounting System and Village Accounts ..	61
IX. <u>Principal Findings and Recommendations</u>	
A. Findings	62
B. Recommendations	64
X. <u>List of Appendices and Tables</u>	
Table 1 : Summary of BVS Projects Funded in Sharkia Governorate, 1980	10a
Table 2 : Summary of BVS Projects Funded in Fayoum Governorate, 1980	12a
Table 3 : Summary of BVS Projects Funded in Sohag Governorate, 1980	14a
Table 4 : Summary of BVS Projects Funded in Sharkia, Fayoum, and Sohag Governorates; 1980 ,....	19a
 <u>Appendices</u>	
Table 1 : List of BVS Project Documents	67
Table 2 : Summary of BVS Projects Visited by the Evaluation Team	69
Table 3 : Projects Planned for BVS Funding in Giza Governorate, 1981	70
Table 4 : Projects Planned for BVS Funding in Minufia Governorate, 1981	74
Table 5 : Projects Planned for BVS Funding in Qalyubiyah Governorate, 1981	78
Table 6 : Reporting Format for Title III, PL 480 Currency Use Offset	81
Table 7 : Estimated Costs of BVS Projects in the nine Selected Governorates , 1981	85

<u>Appendices (cont.)</u>	<u>Page</u>
Table 8 : Background on Evaluation Team Members ...	86
Table 9 : Partial List of Persons Interviewed by the Evaluation Team	87
Table 10: Projects Funded by BVS in Sharkia Governorate, 1980	90
Table 11: Projects Funded by BVS in Sohog Governorate, 1980	93
Table 12: Projects Funded by BVS in Fayoum Governorate, 1980	96
Table 13: Projects Planned for BVS Funding in Sharkia, 1981	101
Table 14: Projects Planned for BVS Funding in Fayoum Governorate, 1981	104
Table 15: Projects Planned for BVS Funding in Sohag Governorate, 1981	108

* * * * *

PREFACE

This annual evaluation of the Basic Village Services program was conducted by a joint team of USAID and USDA personnel. Several representatives from ORDEV-Cairo and USAID-Cairo participated in all project site visits. The opinions expressed in this report, however, are solely those of the authors.

Dr. George Gardner, USAID/NE/TECH-Washington, served as team leader. Dr. David Kunkel, USDA/FAS-Washington, and Ms. Elizabeth Berry, USDA/OIC -Washington, were the other writing members of the evaluation team.

Background research on the BVS projects commenced during January 1981 in Washington and Cairo. The evaluation team departed Washington on February 23 and arrived in Cairo on February 24. Field visits and interviews in six governorates were conducted during February 25 - March 15. Analysis and write-up was completed in Cairo by March 20.

Invaluable assistance and logistic support were provided by Mr. Magdi Sidarous and Mr. Remah Talaat of USAID/DRPS/LAD in Cairo. Without their assistance this report would not have been possible. This report was typed and proof-read by Ms. Julie Anne Rudge.

Special appreciation is also extended to the three ORDEV officials who accompanied the evaluation team on the various field trips: Mr. Mahmoud Hassan M. Hassan, Mr. Maged El Sheibini and Mr. Fawzy Ali El Ahwal.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. History of the Project

The Basic Village Services (BVS) Program was formally initiated on March 20, 1979 as a PL 480 Title III (Food for Development) agreement between the Government of Egypt (GOE) and the United States Government (USG). The stated goal of the program is to reinforce and strengthen local government in Egypt so that it more effectively supports agricultural and rural development. This goal is consistent with GOE rural development policy (primarily articulated in Public Laws 52, and 43), which emphasizes governmental decentralization as a means of promoting rural development.

More specifically, popularly elected village councils are to be utilized as the principal institutions for identifying local needs, and planning and implementing projects on the basis of these needs. The projects funded through the BVS program must be public projects, accessible to almost all people residing within the territory of the public unit that owns or supplies such services.

These projects have mainly been oriented to the provision of potable water, feeder roads, small canals and drainage systems. Other types of public projects are eligible, providing

they are widely desired, widely accessible and cost effective with respect to number of beneficiaries.

Thus, the BVS program actually has a dual emphasis: to support the GOE's decentralization policies and to upgrade Egypt's rural infrastructure. It is anticipated that improved local governmental capacity to implement BVS projects will result in continued rural development progress after the program's completion in 1985.

The stated objectives of the Title III agreement are as follows:-

1. Public Law 52 will be implemented in such a way that the physical, social, and economic components of a rural development strategy will be effectively supported among all levels of government.
2. Government inter-ministerial coordination will effectively ensure that all policy, technical, and management inputs mesh in support of village council Basic Village Services needs.
3. Popular participation in local economic development and the provision/distribution/operation of services and infrastructure will be effectively promoted through the village councils.

4. The Organization for Reconstruction and Development of the Egyptian Village (ORDEV) will be organized and operated in a manner that will effectively support the operations of the Title III supported Basic Village Services program.
5. Basic Village Services projects will be defined, designed and implemented in ways which most expeditiously meet village needs using available Egyptian technical advice and locally obtainable materials.
6. GOE will develop opportunities during the various stages of the Title III Program so that World Bank foreign exchange inputs and USG-funded special technical assistance can be programmed into the operations, where appropriate.
7. The GOE will continue to provide financing of Basic Village Services activities during the period of the Title III program and thereafter.

The Inter-Agency Committee for Basic Village Services is responsible for formulating BVS planning and implementation procedures. It is chaired by a representative of ORDEV, and includes representatives from the Ministries of Local Governments, Finance, Planning, Economy and Agriculture. ORDEV has been charged with the program's administration at the central government level.

The Title III Agreement provides for program support valued at \$15 million per year for five years, through the shipment of wheat and wheat flour. The proceeds generated from the sale of the agricultural commodities provided under this agreement are utilized to finance program activities. Loan forgiveness (for the commodities) occurs when Title III currencies are disbursed to the participating villages.

The BVS program was significantly expanded by AID through an additional agreement dated August 31, 1980. This agreement, which has been integrated with the Title III agreement, has the following stated purpose:

"to improve and expand a continuing capacity in local units to plan, organize, finance, implement, and maintain locally chosen infrastructure projects."

As with the Title III agreement, the program is intended to support GOE policy objectives in economic and administrative decentralization. The desired project outputs are as follows:

1. Institute a management system for BVS and other projects in governorates/villages.
2. Completed rural infrastructure projects serving needs of village people, especially the poor.

3. Training of governorate/village staff in the entire system of project conception, implementation and management.
4. Production of a series of working manuals for training and operations.

In brief , the 1980 AID agreement is consistent with the Title III agreement and supplements it in the following areas:

1. An additional \$70 million grant is provided, bringing the total cost of the project to \$145 million.
2. The GOE is required to provide the equivalent of 10% of project construction costs (approximately \$6 million) for maintenance of these projects.
3. The Egyptian pound equivalent of \$15 million dollars is to be borne on an "in-kind" basis by GOE (for indirect sub-project costs such as land acquisition, engineering design, contract administration, in-country training and staffing support).
4. The capacity-building dimension of this program is further emphasized and additional resources are directed to this capacity-building component.
5. Funding is provided for long-term technical advisory services participant training, research, and evaluation.

B. Present Status of the Project

The team found that among the three governorates receiving the first disbursement of BVS funding -- Sharkia, Fayoum, and Sohag -- progress in project implementation varied. In Fayoum, many projects are complete or nearing completion. In Sharkia, many projects are nearing completion, with shortages of certain critical materials delaying progress. In Sohag, work on many subprojects is just beginning with some delay attributable to contractors' timetables, and materials not having arrived.

The types of projects being undertaken are nearly all rural roads or water-related projects. A breakdown of project type by governorate is as follows:-

	Fayoum*	Sharkia**	Sohag*	Total
Road	51	16	28	95
Water	4	55	45	104
Other	69	-	-	69
TOTAL	124	71	73	268

* as of 12/31/80

** as of 9/30/80

In actuality, it is difficult to specify the exact number of BVS projects because a single project title often encompasses several closely-related subprojects. Therefore, the above figures under-represent the number of BVS projects funded by the first year's allocation. It is estimated that the total number of discreet construction activities may actually total 500 to 600.

Also, at the time of this writing, the team found that the BVS program was in the early stages of implementation in the six other governorates participating in the program -- Giza, Minufia Qalyubiyah, Behiera, El Minya, and Qena. In Giza, for example, the projects have been proposed by the village councils and approved by the governorates, but the villages have not yet received their allocations, although they expect them shortly.

Technical advisory services are to be provided by United States and Egyptian advisors in management, planning, local finance, training, engineering design and environmental analysis. While the Egyptian governorates and markazes have, in some cases, provided extensive technical assistance to many of the participating villages, the United States has not begun to provide technical advisory services on an ongoing basis. This can be attributed to the fact that AID monies have not yet been made available, and the Title III agreement does not require that funding be set aside for training and technical assistance.

AID has commissioned a number of studies in order to ascertain how to utilize these supplementary training and technical assistance monies most effectively. The studies are listed in Appendix Table 1.

ORDEV has been charged with the responsibility for developing and staff a training program for the purpose of strengthening BVS implementation capability at the village and governorate level. Progress in this area has been slow.

C. Methodology of the Annual Evaluation

Because the BVS program is subject to evaluation by both USAID and USDA, it was decided to conduct a joint team review of the program's 1980 achievements. However, this joint approach presented the challenge of attempting a review that would meet the evaluation requirements of both agencies.

Furthermore, because the BVS program has multiple objectives of both physical outputs (i.e. construction of rural infrastructure) and process (i.e. decentralization), the evaluation process must address both types of objectives. The assessment of a complicated process such as decentralization is best suited by the case study approach. However, the review of physical outputs such as rural roads and water systems is better suited to the sampling approach.

The methodology used in this evaluation is a combination of several approaches. A stratified random sample of 10% of the 268 projects listed by ORDEV was selected for visitation and review. Information was gathered on these specific projects by site inspections and structured interviews. The sampling process was stratified by both governorate and type of project, such that 10% of each type of project in each of the three governorates were inspected.

Structured interviews were then conducted with personnel at the local unit, "markaz" (district), and governorate level to review the projects initiated in 1980. Additionally, separate structured interviews were conducted at the governorate level to assess the BVS projects planned for implementation in 1981.

Specific information was gathered on the 26 projects randomly selected, but the evaluation team actually visited about 40 of the 268 activities funded by BVS.

The random sampling approach was adhered to rigidly by the evaluation team in order to avoid being shown only the "best, most complete or nearest" project activities. Thus, although the evaluation team visited only a fraction of the total array of projects, the information gathered is truly representative of the entire scope of the BVS program. A listing of the projects visited is seen in Appendix Table 2.

II. REVIEW OF THE 1980 BVS GOVERNORATES

A. Sharkia Governorate

Sharkia has a total of 63 BVS projects, of which 56 are water projects and seven are rural roads. A summary of the projects is seen in Table 1. The team visited six water projects and one road project.

Most of the water projects visited involved the refurbishing of facilities that had been allowed to deteriorate over the past 20 or 30 years. These improvements tended to enhance delivery of existing services (i.e., make water delivery more reliable) rather than extend services to new beneficiaries. In only one case did we observe a project that brought potable water to a hamlet previously lacking this service.

One benefit of refurbishing existing systems was that the improvements made home connections technically feasible. Typically, homeowners requesting such a service were required to pay only the cost of pipe and meter -- about L.E. 40 to 50.

Another pattern observed with respect to improvement of potable water systems was the tendency to replace diesel pumps with electric pumps, using the diesel pumps for back-up power. The electric pumps are expected to cut both energy costs and maintenance costs in half, although they require a large initial capital outlay.

Table 1.

Summary of BVS Projects Funded in
Sharkia Governorate, 1980

Type of Project	No. of Projects	-- Funding amount in L.E.--	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Potable Water	56	2,627,710	2,031,922
Roads	7	1,307,498	547,799
Totals	63	3,935,208	2,579,721

Notes: a) Average approved funding for potable water projects is L.E. 46,923.

b) Average approved funding for rural roads projects is L.E. 186,785.

c) "Disbursed" banking as percentage of "appropriated" funding is 65%.

SOURCE: ORDEV annual report on BVS with project data as of 12/31/80.

Completion time for these water projects ranged from one to three months when no delays were involved. However, a number of Sharkia's potable water projects were delayed due to the fact that an adequate amount of pipe couplings had not been produced. The sole Egyptian producer of the required pipe fittings*, a public sector company, had been paid in advance so governorate officials had little alternative other than to wait. Also, in several cases, pumps were installed but their operation was delayed because the required electrical connections had not yet been made (due to financial constraints rather than technical constraints).

With respect to the project selection process, we were told that for four of the projects observed, the village councils were the initiators, while in three cases, project selection was primarily a governorate-level decision. (Governorate officials told us that they did not have time to politically involve the village councils this year, but they planned to do so next year.)

Project selections were reportedly made by Sharkia officials on the basis of population size, coupled with proximity to a central village (because costs for construction materials are less for projects in more centrally located hamlets than in distant hamlets.)

* The BVS project agreement stipulates that construction materials must be purchased from Egyptian firms, or if not available, from United States firms.

The governorate level was also primarily responsible for project implementation, and utilized contractors for three of the projects visited. Written records, both financial and technical, were maintained in governorate offices only. Some technical input was provided by the markazes, while village-level participation seemed limited to digging ditches for the pipes. The villagers provided their labor without pay.

B. Fayoum Governorate

There are 118 BVS projects in the Fayoum governorate -- 47 road projects, 50 retaining wall and drainage projects, and 21 other types of projects (potable water, bio-gas and garbage-to-fertilizer). The team visited 12 of these projects, finding that 10 of them had been completed in periods ranging from one month for a canal improvement to nine months for a sanitary drainage canal. A summary of the projects is seen in Table 2.

The road projects tended to be road improvements rather than creation of new roads, facilitating farm-to-market access but not significantly benefitting new segments of the population. On the other hand, drainage projects did involve many new beneficiaries as waterlogging is a chronic problem in Fayoum, and such projects brought relief to farmers and homeowners.

Table 2

Summary of BVS Projects Funded in
Fayoum Governorate, 1980

Type of Project	No. of Projects	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Roads	47	1,150,439	711,568
Retaining Walls and Drainage	50	1,301,718	938,448
Potable Water	3	437,000	401,260
Other	18	295,000	95,000
Totals	118	3,184,157	2,146,276

- Notes:
- a) Average approved funding for potable water projects is L.E. 24,477.
 - b) Average approved funding for rural roads projects is L.E. 26,034.
 - c) "Disbursed" funding as percentage of "appropriated" funding is 67%.

SOURCE: ORDEV annual report on BVS with project data as of 12/31/80.

The garbage-to-fertilizer projects in Fayoum have been cancelled due to lack of necessary equipment and technical capability. Monies set aside for such projects will be reallocated for other BVS projects in Fayoum. Bio-gas projects have been held up by AID due to a determination that they were not, so far, technically viable. However, they should be resumed in several months when technical assistance can be provided by AID.

In almost all cases observed, project initiation, planning and implementation took place at the village level with technical assistance from markaz and governorate officials. Financial and technical information for each project was housed at the respective local unit -- a positive indication of effected decentralization.

An outstanding feature of BVS implementation in Fayoum is that contractors were rarely used. Local unit officials found that they could cut construction costs considerably by undertaking the projects themselves or contracting with markazes rather than with private firms. (Fayoum's incentive system for cost reduction encouraged local unit officials to carry out the projects, themselves, as will be discussed below.) Another cost-cutting mechanism was the hiring of villagers at "below market" wages. This can also be viewed as a contribution by the villagers toward project completion.

C. Sohag Governorate

The Sohag governorate has 73 BVS projects planned -- 45 potable water and 28 road -- of which four water projects and three roads were visited by the team. A summary of the projects is seen in Table 3

Project implementation in Sohag is progressing very slowly, with none of the observed projects nearing completion. Work on all the projects was contracted to private firms. In response to our inquiries as to why construction was taking so long, governorate officials claimed that the delays were due to scheduling by the large contracting firms they had hired. (Officials asserted that they could not utilize small local firms because smaller contractors do not have access to the more efficient equipment used by the larger firms and are less competent.)

Another factor in implementation delays is that governorate officials did not begin most project implementation until December 1980, (whereas in Sharkia and Fayoum construction was well underway by August 1980). There are reports that Sohag officials deliberately delayed construction in order to allow BVS accounts to continue to accrue interest. The Office of the Inspector General is investigating these reports. This issue will be discussed further in another section of this report.

Table 3

Summary of BVS Projects Funded in
Sohag Governorate, 1980

Type of Project	No. of Projects	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Potable Water	45	2,288,134	682,716
Roads	28	1,192,488	198,847
Totals	73	3,480,622	881,563

- Notes:
- a) Average approved funding for potable water projects is L.E. 50,847.
 - b) Average approved funding for rural roads projects is L.E. 42,589.
 - c) "Disbursed" funding as percentage of "appropriated" funding is 25%.

SOURCE: ORDEV annual report on BVS with project data as of
12/31/80

Of the projects visited, only two would provide services to many new beneficiaries, while five were geared toward refurbishing existing infrastructure. While the team was told that all projects were initiated at the village council level, there were many indications that all phases of project implementation (including initiation) were being carried out at the governorate level. Contractors were hired by governorate officials; technical and financial records were housed in governorate facilities.

Governorate officials contend that the local units are not technically capable of awarding contracts and supervising project completion. Furthermore, because Sohag governorate only employs five engineers, they feel that it is not possible to provide adequate technical support to the 51 local units in order to allow them to implement the projects themselves.

All 11 markazes in Sohag were scheduled for BVS projects, with funds purportedly being allocated on the basis of need as well as population size in the deprived areas. Need was determined by governorate officials, who evaluated village council requests.

The governorate has three maintenance centers to provide training and technical assistance to the markazes, although funding for BVS project maintenance has not yet been set aside.

D. Summary of the 1980 Projects

Although the team visited only 10 per cent of the BVS projects, a number of patterns emerged and it became apparent that the approach of each governorate to the BVS program was distinctive.

While the village units are primarily responsible for all phases of project implementation in Fayoum, these responsibilities are assumed at the governorate level in Sharkia and Sohag. Governorate officials in both Sharkia and Sohag asserted that they lacked a sufficiently large technical staff to allow projects to be supervised by the village councils with higher-level technical support, as is being done in Fayoum.

In Fayoum, virtually all projects were being implemented directly by the local units without utilization of private contractors, while Sohag hired contractors in every case examined. Sharkia fell in between these two extremes.

Interestingly, project completion time appears to be related to both degree of decentralization and utilization of contractors. In Fayoum 10 of the 12 projects observed had been completed by October 1980. In Sharkia three of the seven projects had been completed by October 1980. In Sohag, none of the projects had been completed at the time of this evaluation.

Another indication of degree of project completion is "disbursed" funding expressed as a percentage of "appropriated" funding. As of December 31, 1980, Fayoum had disbursed 67% of its appropriated funding, Sharkia 65%, and Sohag only 25%. (See Tables 1, 2, and 3.) Although Fayoum and Sharkia had disbursed approximately the same percentage of allocation by the end of 1980, Fayoum's projects were completed sooner than Sharkia's. Also the number of projects completed by Fayoum was almost twice the number completed by Sharkia. (Most of the projects not completed in Fayoum were the bio-gas and garbage-to-fertilizer projects, which were experimental.)

Another interesting relationship is that between project cost and degree of decentralization. In this regard, we have focused on water projects, which are very similar in nature among the three governorates (and therefore should be similar in cost.) The average approved funding for such projects in Sharkia was L.E. 46,923; in Sohag it was L.E. 50,847; while in Fayoum it was only L.E. 24,477 or about half the average approved project cost in the other two governorates.

If, indeed, casual relationships exist between degree of decentralization and project completion time as well as between project costs and decentralization, this would confirm a major assumption underlying both GOE's decentralization policy and the BVS program -- that governmental decentralization will

enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of providing public services, thereby accelerating the rural development process.

Another difference among governorates is that Sohag had not made provisions for project maintenance, while the other two governorates had done so. It should be emphasized, however, that while the required maintenance accounts had been established in Sharkia and Fayoum the team did not observe evidence of active maintenance programs in either of these two governorates.

There are a number of similarities among the three 1980 governorates. The most striking similarity is the tendency to upgrade older water systems and deteriorating rural roads rather than building new water and road projects. Again, this means that while quality of service seems to have been improved, these projects generally have only reached a moderate number of new beneficiaries. The projects are, however, affecting a large number of people.

When questioned about the desirability of training -- either technical or managerial -- almost all village chiefs asserted that they did not feel a need of such support.

Additionally, almost all village chiefs stated that they did not need or want technical assistance from outside the governorate (although governorate level officials in Sohag and Sharkia cited the lack of technicians as a major constraint to the project implementation at the village level.) These attitudes have

definite implications for the role of the proposed AID contractor which will be discussed later.

Finally, the village chiefs interviewed, when asked what type of projects they would undertake next if they had additional money, did not hesitate to enumerate more similar projects -- mainly potable water and roads. The team felt certain that the villages had the capacity to absorb much higher funding levels both to rebuild archaic infrastructure and to initiate new projects.

A summary of the 1980 projects in the three governorates is seen in Table 4.

Table 4.

Summary of BVS Projects Funded in
Sharkia, Fayoum, and Sohog Governorates, 1980

Governorate	no. of Projects	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Sharkia	63†	3,935,208	2,579,721
Fayoum	118	3,184,157	2,146,276
Sohog	73	3,480,622	881,563
Totals	254	10,599,987	5,610,139

- Notes: a) Equal to U.S.\$ 15,051,981 using conversion of L.E. 1.00 = \$ 1.42.
- b) Equal to U.S.\$ 7,966,397 using conversion of L.E. 1.00 = \$ 1.42.
- c) "Disbursed" as percentage of "appropriated" funding equals 53%.

Source: Derived from data in ORDEV annual report on BVS with all project data as of 12/31/80.

III. REVIEW OF THE 1981 BVS GOVERNORATES

A. Giza Governorate

At the time the evaluation team visited the Giza governorate, BVS implementation plans were in place and projects had been selected but funds had not been disbursed to the governorate. (Since our visit we understand that Giza has received 1.1 million in order to begin BVS project construction.)

While both governorate officials and the local ORDEV representative consider potable water projects to be of highest priority for Giza, project proposals from the village were considered in the selection process. In all, the governorate approved 143 water projects and 23 road projects. The projects are listed in Appendix Table 3.

All five markazes in Giza received BVS funding with monies allocated on a per capita basis. Projects were proposed by the local units to the respective markazes which then forwarded requests to the governorate. The governorate gave priority to projects in areas with the highest population density.

Both financial and technical records will originate at the local unit level. The local units will send copies of these records to the markazes and governorate. At this time the Giza governorate will provide most of the technical assistance for

BVS implementation, as the markazes do not have sufficient capability to do so. Governorate officials think they might need more engineering consultants, and stated that they would prefer Egyptian engineers.

No training programs have been planned for Giza, although governorate officials realize that such programs should be established in the near future. Training in project planning is needed at the local unit and markaz level, while technical training is required by markaz and governorate-level engineers.

Giza would like to utilize an incentive system, and ORDEV has requested a BVS participation incentive fund from USAID. At this time, however, Giza has no incentive system and does not intend to use BVS monies for this purpose.

A formal evaluation plan has not yet been established for Giza. Governorate officials plan to adopt the ORDEV evaluation system developed in Cairo. (ORDEV wants all governorates to use a uniform evaluation system.)

The only problem Giza officials have experienced so far is the allocation of funds in cases where a project will benefit people in more than one local unit. Apparently, local units are reluctant to implement projects that will benefit other local units.

B. Minufia Governorate

Various officials including the governor and executive secretary were interviewed in Miunfia in order to assess the status of the 1981 BVS program.

The markaz level officials have been given the lead role in meeting with all the local councils to choose projects. Because water projects often involve laying additional pipeline which damage roads, water projects will be completed before road improvements are undertaken. The projects approved and submitted to ORDEV-Cairo are summarized below. A complete list of projects appears in Appendix Table

<u>Type of Project</u>	<u>Amount Appropriated</u>
Potable Water	2,615,500
Sanitary Drainage	190,000
Roads	194,000
TOTAL	<u>L.E. 3,000,000</u>

Village entrance roads and sanitary drainage are to be scheduled after the water projects are completed.

The water projects represent the usual pattern of refurbishing, upgrading and extending the system to satellite villages.

Funding was first allocated on a per capita basis. The second priority was for those villages without water and having the largest population.

The markaz chief has been charged with meeting with the popular councils in selecting and planning the projects. The first allocation of L.E. 1.11 million from Title III has been received and the markaz chiefs have been consolidating equipment lists in order for the governorate to make a consolidated purchase of all equipment and pipes. The governorate and markaz officials are aware of possible problems with delays in pipe deliveries and are assessing the problem.

The local units will implement the projects and let contracts with technical assistance from the markaz. Project management will be jointly run by the local council and the markaz. There will be an attempt to use, as much as possible, residents from the respective local units as contractors and laborers. Financial records will be maintained at the markaz level with copies at the local unit. Money will be disbursed at the markaz level after obtaining authorization of chief of the local unit. Technical and project records will be kept at both the local unit and markaz level.

The governorate has formulated a written monitoring and evaluation program which places principal authority for monitoring the program on the local unit. Additionally, two

committees have been formed, one at the markaz level and one at the governorate level. The committees will be made up of representatives from both the popular and executive councils. The governorate will award bonuses from its own funds, based on success in completing the projects to local unit and markaz level personnel. This will not exceed more than one or two months salary and will be authorized by the Governor.

The main training need indicated was for technicians (not engineers) at the local unit level. The local unit leaders also indicated a need for training in project management. Additionally, a need for training of technical people at the markaz and governorate level was expressed.

The officials felt there was a need for technical assistance in determining what type of sanitary drainage systems are most suited for villages in Minufia. They had already contracted for these studies from Cairo and Alexandria Universities and said they would pass on the reports to USAID. They did not feel that there were any other areas in which technical assistance was necessary.

In summary, Minufia appears well prepared to implement the BVS program this year. Officials have done some advance planning and considered alternatives before proceeding. They have also made the conscious decision that the first stage of decentralization should be directed by the markaz level. They felt that

after the markaz has worked closely with the popular councils during the first year, the local units would be prepared to take on greater responsibilities. It appears that Minufia may serve as another model for the BVS program if they proceed as well in the future as they have up to now.

C. Qalyubiyah Governorate

The evaluation team interviewed various officials at the governorate level in Qalyubiyah in order to assess the governorate's level of preparedness for participation in the BVS program in 1981.

The ORDEV officials in Benha have already submitted a list of approved BVS projects to ORDEV-Cairo. A summary of the projects appears below, and the complete list of projects appears in Appendix Table 5.

<u>Type of Project</u>	<u>Amount Appropriated in L.E.</u>
Potable Water	1,940,100
Roads	1,406,784
Sanitary Drainage	40,000
TOTAL	<u>3,386,884</u>

About 57% of the funding was allocated to potable water projects, while 42% was marked for roads projects. Only one per cent of the funding was appropriated to sanitary drainage projects.

The proposed projects represent the familiar pattern of being largely projects to rebuild existing water systems and upgrade earthen roads. However, some of the water projects will create new systems to extend potable water to new beneficiaries. And for many of the road projects, BVS funded improvements will be supplemented with governorate funds to provide asphaltting.

In Qaiyubiyah, the funding was allocated to each and every markaz based on a per capita formula. All projects originated at the local unit or markaz level, and the ORDEV officials indicated that every local unit would receive some BVS funding.

There is an ORDEV training program in place in Benha. For the past five years, four or five groups of about 30 local officials each have been brought into Benha for training in the general area of public administration with particular emphasis on the planning of roads and potable water systems. Because of the existence of this training program, ORDEV officials do not feel that any technical assistance from outside the governorate is necessary.

Unlike Fayoum, there is no formal incentive program planned. However, the local unit and markaz officials who supervise BVS funded projects will apparently receive salary incentives of

L.E. 100-200 annually based on their rank and performance. ORDEV officials stressed that the "bonus" money will come from governorate appropriations, not from BVS funding.

All financial and technical documents pertaining to BVS projects will originate at the governorate level. The ORDEV officials indicated that the local units are not yet capable of maintaining financial records despite the existing training program. Copies of contractor payments, bank balances and other disbursements will be provided to the respective markaz and local unit.

During the implementation of the BVS projects, the project monitoring will be conducted by governorate level officials from the various departments (e.g. Housing, Waterworks, Roads.) A final evaluation of BVS projects will be conducted by the governorate's planning department and ORDEV.

When questioned about problems encountered in the BVS planning process and possible technical assistance needs, the ORDEV and governorate officials in Benha concurred in stating that no problems have been encountered and that no technical assistance from outside the governorate is needed. Only the future can determine if their assessment is accurate.

In summary, Qalyubiyah appears to be adequately prepared to participate in the 1981 BVS program. The degree of decentralization in the planning process had not been as favorable as the Fayoum governorate, however.

IV. GENERALIZATIONS, ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR AID AND USDA

A. On Rebuilding Rural Infrastructure

During 1980, the ORDEV reports indicate that BVS funding was used to implement about 268 separate projects in the governorates of Sharkia, Fayoum and Sohog. An inspection of the project list alone would indicate that the impact of BVS has been widespread. In actuality, however, the evaluation revealed that the impact of BVS has been even broader in geographic scope than a mere reading of the project listing would imply.

Site visits revealed that many construction activities listed as a single "project" in the ORDEV reports were actually a cluster of three to five descreet sub-projects. In the Gerga markaz of Sohag governorate, for example, there is a rural road listed as the El Berba project with funding of L.E. 26,000. In reality, this project consists of three separate road upgrading activities which will serve a total of eight villages with a combined population of 60,000 persons. Similar cases exist in many of the potable water projects as well.

In all three of the governorates on line in 1980, another pattern held almost uniformly: BVS funding is being used largely to rebuild existing worn-out rural infrastructure. In other cases, BVS is funding the upgrading of existing infrastructure

(e.g. increasing the flow capacity of a water system, or improving the width of a road.) But in very few cases is BVS money being used to extend roads or potable water to new beneficiaries -- that is, families who are being afforded access to roads and piped potable water for the first time.

In most of the water systems and rural roads inspected by the evaluation team, many years of deferred maintenance and neglect have taken a heavy toll. The use of BVS funding to refurbish this existing infrastructure certainly appears to be cost effective -- the demand for these "basic village services" is certainly already in place.

However, the implications of this approach (rebuilding or upgrading versus extension of services to "new beneficiaries") are several. Briefly, the following topics deserve mention:

- o the "visibility" of these projects is generally low;
- o the measurement of their impact is difficult;
- o such fragmented projects are difficult to trace;
- o baseline data for planning or monitoring such projects is virtually non-existent; and
- o is the BVS program intended to be used largely as a maintenance funding source for rural infrastructure?

Relative to typical rural development projects (such as the construction of clinics or schools), the BVS projects have very low visibility. That is, there is little tangible physical evidence of their implementation. This is especially true of the rural water systems, where BVS funds are generally used to:

- (a) drill a new well with higher flow capacity; and
- (b) convert the pump from diesel to electric power.

Typically, the final impact of such a project is that a village which in the past had piped water available only six to eight hours daily will now have tap water available at all hours.

Measurement of the impact of typical BVS potable water or road projects will be difficult, if not impossible. Most conventional impact methodologies attempt to define new benefits bestowed on new beneficiaries. But attaching of a value to increased hours of water availability, or the levelling of an existing earthen road, will be a demanding task.

The typical BVS project is fragmented and will be difficult to trace. Indeed, the end-of-project status of many of the projects is questionable. This observation is not meant to detract from the basic worthiness of the projects, but merely to raise a point of consideration for auditors and future evaluators.

Baseline data against which to measure the end-of-project status and viability of the diffuse and fragmented BVS projects

is virtually non-existent. Typical of all infrastructural projects, the BVS activities create a public good, and the benefits are reaped by a large number of persons scattered over a large geographic area. The beneficiaries are often arrayed over several different local units and markazes. The gathering of meaningful data for monitoring and impact evaluation would be a very expensive task.

The final topic which deserves some discussion is the question of maintenance. This potential pitfall is addressed in the program agreement which requires the set-aside of governorate or local funds for maintenance equal to 10% of the cost of the given BVS project(s). When questioned by the evaluation team, officials at all levels -- local unit, markaz and governorate -- almost uniformly replied that the BVS projects will be maintained by the use of existing government appropriations.

However, the reality of the generally poor conditions of Egyptian rural infrastructure leads to a certain amount of skepticism. In effect, the current BVS projects are being used to compensate for the neglected or deferred maintenance of previously existing projects. Given the reality of population growth and the competing budgetary demands from other sectors, there is little evidence on which to base optimism for the future maintenance of BVS-funded projects.

B. BVS Impact on Rural Population

Because BVS has multiple objectives of building rural infrastructure while fostering the process of decentralization in the Egyptian government, different yardsticks must be used to gauge the success of the program.* The decentralization objectives have been addressed in other sections; the appropriateness of the rural infrastructure projects implemented to date as outputs of the overall project purpose now deserves brief discussion.

There are many positive aspects of the BVS projects and their impact on the rural population. Most immediately observable is the fact that all of the projects inspected are clearly creating public goods, and the benefits of these goods are accruing more or less evenly to rural, low-income persons. Indeed, all of the projects visited are intended to provide services so "basic" that there is little opportunity -- if any -- for a particular portion of the beneficiaries to take unfair advantage of the situation.

In the case of potable water projects, public taps are provided in all hamlets served by a given system. Individual home hook-ups are usually available at a cost of L.E. 40-50 -- admit-

* The stated objectives of both the USAID and PL 480 - Title III emphasize the decentralization process. However, the Title III funding also carries the additional purpose of providing rural infrastructure to support agricultural development.

tedly a lot of money by village standards, but not an absolute necessity anyhow.

All of the roads inspected are earthen-based with a gravel toplayer and appear to be appropriate for the given useage. Most of the roads projects are merely the upgrading of poor roads or trails, thus allowing the access of four-wheel vehicles (e.g. taxis, ambulances, produce trucks) for the first time.

The sanitary drainage projects in Fayoum, where excessive ground water is a ubiquitous problem, are especially appropriate. In all cases observed, the construction techniques -- whether roads, ditches, or water wells/pipelines -- are very labor intensive in nature. In most cases, local village labor is hired for the construction phase. Thus, in addition to decentralization training and infrastructure construction, the BVS is generating local -- although temporary -- income in hundreds of villages.

Perhaps the most impressive feature of BVS projects is the factor of local contributions. In 15 of the 26 cases observed (8 of 12 cases in Fayoum), villagers contributed either labor or land to the BVS projects. Labor contributions occurred in two forms. In some cases, labor was provided without wages; in other projects, villagers worked under the supervision of local unit technicians (not contractors) for wages lower than prevailing wage rates. These contributions provide an important indication that the BVS projects are meeting the felt needs of rural residents.

In no cases did the evaluation team observe the use of inappropriate (or capital intensive) technology. Also, no cases of harmful environmental impact were observed. In the few cases where new roads were being constructed, care was being taken to avoid the use of agriculturally productive land.

In summary, the BVS projects observed appear to be meeting both the requirements of the USAID congressional mandate, and the intermediate objectives of the BVS program agreement.

C. Decentralization: The Appropriate Level?

While the BVS program's physical outputs are the most obvious outputs, and the easiest to measure and discuss, these projects are to be accomplished within the context of the program's purpose -- to improve and expand a continuing capacity in the local units to plan, organize, finance, implement and maintain locally chosen infrastructure projects. Therefore, the team has been constantly grappling with the question: What level of decentralization is appropriate for each stage of project implementation?

The assumption that project selection/initiation responsibilities should lie with the popularly-elected village councils is a basic tenet of the BVS program. Since project planning is to reflect local choice based on need, finance and future growth, clearly the popularly elected village units are the appropriate

institutions for articulating local choice. However, from the assertion that these village units should initiate infrastructural projects, it does not necessarily follow that the village level should be responsible for the other stages of project implementation.

Project planning and design requires technical and managerial expertise often not available on the village level. Experience so far with BVS indicates that most of the technical expertise resides at the markaz and governorate level. However, if planning and design is accomplished solely at these higher levels of government there is a danger that local needs and choices will be overshadowed by technical expediency. For example, locating a new road, a political process requiring individuals to give up their landholdings should involve active village-level participation. The engineer at the markaz or governorate level would tend to plan a road on the basis of entirely technical criteria such as water table or soil type. Obviously, it is desirable to include both local needs and sound, cost-effective design at the project planning phase. Therefore, we suggest that governorate-level technicians work with village council officials to assure that both political and technical components receive proper consideration in the project planning phase.

Coordination of the many BVS infrastructure projects also requires a balance between local needs and overall efficient use of resources. Again using road projects as an example, it is desirable that local choice of new road projects fit into the entire network of roads in a geographic area in order to maximize project benefits. The boundary of a village or markaz is obviously too small a context in which to plan road projects. Of course the fact that all BVS projects must be approved at the governorate level should mitigate the danger that roads to nowhere will be built. Again, the point is that it is often desirable that governorate-level input be integrated with village-level input at the project planning and design stage.

With respect to project implementation and maintenance issues of efficiency and effectiveness assume great importance. Economics of scale must be considered as must cost effectiveness, infrastructural coordination and the capability to implement programs. That Sohag officials chose to award a number of road projects to the same contractor may have been a reasonable choice. This makes it feasible for the contractor to use his most advanced machinery. If each village were doing a small road project at a different time, such equipment would probably not be used. So in this case, coordination at the governorate level may result in more cost-effective road construction (although construction delays can also be attributed to the contractors.)

Further, with five engineers for 51 villages, the technical capability apparently does not exist for decentralized project implementation in Sohag at this time.

On the other hand, village level participation in the project implementation phase increases the likelihood that the project will be well maintained. If villagers view a project as the American's project or the governorate's project, they are more likely to allow the project to deteriorate than if they view it as their own project. Perhaps it follows that if project implementation takes place at the village level then project maintenance should take place at the village level; and if project implementation takes place at the markaz or governorate level (without village involvement) then it would be realistic to make markaz or governorate-level maintenance provisions.

To conclude, although it is highly desirable that village councils initiate projects and actively participate in their planning and design, it may not be technically efficient or feasible for actual project implementation to take place at the village level.

D. Fayoum: Salary Incentives that Work

Before visiting Fayoum, the team received glowing reports about Fayoum's performance in the BVS program. Our visit confirmed that the enthusiasm was well founded. Project initiation, planning and implementation were primarily in the hands of the village councils, which received technical assistance from markaz and governorate-level officials. Projects were being completed rapidly at costs significantly below projections (and also below costs for comparable projects in Sharkia and Sohag). Fayoum could well serve as a model for the other eight governorates.

We asked both Fayoum's Assistant Secretary General, Hosain Dawood, and ORDEV representative, Amin Mansour, to what they attribute Fayoum's success in implementing the BVS program. Each cited a number of factors, but the one factor the team thought to be most significant was Fayoum's "incentive system."

Fayoum has different incentive systems for different types of projects. Overall, village chiefs can raise their incomes from L.E. 50 per month to L.E. 80 through effective project implementation. For BVS projects, the difference between projected costs and actual project costs is disbursed accordingly:

90% goes into the village development fund to be applied toward expanding the original project or to other development projects. Ten per cent of the total is used for

income incentives. Of this ten per cent, 70 percent goes to the village council chief, and the rest is divided among markaz and governorate-level officials and technicians.

This type of program has both advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, village chiefs are more likely to accept full responsibility for implementing the BVS projects and expediting their completion. Clearly the system provides a strong incentive to minimize construction costs. The incentive to reduce costs has resulted in the hiring of local labor -- as private contractors are rarely used; this means more income for the villagers, at least temporarily.

On the other hand, this system also provides an incentive for local unit chiefs to overestimate project costs and pay local labor as little as possible. In practice, these factors do not seem to have been detrimental. As stated above, Fayoum is completing its water projects at about half the cost of Sharkia's and Sohag's water projects. The problematic issue is one of legality for AID. The salary supplementation question should be resolved for BVS and other AID projects.

Other factors to which Fayoum's success is attributed by Mr. Dawood and Mr. Monsour are as follows:

- The governorate-level departments cooperate with each other and support the ORDEV representative.
- At the local level, a team spirit has been promoted among officials and technicians.
- The decentralization concept is widely understood and supported by the villagers and their representatives.
- Fayoum follows the rules and keeps its books open.
- The governorate officials closely monitor village-level operations.
- The Fayoum governorate uses the "management by objectives" strategy.
- The executive council chiefs were screened and selected very carefully.
- Mr. Dawood, himself, was formerly a village chief. He understands their situation and communicates with them directly.

E. Village Sanitation

The general sanitation level in most villages visited by the evaluation team is extremely poor. Both organic and inorganic waste is abundant in all public areas, including streets, drainage ditches and public water taps.

Many of the BVS projects (e.g. potable water and drainage projects) are designed to have a direct positive impact on the sanitation and health conditions of rural villages. A clean and regular potable water supply will undoubtedly improve the living conditions of virtually all persons living in a village with such a system.

However, it must be pointed out that in some cases the evaluation team observed circumstances where the potable water projects might have a negative impact on village sanitation. Some of the recently-constructed public water outlets have become surrounded by a zone of mud and human and animal feces. The villagers who use such outlets -- usually women and small children -- must literally wade in their bare feet through this quagmire in order to fill their water vessels.

Public water outlets in this condition may provide villagers with piped potable water for the first time but they also present a new vector for the transmission of various diseases. On the balance, the improved access to cleaner water may be offset by increased exposure of individuals to contagious diseases. In the design and installation of public water outlets, proper drainage for spilled water must be provided in addition to self-closing taps. The provision of a sloped zone of cement or clean gravel around the public outlets is an absolute necessity if the potable water projects are to have a positive impact on the sanitary conditions of villages.

Of the projects reviewed by the evaluation team, the drainage ditches in Fayoum appeared to have the greatest positive impact on village sanitation. In several cases, the drainage projects caused a 12 to 18 inch drop in the ground water level and areas of the village previously under standing water had dried up completely. Although the drainage ditches do present new bodies of stagnant water, the overall area of stagnant water in the villages was greatly reduced.

According to the project paper, about 10% of overall BVS funding is to be spent on sanitation projects such as drainage and sanitary sewers. However, interviews and visits to villages revealed that the improvement of sanitary conditions in rural villages is apparently not a high priority item.

F. GOE Expectations and Support

The BVS program was initiated and is being implemented by the Government of Egypt. In subsidizing this program the USG is, in effect, supporting the GOE's decentralization policy, which is set forth in Public Laws 52 (1975) and 43 (1979). These policy initiatives promote governmental decentralization as a means by which to expedite rural development. GOE shows signs of continued active support for decentralization, and is currently considering legislation that would result in even greater policy and program input for elected officials at all levels of government.

One measure of support for BVS at the governorate level is illustrated by the case of Qalubiyah. Governorate officials plan to complete many road projects with BVS funds, then use governorate monies to provide asphaltting to protect the basic improvements made possible by BVS.

Additionally, United States support for BVS is significant to the GOE because it allows for the implementation of projects; some of which could not otherwise have been afforded. Finally, BVS provides general economic support to GOE in the form of agricultural commodities valued at \$75 million, as well as a \$70 million grant.

V. MONITORING AND EVALUATING FOR BVS

A. The Proposed System

The study by Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) provides excellent background information on the issues involved in decentralization in Egypt. The goal of the decentralization policy is to provide improved rural living standards with control over local development programs at the lowest level of administrative competence. The current state of rural infrastructure is a result of the conscious policy at the national level of extracting resources from agriculture through taxation, pricing and other policies to finance industrial and urban development as well as defense costs. The centralized administrative system has been used as the means for mobilizing resources. The success of decentralization requires changes in the national policy of extracting resources if resources are to remain available for continued investment in refurbishing and upgrading of rural infrastructure from the rural sector to more balanced growth as well as changing the administrative structure. Thus, the measurement of decentralization should include macro-level indicators that show an increased flow of resources and income going to the rural sector as well as the more micro indicators suggested in the DAI report.

The principal measures of decentralization proposed by DAI are the degree of:

1. Control over financial resources,
2. Management of personnel; and
3. Administration of government activities.

For each of these measures a number of indications are proposed and illustrated by data collected in selected local units and governorates. These indicators are adequate and should serve as a guide in the evaluation process but require extensive data and analysis to carry out. In the beginning, a simplified system should be used based on existing data and manpower availability.

B. Toward Appropriate Design for Monitoring

The strategy for developing an appropriate monitoring and evaluation system should be to select the least number of indications for which information can be obtained easily and that will be useful for project management. These can be expanded to cover more detail as experience is gained. These indicators should be supplemented by carefully selected more intensive case studies based on extensive interviews with local unit chiefs, markaz and governorate officials.

The monitoring of BVS projects to date has involved monthly and quarterly reporting from local units and governorate level officials involved as well as quarterly spot checks by an ORDEV monitoring team in each governorate. The quarterly and other reports provided to the team were of limited usefulness and not consistent. Standard reporting formats have been devised (see 1980 evaluation report) and there is also a system of reporting to be followed. While there may exist sufficient reports in Arabic, it was not clear to the team that these were adequate or sufficient for monitoring the implementation of projects or overall utilization of funds. The first priority should be the implementation of a standardized financial reporting system. USAID should be provided with these reports and sufficient translations made to meet the USG requirement for project management and monitoring.

Finally, since the thrust of this program is decentralization, the focus should be on helping the governorates have the capacity to monitor and evaluate the project -- rather than having the monitoring and evaluation system centralized in ORDEV.

C. Appropriate Technology for Financial Record Keeping

Some members of the team have had considerable experience in the application of automated data processing in other developing countries. Experience indicates that while it is possible to develop the capability for computerized systems, their use requires extensive training and a long gestation period before an adequate pool of expertise is developed. In addition, once the technicians have been trained there is a large demand for their skills from the private sector, which makes retention of staff difficult. Thus, a careful evaluation of the existing financial system and how it could be improved using different methods should be done.

For example, considerable improvement in the financial system might be obtained by providing a large number of easily maintained calculators together with training in accounting and financial systems. Even if a computerized system to handle financial record keeping is developed, it will be necessary to maintain a parallel manual system until the system is proven reliable.

D. Data Collection and Analysis

The 1980 evaluation recommended the development of benchmark data on such indicators as number of villages and percentage of persons having potable water, kilometers of roads, amount of canals

currently lined and other basic data for use as indicators of progress in the implementation of the projects. This data is available and was used by Asmon in his reports but has yet to be organized in a more usable fashion. As the implementation of the project proceeds, it will be useful to show how and what the project has accomplished in increasing the access to those services being provided under the BVS program.

As of now little has been done concerning collection of other data for use in monitoring and evaluation. As was indicated elsewhere in the report, data collection should be based on availability, usefulness and available manpower.

E. Other Observations

Various types of construction activities may be suitable for implementation at different levels of administration, and even for discrete projects there may be economies of scale for either construction or maintenance if combined into a single larger project. Thus, there is continued need to compare the quality and design of projects implemented by villages with those implemented by the governorate.

In the case of Fayoum, where the incentives are based on savings the initial cost estimates will need to be monitored to see that they are not inflated and that completed projects are of acceptable standards.

While there is a large demand for BVS type projects and the expertise to carry them out, there are some constraints that are likely to be reached. The first constraint, which has already been encountered, is the adequate supply of materials. The water projects in Sharkia are currently stalled until the pipe couplings are delivered. This potential problem was identified by Asmon in 1979 and ORDEV was advised to ask that the asbestos pipe manufacturing plant be expanded. With the number of additional water projects now on line, this is likely to become an even greater problem unless alternative sources of supply are found. Even then, there may be delays. The list of proposed projects should be examined carefully to identify other potential problems.

The implementation of increased numbers of projects may eventually run into an institutional constraint of insufficient managerial resources. Coordination between ORDEV and the governorates, as well as between AID and ORDEV, will have to increase as all of the governorates begin to implement the BVS program.

Finally, while there can potentially be a large number of project types for which BVS funds can be used, in reality by the time the popular councils act the possible areas have been considerably limited. Efforts should continue to be made to expand the eligible areas in which projects can be undertaken.

VI. BVS TRAINING: PRESENT AND FUTURE

In the Title III agreement (as amended in June 1980), the USG and GOE agreed that Egypt would develop and staff a training program for the purpose of strengthening BVS implementation capability. The team found that such a program has not yet been developed by ORDEV, although a BVS-oriented component has been included in another ORDEV training program. This section includes a description of the current status of ORDEV training with respect to BVS, as well as a discussion of future BVS-related training.

ORDEV operates training facilities in Fayoum, Minufiya, Assuit, El Minya and Benisuef. The main training branch is located in Alexandria but will be moved to Sakkara when that facility is completed.

Training curriculum is varied, depending on ORDEV's clientele. It includes both technical and administrative courses, although it appears that the latter type of curriculum is emphasized.

One of ORDEV's programs, which is for village council chiefs, is geared toward planning, implementing and managing Local Development Fund (an AID-funded loan program) projects. The program lasts for two months and is held in Alexandria. One third of Egypt's village council chiefs participate in this program each year. Hence, ORDEV officials expect to complete the program in three years. While this program has not been deliberately

oriented to BVS management, its curriculum appears to be useful in this regard.

Another ORDEV training course that is closely related to BVS management is a three-day course for popular and executive council officials. The purpose of this course is to have participants better understand their roles, duties and legal obligations. In addition, the course is designed to promote a better working relationship between elected and appointed village officials, as there has been some contention between these two groups. The curriculum emphasizes management, planning and problem solving (for which a case-study approach is used.)

During our visit to Minufiya the evaluation team had the opportunity to observe this course in progress. The participants seemed extremely enthusiastic about the course, although several of them expressed a desire for the inclusion of more technical material.

While ORDEV does not yet have a training plan tailored to BVS, some BVS training had been added to the two-month Alexandria course the last few times it was offered. The curriculum included BVS priority identification and project selection. Also discussed were the philosophy and benefits of decentralization.

ORDEV is now in the process of considering appropriate curriculum for BVS support. ORDEV's executive director for training mentioned the following subjects for possible inclusion: planning,

budgeting, revenue generation, evaluation and follow-up; public administration, group dynamics and cost-benefit analysis. Additionally, technical training is needed for engineers and other technicians. He noted that while the appointed village executive council chiefs tend to be well educated, the elected popular council officials usually have limited educational backgrounds and stressed the importance of taking this into account when formulating training plans.

The AID project agreement provides funding for a BVS training component. A consultant will be hired by AID to work with ORDEV in developing such a program. Additionally, some training for ORDEV staff in areas such as finance, management, engineering and maintenance may be provided by AID.

It should be noted that the majority of village council chiefs did not perceive a need for BVS-related training. Also, the team did not observe a need for US training in support of BVS. If such training is undertaken it should be done on a limited basis for selected central government and governorate-level officials.

Finally, it is recommended that BVS training be integrated with other closely-related ORDEV training programs. Not only would this allow for efficient use of training resources, it would also promote the utilization of the benefits of BVS-related training for improving management of all public service projects. This approach would be harmonious with BVS's capacity-building purpose.

VII. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

While not in the original scope of work, USAID-Cairo requested that the evaluation team give its opinion on technical assistance needs for BVS. The RFP has been issued and the proposal received. Thus, it was thought that any comments the team has would be useful in making the final selection.

All governorate and local officials interviewed were asked what outside technical assistance was needed for BVS project planning and implementation. In every case except Minufia, no outside technical assistance was thought to be necessary. In Minufia, technical assistance was requested to determine what kinds of sanitary drainage systems are needed. Cairo and Alexandria Universities were already asked to look into the problems by governorate officials. There is thus no great felt need for technical assistance beyond what is available in Egypt.

The team believes that the projects which are being undertaken use known and appropriate technology given the existing conditions. The one exception is bio-gas which is still in the experimental stages in Egypt, as in other parts of the world. The team did not obtain a good feel for the desire at the ORDEV level for technical assistance, though officials appeared to expect it.

In the view of the team, there is a need for technical assistance of the type provided by previous consultants such as I. Asmon, and in the financial, management and training areas. The team should be limited to a relatively small number of persons who are both technically qualified and are knowledgeable in Arabic and Egyptian culture. It will be necessary for the team to establish good lines of communication with Egyptian officials at all levels as well as AID so as to be able to provide assistance in a collaborative style. The top priority areas to be filled first are the financing and budgeting specialist and someone with both planning and engineering experience. Primary reliance should be placed on Egyptian staff for any other technical assistance needs. Furthermore, the technical assistance staff should be prepared to work in a given governorate for relatively long periods of time.

IIX.FINANCIAL STATUS OF BVS

A. Introduction

This program integrates funding from two sources: PL 480 Title III and a direct grant from AID. Once the money is generated, it becomes a single fund for undertaking the program. However, the funding in reality is a combination of GOE and USG funding. The Title III program is still a Title I sales agreement under which the loan is forgiven provided the proceeds from the "sales of the commodities" are used according to the Food for Development program i.e. BVS. The funds generated by Title III are deposited in the special account and thus owned by the GOE.

A second area in which the funds differ is the point at which disbursement is supposed to occur. USAID considers disbursement to have occurred when the equivalent amount of Egyptian pounds have been deposited in the special account. For purposes of the Title III agreement, disbursement is considered to have occurred when the money is transferred from the special account to the village or local unit account.

B. The Loan Forgiveness Process

Once the transfer of funds to the village account has been made the GOE notifies the USG and provides whatever documentation has been agreed upon. The USG then certifies that the disbursements have been made and notifies the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture using the appropriate form (see Appendix Table 6). The CCC then establishes a Currency Use Offset (CUO) account. This is an interest-bearing account from which payments due are offset until the account is exhausted. When the CCC is notified that an amount equivalent to CCC value of the commodities shipped has been used for agreed upon activities the loan is considered to have been completely paid. According to the agreement, the GOE has two years from the time of the last shipment to complete the program. Any funds not used would then revert to Title I to be used for self-help activities.

C. Implementation Actions

The following is a schedule of specific implementation actions to date:

March 20, 1979	Title III Agreement signed
May 14 - June 7, 1979	Arrival of commodities in 5 ships

June - September 1979	Deposit of the equivalent value (L.E. 9,858,000) by food authority in Central Bank
November 1979	Opening of the special account in the National Bank and transfer of the funds less 0.28% service charge by the Central Bank
November - December 1979	Approval of projects totalling L.E. 9,838,311.20
December 1979	Transfer of above to the three governorates in the following amounts:
FAYOUM	L.E. 2,988,978.70
SHARKIA	L.E. 3,368,457.20
SOHAG	L.E. 3,480,895.30
	<hr/>
TOTAL	L.E. 9,838,311.20
January 1980	Transfer of the total to village or directorate accounts for 268 projects in the villages (Local Units)
June 30, 1980	First amendment to the March 20, 1979 PL 480 agreement
June 1980	USAID BVS proposal submitted for USAID Washington review
July 8, 1980	PA #EG 7031 for \$15,000,000 (approx. 90,000 MT) issued
July 22, 1980	USAID BVS proposal approved NE Advisory Committee

August 28, 1980	BVS project authorization signed
August 31, 1980	Project agreement signed between GOE and USG
Sept - October 1980	Arrival of 88,465.66 tons of wheat valued at \$14,878,506.51
January 20-25, 1981	Deposit of \$14,878,506.50 by Ministry of Supply in National Egyptian Bank
January 25, 1981	Deposit of above less 5% for letter of credit on \$14,134,581.18
January 1981	Conditions precedent met and USAID disbursement process begun for \$20 million grant
February 1981	Transfer of L.E. 1,110,000 to 9 governorates as first payment for BVS program in 1981
March - April 1981	Deposit of L.E. equivalent of \$20 million AID grant expected and subsequent transfer of governorates.

D. Problem Areas

Because the procedures for handling forgiveness are new, it has taken some time for both Washington and the country team to develop and put these procedures into place. Therefore, even though the GOE had met the disbursement requirements under the Title III agreement prior to the first interest payment being due, the country team has not yet certified and reported to the CCC that this has occurred. Thus, the GOE was billed and paid the first interest payment due on June 6, 1980 of \$279,997.61

The GOE has requested that this payment be reimbursed or applied to other Title I indebtedness.

The USAID controllers office has been designated as the responsible unit for maintaining and reporting the financial status for Title III. Reporting to the CCC should begin in the next few weeks. Once the first reports have been completed the issue of the GOE first payment will have to be considered.

E. Combining Title III and USAID Funds

While there is no difference in the manner in which the funds from both sources are to be used, there are different accounting and legal requirements. Funds generated under Title III are legally owned by the GOE and are subject to GOE budgetary regulations. Funds generated from the USAID grant, in contrast, are viewed as U.S. owned until actually spent for project activities and therefore, are governed by USAID as well as GOE regulations. Since there has not yet been any USAID money converted to Egyptian pounds, the accounting does not yet pose any problems. However, there are some potential problems if the monies are combined and consideration should be given to maintaining separate accounting of the funds.

F. Interest and Unused Funds

There has been some controversy concerning interest that accrues on the monies held in the village accounts prior to disbursement. For funds generated under Title III there is no restriction against interest bearing accounts as long as it is consistent with project objectives and Egyptian laws and regulations. USAID regulations, however, state that any interest earned on USAID monies must be returned to USAID. The question arose because of the discovery that the interest earned on the village accounts in Sohag was being transferred to the Governorate Development Fund. It is our understanding that ORDEV has since issued regulations that all interest earning from Title III funds will be returned and placed in a special development fund controlled by the inter-ministerial committee. (Translation of regs for Annex 2). Interest on grant funds are to be returned to the USG. A copy of the regulation should be obtained for confirmation.

A second issue concerns use of funds remaining after a project has been completed. In the case of Fayoum any savings after the project is completed go into the village development fund or the incentive fund. The village development fund is used to carry out additional projects or in some cases extensions of the original project. The question is: Do these additional activities need to be approved in the same way as the original projects were?

As mentioned above, the issue of use of project funds for incentives needs to be resolved.

G. ORDEV Accounting System and Village Accounts

ORDEV has supplied information on a quarterly basis for all approved project concerning initial cost estimates, disbursements and actual utilization. These reports are handwritten in Arabic and have essentially been passed on from the governorate level without consolidation or checking. These reports contain numerous summation errors. Totals for the governorates often do not check with summary totals in other reports. This has made it difficult to assess how much of the funds have been spent. With an additional six governorates being added this will become an even greater problem unless the accounting system is improved and monitored.

Village level accounts, (except in Fayoum) are accounts in name only with the governorates retaining control over their use. While projects have in general been approved by the Popular Council (except for Fayoum) the projects are being implemented at the governorate level and funds are transferred to the designated agency from the village accounts by the governorates. While this procedure technically meets the terms of the PL 480 Title III agreement and does get projects done at the village level, the BVS program envisioned more control of use of the funds at the village level.

IX. PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Findings

The Basic Village Services program has continued to make progress since the last evaluation. Progress in Fayoum and Sharkia governorates has been good with 66% of the projects now completed. Sohag governorate has been less successful in implementing projects and has only disbursed 25% of the BVS funding received.

The projects being implemented are appropriate to the needs of the rural population and impact directly on a large number of people. Virtually all of the projects, however, are merely the refurbishing, upgrading and extending of existing rural infrastructure -- mainly roads and potable water systems. Thus, the number of new beneficiaries is relatively small in relation to the total rural population in the project areas. The technology being used is known, suitable for the conditions existing in the village and quite labor intensive. There is both temporary and a limited amount of employment generation.

In terms of the decentralization process, Fayoum is an outstanding example of what can be accomplished by giving the local village units responsibility for the management and implementation of projects. The key factors responsible for Fayoum's performance appear to be good management at the markaz and governorate

levels, plus an incentive system for the chiefs of the local units and savings for additional projects. Sohag governorate, on the other hand, while obtaining inputs from the local units, has retained control of project implementation at the governorate level. Their justification for this approach was that the lack of technical people at the markaz level and limited capability at the local level prevents further decentralization. Thus, most of the Sohag projects have been consolidated in order to use larger contractors.

Sharkiya governorate falls somewhere between the other governorates with more inputs from the local unit but the use of governorate resources, smaller contractors and local labor.

For the new (1981) governorates visited, Minufiya has used the approach of decentralization to the markaz level as the first step in the process. Qalyubiyah and Giza are similar to Sharkiya.

Monitoring has been done principally by ORDEV and the governorates on a quarterly basis. Project reporting by the local units is supposed to be done on a monthly basis. The quarterly and other reports provided to AID have been of summary types along with more detailed project lists passed on from the governorates. These reports have not been adequate nor is the annual report called for by the project agreement available in English.

The funding of BVS up to this point has been solely from Title III with the Egyptian pound equivalent of \$14.3 dollars made available to three governorates in 1980, and the Egyptian

pound equivalent of \$14.1 million is disbursed to nine governorates in 1981. An additional \$20 million from the AID grant will be made available within the next month. While disbursements have been made, the USG has yet to certify any Title III loan forgiveness because the procedures have not yet been finalized. (See Appendix Table 7 for the governorate summaries.)

B. Recommendations

1. While the decentralization process is the principal focus of the BVS program, implementation of successful projects is also crucial for continued success. Thus, continuous monitoring of project progress is an absolute necessity.

Material shortages and other technical problems that delay projects can derail the decentralization process. It is recommended that the 1981 proposed project lists be analyzed for equipment and material needs to identify potential bottle-necks. Since many of the projects are potable water systems, an adequate supply of pipes and couplings must be found or substantial delays may again result. This potential problem was identified by I. Asmon in 1979 and it is now a major problem in Sharkia.

2. With the implementation of BVS in nine governorates and a technical assistance contractor on board, the program management load will increase greatly. It is recommended

that the project monitoring be strengthened. The first priority is the implementation of a standardized financial reporting system which will be followed by all governorates. ORDEV and AID should agree on which reports will be provided, and provisions must be made for their translation to English.

3. Because of the complexity of the program and the ever larger number of projects that will soon be underway, it is necessary to develop an ongoing evaluation system as soon as possible. This system should be as simple as possible since the baseline data are not currently available for the use of a more complex system such as was proposed and developed by Development Alternatives, Inc. This approach should be supplemented by case studies based on face-to-face interviews with local unit, markaz and governorate leaders.

4. The technical assistance contract personnel must be competent in Arabic and knowledgeable of Egyptian rural culture if they are to be effective. Though there is need of technical assistance in the financial, management and planning areas, it must be delivered in a truly collaborative style and combined with the EVS training component.

5. The training program component should be technical for engineers and technicians, and managerial for administrators. There is a very limited need for U.S. training. BVS training should be integrated with other pertinent ORDEV training courses.

6. Maintenance of rural infrastructure requires more than the mere setting up of a "maintenance fund". It requires tools and equipment, trained technicians, regularly scheduled inspection for routine maintenance and training in preventive maintenance by operators. It is recommended that a plan be developed for the use of the established funds.

7. If the BVS program's decentralization objectives are to be achieved, ORDEV and USAID must stress the role of local participation in project selection -- rather than merely implementation.

8. Finally, it is necessary to work continuously to improve communication and coordination between USAID and ORDEV, and between ORDEV and the governorates, if the BVS program is to continue the successes so far achieved.

Appendix Table 1

LIST OF EVS PROJECT DOCUMENTS

I. Asmon, Technical and Economic Aspects of the Egyptian Basic Village Services Program, Cairo, April 1979.

I. Asmon, Extension of the Basic Village Services Program to Qeny Minya and El Beheira, Cairo, May 1979.

I. Asmon, Initiation of the Basic Village Service Program in Qalubiyah, Menufiyah and Gizah Governorates, USAID/Cairo, October 1980.

Development Alternatives Inc., The Basic Village Service Program, Egypt: Technical and Financial Assessment, Cairo, February 1980.

Mayfield, James B, The Budgetary System in the Arab Republic of Egypt: Its role in Local Government Development, AID/Washington, August 1977.

Mayfield, James B, Some Considerations for the Establishment of a Monitoring and Evaluation System in Rural Egypt, USAID, April 1980.

Newbury, R, and D.E. Kunkel, PL 480 Title III Evaluation Basic Village Services Egypt, Cairo, February 1980.

USAID, Project Paper, Basic Village Services Project, 263-01.03, Cairo, June 1980.

USAID, Request for Proposals.

Appendix Table 2
Summary of EVS Projects Visited by
the Evaluation Team

Governorate	Markaz	Village	Type of Project	Funding:		Village Contribution	Project Objectives Accomplished
				Budgeted	Actual (x1,000 LE)		
Sharkia	Zagazik	Bordin	Pot. Water	39	19	None	Partially
		Bisha Kayed-Bordin	Road	103	76	None	Partially
		El Aslousy	Pot. Water	12.1	11.5	None	Partially
	Belbais	Awlad Seif	Pot. Water	1.7	1.7	Labor	Yes
		Gheitah	Pot. Water	148	141	Labor	No
	Miniakank	Shabra El Nakhla	Pot. Water	32.3	26	None	Yes
		Senhoa	Pot. Water	12.4	4.5	Labor	Yes
Fayoum	Ebshawai	Kahk	Road	259	85	None	Partially
		Abcksah	Canal Imp.	45	39	Labor	Yes
		Karoon	Road	9	8.7	None	Yes
	Etsa	Abu Gandir	Sant. Drainage	57	34	*Labor	Yes
		Abu Gandir	Road	2.1	2.0	*Labor	Yes
		Abu Gandir	Bio-gas	5	5	*Labor	No
		Meniet el Heit	Canal Imp.	30	30	*Labor	Yes
	Fayoum	Kelhanah	Road	12	9	None	Yes
		El Edwah	Drainage	12	6	*Labor	Yes
		Senoures	Metartares	Road	3	2	?
	Fayoum	Ellahoun	Road	20	20	*Labor	Yes
		El Azab	Drainage	14.5	14.5	Land	Yes
	Sohog	Sohog	Edfa	Pot. Water	67.2	6	Labor
Rawafei		El Kouseir	Road	25	12	Land	Partial
Gerga		El Magabrah	Pot. Water	22.4	4.6	*Labor	No
		El Berba	Road	26	?	None	Parti
Sakoultah		Seflak	Pot. Water	22.4	7.6	None	No
El Monshah		El Zoek	Road	36	?	Land	No
		Rawai El Esawya	Pot. Water	44.8	4.5	None	No

*Villagers worked for lower wages than normal.

Appendix Table 3.
Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Giza Governorate, 1981

POTABLE WATER

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriate
El Giza	Shabramant	13,000
	El Manawat	8,000
	Om Khenan	24,000
El Badrasheir.	El Maraziek	4,000
	Dahshoor	8,000
El Ayat	Barnasht	4,000
	El Mataria	5,000
	El Kotiury	17,000
	El Nasereya	8,000
El Saff	El Akwas	10,000
	El Kobahat	10,000
	Kafr Kandiel	8,000
	El Akhsas	20,000
Embabah	Nahya	15,000
	Abou Rawash	15,000
	El Baragiel	3,000
	Berkash	10,000
	Geširet Mohamed	12,000
	Kafr Hegaz	6,000
	Monshat El Lanater	14,000
	Bortos	6,000
	Wardan	28,000
Total in L.E:		250,000

Projects Planned for EWS Funding in
Giza Governorate, 1981

POTABLE WATER

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
1. El Giza	Manial Shiba	70,000
	Shabramant	40,000
	El Manawat	75,000
	Om Khenan	45,000
2. El Badrashein	Sakkarah	70,000
	Meet Rahinah	60,000
	El Maraziek	80,000
	Dahshoor	70,000
3. Al Ayat	Barnasht	100,000
	El Mataria	60,000
	El Beleidah	40,000
	Meet El Kaied	35,000
	Tahma	40,000
	El Kotiury	65,000
	El Nasereya	55,000
4. El Saff	El Shobak El Sharky	50,000
	Soal	70,000
	El Akwas	80,000
	El Bormbel	65,000
	Etfieb	60,000
	Ghamnaza El Soghra	45,000
	El Kobabat	110,000
	Kafr Kandiel	65,000
	El Akksas	55,000

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
5. Erbahah	Nahya	240,000
	El Baragiel	60,000
	Berkash	90,000
	El Mansoureyah	35,000
	Geziret Mohamed	75,000
	Kafr Hegazy	45,000
	Mnshat El Kanater	55,000
	Bortos	55,000
	Wardan	85,000
	Wanrak El Arab	125,000
	Abu Rawash	130,000
	Bohormos	60,000
	Abou Ghaleb	70,000
	Kerdasah	100,000
6. Bahariya Oasis	5 local units no villages	125,000
Total in L.E.		2,900,000

Projects Planned for EVS Funding in
Giza Governorate, 1981

ROADS		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
El Giza	Abou El Nomros	25,000
El Ayat	Tahma	20,000
	El Kotiury	12,000
	El Beleidah	8,000
El Badrashein	El Maraziek	12,000
El Saff	El Shobak El Sharky	12,000
	Soal	12,000
	El Bombel	16,000
	Atfieh	12,000
	Ghamaza El Soghra	12,000
	Kafr Kandiel	12,000
	El Akhsas	12,000
	Embabah	El Baragiel
Berkash		16,000
Bortos		8,000
Nahya		12,000
Bohormos		12,000
Abou Rawash		12,000
Kerdasah		12,000
El Warrak		16,000
Kafr Hegazy		12,000
Monshat El Kanater		14,000
Total in L.E.		300,000
Total, all projects		3,450,000

Appendix Table 4

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Menoufia Governorate, 1981

POTABLE WATER

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Kweisna	Om Khenan	32,000
	Abnaks	81,000
	Shobra Bakhom	33,000
	Tah Shobra	56,000
	Arab El Raml	38,000
	Begrum	64,000
	Meet Berah	46,000
Tala	Kafr Rabeis	43,000
	Zawyet Bemam	48,000
	Kafr El Sokareya	23,000
	Toukh Daikah	23,000
	Zorkan	53,000
	Meet Abou El Kom	1,000
	Babel	51,000
	Saft Cocam	49,000
El Shohada	Ashma	50,000
	Darageel	38,000
	Zawyet El Bakly	36,000
	Sahel El Gawaber	29,000
	Densheway	39,000
	Zawyet El Naourah	65,000
Shebin El Kom	El Meselhah	40,000
	El May	50,000
	Shanawan	44,000
	Estabary	52,000

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
	Bakhaty	50,000
	El Batanon	109,000
	Melig	43,000
	Shobra Baas	26,000
El Bagour	Garawan	43,000
	Bi El Arab	23,000
	Meet Afif	8,600
	Bahnay	31,000
	Sobk El Dahak	15,000
	Manawahlak	42,000
	Estanha	1,000
	Kafr El Khadra	7,000
	Kafr El Bagour	3,000
Berket El Sabae	Abou Mashhour	1,000
	Sentana El Hagar	1,000
	Ganzour	1,000
	Kafr Helal	5,000
	Toukh Tanbasha	3,000
	Hourein	5,000
Mencuf	Feisha El Kobra	3,000
	Tamalay	3,000
	Monshat Soltan	4,000
	Barhim	3,000
	El Hamouly	1,000
Ashmoon	Talia	1,000
	Shamma	3,000
	Greis	7,000
	Sobk El Ahad	53,000
	Sakyat Abou Shaarah	61,500
	Darwah	36,000
	Sanshour	31,000
	Samadon	23,000
	Ramlet El Angab	13,000
	Tahwai	47,000
	Sentries	38,000
	Korus	31,000
	Shatanof	41,400
TOTAL in LE		2,615,500

Appendix Table

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Menoufia Governorate, 1981

ROADS		
Marhoz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriate
El Bagour	Meet Afif	12,400
	Mesheiref	30,000
	Zawyet Razein	79,000
	Feisha El Kobra	21,000
	Barhim	30,000
Ashmoon	Talia	7,000
	Sakyat Abou Shaarah	500
	Samadon	2,000
	Ramlet El Angab	4,000
	Shatanof	8,600
TOTAL in LE		194,500

- 11 -

Appendix Table

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Menoufia Governorate, 1981

SANITARY DRAINAGE		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Kewaisna	Om Khenan	30,000
	Arab El Raml	16,000
Tala	Toukh Dalkah	14,000
	Zorkan	14,000
	Meet Abou El Kom	8,000
	Saft Godam	8,000
Shebin El Kom	El Meselhah	8,000
	Melig	16,000
El Bagour	Sobk El Dahak	16,000
	Kafr El Khadra	8,000
Menouf	Feisha El Kobra	4,000
	Barkim	7,000
Ashmoon	Samadon	29,000
	Ramlet El Angab	8,000
	Shatanof	4,000
TOTAL in LE		190,000
TOTAL, All Projects		3 000 000

Appendix Table 5

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Qualyoubeya Governorate, 1981

ROADS			
Markaz	Village local unit	Amount Appropriated	Additional funds allocated to project by Governorate
Banha	Betaneida	80,000	35,000
	Sendanhour	153,035	85,000
	Massafa	143,035	75,000
	Tahla	33,000	18,000
	Kaffr el Gazzar	21,300	33,000
Toukh	Aghour el Kobra	93,524	51,000
	Beltan	81,010	44,750
	Meet Kenana	33,719	10,000
	El Ammar el Kobra	137,700	71,250
	Akyad Degwei	130,570	57,000
Qualyoub	Sendeyon	60,000	43,500
	Sanafier	55,750	30,000
Shebin el Kanater	Kafr Shebein	42,000	39,000
	Tahouria	177,050	80,000
El Khanka	El Manayel	55,000	52,000
	Abou Zabal	9,871	16,000
El Kanater	El Moneira	100,200	50,000
TOTAL		1,406,784	790,500*

*

From Governorate owned funds on roads

Appendix Table

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Qualyoubeya Governorate, 1981

POTABLE WATER		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Qualyoub	Belkas	88,000
	Banafeir	22,000
	Tanan	50,000
	Nay	25,400
	Sendeyon	61,000
Shebin el Kanater	El Gaafra	53,000
	Kafr Shebein	74,000
Toukh	El Deir	57,000
	Aghour el Kobra	62,000
	Beltan	82,000
	Tersa	50,000
	Meet Kenana	41,500
	El Ammar el Kobra	42,000
	Eky & Degwei	34,000
	Moushtohor	82,000
Banha	Betemeida	47,000
	Sheblanga	67,000
	Gangara	26,000
	Sendanhour	40,000
	Marsafa	60,000
	Tahla	67,000
	Kaffr el Gazza	71,200
Shebin el Kanater	Tahanoub	82,000
	Tahouria	38,000
	El Ahraz	64,000
El Khanka	El Alag	72,000
	Abou Zabab	92,000
	El Manayel	33,000
	Seryakos	40,000

POTABLE WATER - QUALYOUBEYA GOVERNORATE

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
El Kanater & El Khaireya	Sendebais	67,000
	El moneira	47,000
	Abou el Gheit	46,000
	Salakan	48,000
Kafr Shokr	El Monshah el Kobra	23,000
	Karf Tesfa	38,000
	El Shokr	36,000
	Asneit	33,000
TOTAL		1,940,100

SANITARY DRAINAGE - QUALYOUBEYA GOVERNORATE

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Shebien El Kanater	El Ahraz	16,000
Kafr Shokr	El Monshah	8,000
	El Shokr	8,000
El Kanater & El Khaireyah	Sendabeis	8,000
TOTAL		40,000

Appendix Table 6

Subject : Reporting Format for Title III, PL 480 Currency
Use Offset

Ref : A) A-484 12/2/78 B) A-467 8/24/76 C) A-313 6/3/76

1. Annex A, Item IIIB for Food Development Program (FFP) agreements require that the government of the importing country report quarterly on deposits of local currencies generated and disbursed in connection with the FFD program incorporated in the agreement. It is necessary for the USG to review the disbursements of the importing country and certify that they are eligible for application against Title I payments. The Ambassador should delegate this authority to the proper office. Disbursements in turn must be reported quarterly by the Embassy to USAD's Commodity Credit Corporation.

2. In order to receive full forgiveness for all Title I debt under a FFD agreement it is necessary for the full dollar value of local currency, in an amount equivalent to the CCC Credit furnished, to have been disbursed. The complete debt will be deemed to be offset when there is full disbursement of local currencies which were deposited in the special account, in an amount equal to the dollar value of the CCC Credit, regardless of fluctuations of exchange rates that may

occur during the life of the program. Full forgiveness does not apply in the case of RLDC's which elect to utilize disbursements from the special account to offset other Title I objections during the fiscal year. The Embassy should certify when the full dollar value of local currency generations has been disbursed, otherwise only the dollar value at the time of disbursement will be applied against the earliest installment coming due.

3. The Embassy is to work with the government of the importing country on a mutually acceptable format to use in reporting deposits and disbursements for eligible uses to the Embassy. If such a format has now been developed, your transmission of copies to Washington would be appreciated.

4. Attached to this message is a reporting format for use by the Embassy in reporting disbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Following are instructions for its use:

- a. Reports should be submitted under cover of a transmittal airgram, marked for the attention of the Chief, Fiscal Operations Branch, Financial Management Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, USDA/FOB/ASCS/USDA.
- b. Items 1 through 3 of the form are self-explanatory.
- c. In Item 4, insert the current cumulative value of disbursements reported to the Embassy by CCC through Form 331, Advice of Payment.
- d. In Item 5, insert the cumulative value of deposits made to the special account.
- e. In Item 6, report the figure from Item 8 of the report of the previous quarter. For the initial report this will be zero.
- f. In Item 7, indicate all disbursements reported by the Government of the importing country for approved eligible uses during the quarter covered by the report, by date of disbursement, amount of disbursement and exchange rate in effect on the date of disbursement, and insert their total U.S. dollar equivalent on the indicated line.

If the number of disbursements is voluminous, they may be detailed on a seaparte sheet using the indicated format, and their totals inserted in this time.

- g. Add Item 6 and 7.
- h. Subtract Item 8 from Item 5.
- i. In addition to the statistical information to be reported on the attached format, the Embassy should also provide a brief narrative progress report on the status of each of the projects for which disbursements were made during the reporting quarter. No more than a short paragraph on each project is contemplated for the narrative section.
- j. Specific time deadlines have not been established for submission of the subject report. However, reports should be submitted as soon after the close of the reporting quarter as possible.

Drafted by D.Kunkel 4/25/80 FAS/EC/PDD/AA

Appendix Table 7

Estimated Costs of BVS Projects in the
9 Selected Governorates, 1981*

Governorate	Potable Water	Roads	Sewerage & Drainage	Others**	Total
Sharkia	1,000,000	1,035,900	1,383,350	30,750	3,450,000
Qaluibia	1,940,100	1,406,784	40,000	--	3,386,884
Menoufia	1,732,050	1,029,950	873,000	—	3,635,000
Beheira	1,051,427	2,189,449	209,114	—	3,450,000
Giza	2,900,000	300,000	—	—	3,200,000
Fayoum	1,000,000	1,017,900	1,301,350	30,750	3,350,000
Minia	2,126,500	1,653,700	—	—	3,780,200
Sohag	2,129,000	1,321,000	—	—	3,450,000
Qena	2,300,500	1,016,900	—	—	3,317,400
Total	16,179,587	10,881,583	3,806,814	61,500	31,109,284

* All amounts expressed in Egyptian pounds

** Includes slaughter houses for Sharkia & Fayoum
governorates

SOURCE: ORDEV

Appendix Table 8

A. Background on Evaluation Team Members

Team Leader:

George R. Gardner (Ph.d., Rural Sociology & Agricultural Economics, Cornell University). Currently a Development Officer with the Social Analysis Division of the Near East Bureau, AID Washington. Dr. Gardner previously worked with development projects in Chile, Nicaragua, Mexico, Guatemala and El Salvador.

His international development experience dates from 1966. He has taught and conducted research at three U.S. land-grant universities.

Team Members:

Elizabeth B. Berry is currently employed by the Office of International Cooperation (OICD) Development Planning and Analysis Staff, U.S.D.A., Washington. She received a B.A. from the University of Michigan and an M.A. from the University of Minnesota's Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs. Her graduate work in public administration emphasized development administration, international policy and technology planning. In 1979, Mrs Berry was selected as a Presidential Management Intern.

David E. Kunkel (B.S. Agronomy, University of Idaho,
M.S. Agricultural Economics, Colorado State University
and Ph.D. University of Wisconsin)

His current position is as an Agricultural Economist with
the Foreign Agricultural Service responsible for PL 480
Title III Food for Development Program in Asia and the
Near East.

Previous experience includes six years in the Philippines
working on agricultural policy analysis and modelling, dis-
sertation research in Turkey on the turkish cotton and
cotton textile industry, Peach Corp volunteer in Turkey,
Soil Scientist with the Bureau of Reclamation and raised on a
irrigation farm in Idaho.

Appendix Table 9

Partial List of Persons Interviewed by the Evaluation Team

Name	Title/Agency	Date Interviewed
SHARKIA GOVERNORATE		
Mr Mahmoud El Khaly	Sec. General	2/28/1981
Mr Mohamed Rashad	ORDEV Rep. Sharkia	2/28/1981
Mr Henry Fahmy	Director of Housing	2/28/1981
Mr Mahmoud Askar	Abbassa Water Works	2/28/1981
Mr Mohamed Metwally	Chief of local unit in Shobra el Nakla	2/28/1981
Mr Mohamed Kamal	Chief of Local Unit in Gheitah	2/28/1981
Mr Mohamed Hassan	ORDEV, Cairo	3/1/1981
Eng. Heneky Fahmy	Directory of Housing	3/1/1981
FAYOUM GOVERNORATE		
Mr Hosain Dawood	Assistant Sec. General	3/2/1981
Mr Amin Mansour	ORDEV Representative	3/2/1981
Mr Gomaa Mahmoud Saleh	Chief of Local Unit in El Azab	3/2/1981
Mr Saied Hassan El Saiwah	Chief of Local Unit in Ellahoun	3/2/1981
Mr Hosny Ahmiad Mady	Chief of Local Unit in El Edwah	3/2/1981
Mr Mohamed Arafa	Chief of Local Unit in Metartares	3/2/1981
Mr Hussein El Din	ORDEV Representative	3/3/1981
Mr Mohamed Samir	Chief of Local Unit in Kal Hana	3/3/1981
Mr Sayed Kassem	Chief of Local Unit in Minnieyet El Heit	3/3/1981
Mr Salah Abu El Ella	Chief of Local Unit in Abu Gadid	3/3/1981

Name	Title/Agency	Date Interviewed
------	--------------	------------------

FAYOUM GOVERNORATE (cont.)		
Mr Mahmoud Hassan	DEV, Cairo	3/3/1981
Mr Amin Mansour	DEV, Fayoum	3/3/1981
Mr Abdalah Hafez	Chief of the Local Unit of Abou Kosah Village of Ebshway Markaz	3/3/1981
Mr Abdel Said Abdel Aziz	Chief of the Popular Council Ebshway - Abou Kosah	3/3/1981
Mr Hassan Rabea	Chief of the Local Unit of karoun village at Ebshway Markaz	3/3/1981
Mr Samir Zaki Seif	Chief of the Popular Council of Karoun - Ebshway	3/3/1981
Mr Saleh Abdel Tawab	Chief of the Local Unit of Kahk village of Ebshway Markaz	3/3/1981

SOHAG GOVERNORATE		
Mr Yehya el Sherif	ORDEV Representative	3/9/1981
Mr Rateeb Shehatah	Chief of the Local Unit in Edfa	3/9/1981
Mr Abd el Aziz Ahmed Hassan	Chief of the Local Unit in Rawafi el Kouseir	3/9/1981
Mr Anwar Mahmoud el Saied	Chief of the Local Unit in Seflak	3/10/1981
Mr Latif Noseir Ebaid	Chief of the Local Unit in Rawafi el Esaweya	3/10/1981
Mr Said Tayeb Abd el Aziz	Chief of the Local Unit in El Berba	3/10/1981
Mr Hanna Yousef	Chief of the Local Unit in El Magabra	3/10/1981
Mr Hossain Nabil	Chairman of Gerga City Council	3/10/1981
Mr Ahmed Radwan	Road Engineer	3/10/1981
Mr Mahmoud Talat	Water Engineer	3/10/1981

Name	Title/Agency	
------	--------------	--

QALUBIYAH GOVERNORATE		
Mr Maged el Sheabini	ORDEV, Cairo	3/15/1981
Mr Fathi Nofal	Secretary General	3/15/1981
Mr Fouad Seoudi	ORDEV, Qalubiyah	3/15/1981
Mr Saad Mahmoud	Road's Project Chief	3/15/1981
Mr Said Fouad	ORDEV, Qalubiyah	3/15/1981
Mr Mahmoud Aly Ahmed	Secretary General Assist.	3/15/1981
Eng. Samuel Medhael	Directory of Housing Rep.	3/15/1981

GIZA GOVERNORATE		
Mr Ahmed Abd el Monem	Secretary General	3/4/1981
Eng. Mrs Nazeg	ORDEV Representative	3/4/1981
Mr Ahmed Gaber	Director of Projects	3/4/1981

MINUFIA GOVERNORATE		
Major General Mahmoud	Governor	3/15/1981
Moh. Makrous Abu Hussein		
Mr Mohamed Farok Hasanein	Assis. Sec. General	3/15/1981
Mr Samir Abd el Rahman	Chief of Local Council	
Abou El Nasr	in Shebin el Kom	3/15/1981
Mr Moh. Abd El Naby	Deputy Rep. at Peoples Assembly for Minufia Governorate	3/15/1981

Appendix Table 10

Projects Funded by BVS in Sharkia Governorate, 1980

ROADS			
Markaz	Village local	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Minia Hamb	Azizia	296,300	144,690
Fakous	Telleen Sawaleh		
Belbes	Kafr Ayoub Soliman	250,920	74,450
Abo Hamad Zakazik	Helmea Zankalon		
Fakous	Salhia	243,700	31,750
Abo Hamad	Alkarid		
Abo Hamad	Abdea	220,300	114,500
Fakous	Akiad el Bahria		
Belbes	Gheta	145,958	72,489
	Shobra el Makhla		
Zakazik	Bisha Fayed	103,400	87,400
	Bardin		
Herenia	San el Hagar	46,920	22,520
	Sahafa		
Total		1,307,498	547,799

Appendix Table

Projects Funded by BVS in Sharkia Governorate, 1980

POTABLE WATER			
Markaz	village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Zakazik	Bordein	56,650	29,089
	El Aslougny	12,100	10,503
	El Zankalon	23,000	21,016
	Om-el Zein	385	385
Hehya	El Mahmoudeya	15,600	14,002
	Mebasher	176,300	171,887
	El Halwat	5,250	5,250
Belbeis	Awlad Seif	1,750	1,748
	Zafr Ayoub Soliman	5,250	5,250
	Gheitah	148,350	140,625
Abou Hamma	El Abassah	191,000	163,226
	El Aseidiah	19,900	15,463
	El Sowah	1,750	1,748
Fakous	El Samaamah	7,000	7,000
	El Darydamon	342,500	329,843
	Ekiad el Bahreyah	222,000	21,016
	El Sawaleh	12,250	12,250
	El Ghazaly	26,750	8,568
	El Soufeya	37,400	35,016
	Hanout	100,000	-
	Kahboumah	25,300	24,513
El Hosaneyah	San el Hagar	32,025	32,025
	Sammakein el Gharg	389,225	374,829
	El Akhaiwa	7,000	7,000
Abou Kebir	Monshat Radwan	53,000	41,010
	El Haswah	27,450	26,267
	El Rahmaneyah	19,250	19,250

SHARKIA DIRECTORY OF HOUSING - POTABLE WATER

Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Zakazik	Alaslogi	47,200	34,345
	Shenbar Maymona	42,500	33,000
	Bardin	39,000	25,000
	Sheba Mekaria	20,800	17,100
	Om el Zein	12,500	8,500
	Mabasker	10,000	1,338
Hehia	Mahmodia	10,000	1,328
Darb Negm	Haft Razek	59,200	35,786
	Gemiza beni amr	36,000	13,860
	Safour	32,500	20,538
	Karmaut Mahbara	29,300	30,320
	Al Asayd	10,500	9,360
Minia Kanh	Malames	53,800	32,433
	Shalshalaman	35,500	26,833
	Teleen	30,500	13,833
	Sanhaut	29,200	14,733
	Frezeya	27,400	15,466
	Beni Helal	24,000	10,500
	Gadida	19,300	9,433
	Senhoa Sinnahwa	12,400	12,133
	Al Sanafish	12,000	9,000
Belbes	Anshas el Rarnl	37,100	25,700
	Al Sahafa	37,100	30,843
	Shobra el Nakhla	32,300	26,029
	Balashan	30,900	17,943
	Adlea	22,500	19,143
	Awlad Youssef	10,000	5,0000
	Kafr Abrash	7,000	9,500
	Alzwamel	4,500	4.143
TOTAL		2,627,710	2,031,922

Appendix Table 11

Projects Funded by BVS in Sohag Governorate, 1980

POTABLE WATER			
Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
El Monshah	El Zook el Gharbeyah	134,400	35,783
	Awlad Hanzah	67,200	16,718
	El Dewierat	44,800	19,117
	Rawafii el Eisaweyah	44,800	9,366
Geheinah	El Tolihat	89,600	29,264
Gerga	El Berba	112,000	32,728
	Beit Dawood	67,200	22,782
	El Awamer Bahary	44,800	12,309
	Beyet Allam	22,400	4,687
	El Magabrah	22,400	4,687
Akhmeen	El Hawawiesh	22,400	7,731
	Kolah	22,400	7,726
	Niedah	22,400	7,133
Dar el Salam	Awlad Salam Bahary	67,200	19,296
	El Khayan	67,200	16,570
	El Keshh	44,800	9,366
	Awlad Yehya	44,800	9,366
El Babyanah	Arrabet Abidous	89,600	18,722
	Barry Gamil	89,600	18,722
	Awlad Elaiew	44,800	15,385
	Bardies	44,800	9,366
El Maragah	Shendaweel	89,600	32,623
	El betakh	44,800	9,366
	El Aziziat	25,734	8,224
	Awlad Ismail	22,400	7,842
	Banaweit	22,400	8,324

POTABLE WATER

Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Sakoultah	El Gellaweyah	44,800	16,384
	El Sawamaah Shark	22,400	7,137
	Seflak	22,400	7,625
Sohag	Edfa	67,200	24,074
	Awlad Azzaz	44,800	9,366
	Arrabet Abou el Zahab	44,800	11,917
	Tunos	44,800	12,669
	Rawafei el Kouseir	44,800	15,361
	El Kawamel el Bahary	22,400	7,148
	Geziret Shandaweil	22,400	8,102
Tahta	El Safiehah	89,600	25,999
	Banga	67,200	24,196
	Nazlet el Kady	67,200	20,868
	El Sawamah Gharib	22,400	11,758
Tema	El Madmar	67,200	23,248
	El Raiinah el Moalakah	67,200	21,010
	Salamon	44,800	16,026
	Om Doma	44,800	11,703
	Meshta	22,400	9,089
TOTAL		2,288,134	682,716

Appendix Table

Projects Funded by BVS in Sohag Governorate, 1980

ROADS			
Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Tema & Tahta	Om Doma	112,180	102,227
	Nazlet el Kady	110,052	-
El Maragah Sohag & El Monshah	Awlad Ismail	83,120	-
	Edfa	47,580	-
	El Zook el Gharbeyah	36,000	-
	Banaweet	26,960	-
	Geziret Shandaweil	26,312	-
	Arrabet Abou el Zahag	25,806	-
	El Dewierat	12,000	-
	Rawafei el Kouseir	3,036	-
Geheinah	Awlad Hanzah	2,000	-
	El Tolihat	66,982	-
	Gehienah el Sharkia	23,456	-
Akhmeem & Sakoultah	Eineibes	23,200	-
	El Gellaweyah	141,278	-
	Neidah	79,060	-
	El Hawawiesh	49,248	-
Gerga, El Babyanah & Dar el Salam	Seflak	38,690	-
	El Keshh	92,410	-
	Bardies	67,312	-
	El Berba	26,000	-
	Beit Dawood	22,000	36,620
	El Mayabrah	22,000	-
	El Khayam	20,420	-
	Bani Gamil	17,022	-
	Arrabet Abidous	8,000	-
	Beyet Allam	6,000	-
Awlad Elaiw	4,024	-	
TOTAL		1,192,488	198,847

Appendix Table 12

Projects Funded by BVS in Fayoum Governorate, 1980

ROADS			
Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Fayoum	Zawiet el Karadsa	4,200	1,360
	Zawiet el Karadsa	7,000	0,022
	Zawiet el Karadsa	79,800	19,395
	Desia	12,700	12,700
	Ellahoun	40,800	37,965
	Ellahoun	20,000	20,000
	El Azab	14,000	14,000
	Sila	22,000	12,900
	Sila	9,000	9,000
	El Edwah	3,500	-
	Talat	13,500	11,400
	Talat	9,000	-
	Talat	3,500	1,544
Senoures	Metartares	37,500	36,000
	Metartares	3,000	2,200
	Sanhour	31,000	30,000
	Tersa	37,500	37,500
	Menshat Bany Etman	62,000	62,000
	Menshat Bany Etman	49,700	49,700
Etsa	Abou Gandir	9,000	9,000
	Abou Gandir	2,100	2,100
	El Hagar	21,000	21,000
	Kelhanah	12,000	8,352
	Kelhanah	14,900	14,900
	Kalamshah	4,500	4,500
	Kalamshah	12,000	12,000
Tatcon	13,500	13,500	
Om Etsa	Menyet el Heit	9,000	9,000
Tamia	Sersena	13,500	13,500
	Sensena	28,900	28,900
	Monshat el Gammal	34,960	26,598
	Monshat el Gammal	7,665	7,665
	Monshat el Gammal	6,400	-
	El Rodah	13,500	13,500

cont.....

M - ROADS

Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Ebshewai	Aboksah	6,000	-
	Aboksah	6,514	-
	El Hamouly	9,000	9,000
	El Hamouly	9,000	5,000
	El Hamouly	21,000	11,140
	El Nazlah	28,900	16,000
	El Shawashmah	43,500	20,400
	El Shawashmah	36,400	36,400
	El Agemien	7,000	21
	El Agemien	43,500	761
	Kahk	9,000	9,000
	Kahk	259,000	52,870
	Karoon	9,000	8,775
	TOTAL		1,150,439

Projects Funded by BVS in Fayoum Governorate, 1980

RETAINING WALLS & DRAINAGE			
Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Fayoum	Zawiet el Karadsa	6,000	-
	Desia	5,000	3,000
	El Azab	14,500	14,500
	El Adwah	12,000	12,000
	Talat	9,000	7,490
Senoures	Fidemin	92,000	89,929
	Fidemin	50,750	42,000
	Fidemin	2,000	2,000
	Metahtares	35,500	35,500
	Metahtares	2,500	2,000
	Metahtares	78,500	55,000
	Metahtares	2,400	2,200
	Metahtares	3,000	2,200
	Bishmou	12,000	17,000
	Tersa	10,000	9,976
Tersa	45,000	11,250	
Etsa	Abou Gandir	8,000	8,000
	Abou Gandir	85,000	85,000
	Abou Gandir	57,000	57,000
	Kelhanah	4,000	4,000
	Meniet el Heit	30,000	28,554
	Meniet el Heit	5,000	85
	Gardou	22,228	22,228
Tamia	Kasr Rashwan	14,225	14,225
	Kasr Rashwan	3,500	3,500
	Dar el Salam	55,000	50,965
	Sersena	8,000	7,696
	Sersena	5,050	5,000
	El Rodah	8,000	8,000
	El Rodah	2,800	2,800
	El Rodah	2,550	2,550

cont...

FAYOUM - RETAINING WALLS & DRAINAGE

Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
El Shawai	Aboksah	39,163	39,163
	Aboksah	11,243	5,837
	El Hamouly	15,000	15,000
	El Nazlah	7,100	6,000
	El Nazlah	15,900	15,900
	El Shawashnah	24,000	24,000
	El Shawashnah	5,000	5,000
	El Agemien	7,000	-
	El Agemien	17,920	17,920
	El Agemien	9,000	8,770
	El Agemien	23,580	23,580
	El Agemien	65,750	44,462
	El Agemien	16,500	8,000
	Tabhar	29,400	29,190
	Tabhar	17,000	15,680
	Tabhar	600	300
	Kahk	40,000	17,000
	Karoon	40,000	40,000
Karoon	27,000	22,000	
TOTAL		1,098,159	950,919

PROJECTS FUNDED BY EVS IN FAYOUM GOVERNORATE, 1980

HER PROJECTS			
Markaz	Village local unit	-- Funding amount in L.E. --	
		Appropriated	Disbursed
Fayoum	Zawiet el Karadsa	27,800	-
	Desia	27,800	-
	Demou	27,800	5,000
	Ellahoun	27,800	-
	El Azab	27,600	5,000
	Sila	27,800	-
	Sila	5,000	5,000
	El Edwah	27,800	-
	Talat	27,800	-
	Hawwarat el Maktaa	27,800	-
Senoures	Metartares	1,500	1,500
	Sanhour	5,000	5,000
	Monshat Barry Etman	5,000	5,000
Etsa	Abou Gandir	5,000	5,000
	Kalamshah	5,000	5,760
	Kalamshah	5,000	5,000
	Tatoon	5,000	5,000
Tamia	Monshat el Gammal	5,000	5,000
	El Rodah	405,500	374,000
Elsnewai	El Shawashna	5,000	5,000
	Karoon	5,000	5,000
TOTAL		,200	496,260

Appendix Table 13.
SHARKIA GOVERNORATE - 1981 PLANS
Projects Planned for BVS Funding

MARKAZ	LOCAL UNIT	P R O J E C T S									
		P.Water	Roads	Soil Stabiliz.	Retaining Walls	Stand Pipes	Fire Taps	Sanitation	Road Shades	Slaughter houses	Road Signs
Sakr	Alhamarsa	18,004	14,000	-	5,000	1,200	800	3,000	2,100	-	-
	Alkodah	15,843	-	-	10,000	-	-	-	1,500	7,000	-
	Shanout	46,400	-	-	-	-	-	18,040	-	-	-
	Awlad Sakr	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	44,299	-	10,000	-
	Sofia	28,507	24,500	-	10,000	2,000	300	4,500	-	-	-
	Abou Shefouk	41,000	5,624	-	3,000	3,000	-	-	2,100	-	-
Fakous	Ghazali	51,375	11,379	-	-	-	-	2,100	-	-	-
	Brimin	20,000	2,000	-	2,000	1,400	-	-	1,500	7,000	340
	Akiad Bahra	35,750	2,025	-	-	830	100	-	-	2,120	-
	Sawari	19,657	-	-	150	-	-	3,000	300	3,120	-
	Salhea	15,786	11,250	600	-	-	-	-	600	7,000	-
	Sawaleh	25,000	6,379	-	2,000	2,000	-	24,000	3,000	3,000	-
	Samaana	10,413	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	7,000	-	-
	Didamon	29,100	7,431	-	-	2,200	-	-	1,800	-	-
Mashtoul	Ibrash	29,919	1,900	200	500	-	-	5,000	600	3,000	-
	Sahafa	-	23,570	400	-	-	-	2,500	1,800	-	300
Menia el Kanh	Beni Helal	20,949	5,000	-	-	-	-	3,500	1,200	7,000	848
	Malames	19,911	5,000	1,000	1,444	2,600	-	1,500	3,000	3,000	200
	Azizea	23,036	5,700	1,000	-	1,000	1,200	-	1,004	-	-
	Gadida	19,041	7,500	2,000	6,000	1,000	1,500	-	2,700	7,000	-
	Sanafin	14,845	1,800	-	-	200	-	2,000	2,100	7,000	-
	Shlshlon	41,900	-	2,013	-	-	-	750	300	-	-
	Snehwa	14,029	0,000	1,400	-	600	500	6,000	523	-	-
	Telin	32,450	1,500	1,089	-	-	-	2,500	-	7,000	-
Senhout	27,997	-	-	-	679	-	12,000	-	-	-	

SHARKIA GOVERNORATE - 1981 PLANS (cont.)

MARKAZ	LOCAL UNIT	P R O J E C T S								
		Potable Water	Roads	Soil Stabiliz.	Retaining Walls	Stand Pipes	Fire Taps	Sanitation	Road Shades	Slaughter Houses
Abo Hamad	Koren	51,213	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Abasa	53,149	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Helmea	27,500	6,000	-	-	-	-	4,802	-	-
	Soa	39,631	-	-	-	-	700	1,400	-	-
	Tokir	23,085	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Amirea	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	3,160	-	-
Diabr Negm	Sanour	25,493	-	-	-	1,000	2,200	15,000	1,800	-
	Karmout	34,000	16,046	-	-	2,800	600	-	-	-
	Gemez et beni Omar	21,200	-	-	-	-	-	11,248	-	-
	Saft Rozik	47,865	1,000	-	-	2,000	3,000	2,000	-	-
	El Assayed	28,888	-	-	-	-	2,000	-	-	-
	Abou Kebir	Harbit	17,500	8,784	-	-	-	-	-	-
Beni Ayad		18,643	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Manshaet Radwan		28,857	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Rahmania		51,042	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Hossoun		28,162	-	-	-	3,000	-	-	400	-
El Ibrahimia		El Halayat	18,101	-	-	1,000	-	-	1,000	-
	Kofour Negm	27,007	-	-	-	600	900	-	-	-
	Mobasher		14,418	-	4,500	-	-	3,500	1,000	-

SHARKIA GOVERNORATE - 1981 PLANS (cont.)

MARKAZ	LOCAL UNIT	P R O J E C T S									
		Potable Water	Roads	Soil Stabiliz.	Retaining Walls	Stand Pipe	Fire Taps	Sanitation	Road Shades	Slaughter Houses	Road Signs
Hesenea	Monshaa										
	Abou Omar	49,617	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	San el Hagar	78,904	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Gezira Seod	19,250	28,000	-	-	000	-	5,000	1,200	7,000	232
	Alakhoa	35,000	18,000	3,515	-	0,000	-	-	-	-	-
	Kahouna	27,752	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Samakin	46,550	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belbis	Shbra el										
	Nakhla	24,000	-	-	-	-	-	700	955	7,000	-
	Ghita	-	17,474	-	3,020	-	-	2,550	500	-	-
	Zowamel	25,200	4,951	-	-	-	-	6,000	300	-	-
	Anshas Raml	25,400	-	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	823
	Adlia	25,131	2,800	-	-	-	-	14,000	-	-	-
	Awlad Seif	33,324	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Ayoud Solim	6,501	5,001	-	5,000	-	1,000	20,340	3,300	-	200
Balashof	20,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	14,432	-	-	-	
Hahia	El Zarzamon	38,500	-	-	-	4,000	2,000	-	290	-	-
	El Mahdia	5,496	-	-	2,800	1,000	100	10,000	600	-	-
	El Alakma	26,250	-	193	-	-	-	-	1,500	-	-
	El Mahmoudia	10,000	12,298	-	400	-	-	-	1,500	-	-
El Zakazik	Bardine	53,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,000	1,000	439
	Bishet Fayed	40,000	7,500	268	1,000	300	400	15,000	600	-	-
	Sh.El Maouna	50,000	-	437	500	1,400	-	12,000	1,200	7,000	-
	El Asloughi	20,000	-	800	-	400	2,000	9,000	2,400	-	407
	Beni Amer	35,000	-	-	-	800	100	9,055	600	-	-
	El Zinkalon	35,418	1,000	-	-	1,800	1,200	-	-	-	-
	Shobak Basta	8,275	1,700	-	-	-	-	25,000	244	-	-
	Sh.el Bakaria	30,000	-	686	-	600	300	13,500	-	-	-
	Om el Zein	30,000	12,400	601	-	2,600	-	6,000	2,400	7,000	-
TOTAL		2,000,916	1,716,930	16,202	58,314	46,009	20,900	379,376	57,916	102,240	3,789

Appendix Table 14

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Fayoum Governorate, 1981

SANITARY DRAINAGE		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Fayoum	El Azab	39,000
	Ellahoun	23,400
	Sila	34,000
	Desia	5,000
	Zawyet El Karandsa	34,200
	Demou	14,800
	Hawwaret El Maktaa	41,000
	Talat	11,400
	El Edwah	45,000
Senoures	Metartares	4,000
	Tersa	15,000
	Fidemin	80,400
	Biahmou	55,000
	Sanhour El Quebleya	95,000
Ebshawai	El Shawashnah	20,000
	El Nazlah	23,250
	El Hamouly	25,000
	Abouksah	25,000
	Tobhar	35,000
	Karoon	65,000
	El Agamain	53,000
	Kahk	39,000
Etsa	Tatoon	42,800
	El Gharak	51,400
	El Hagar	23,000
	Kalamshah	37,250
	Menyet El Heit	71,900
	Abou Gandir	55,000
	Matool	54,000
	Gardou	42,000
Tamia	Dar El Salam	35,000
	El Rodah	35,000
	Sersena	24,800
	Monshat El Gammal	58,250
	Kasr Rashwan	17,500
Total in L.E.		1,330,350

Appendix Table

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Fayoum Governorate, 1981

ROADS		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Fayoum	El Azab	28,000
	El Lahoun	15,000
	Sila	13,000
	Desia	48,000
	Demou	40,000
	Hawwaret El Maktaa	20,700
	Talat	73,000
	El Edwah	20,000
Senoures	Metartares	57,000
	Tersa	45,000
	Fidemin	15,000
	Biahmou	10,000
Ebsnewai	El Shawashnah	45,000
	El Nazlah	43,500
	El Hamouly	47,000
	Abouksah	21,000
	Iobhar	27,550
	El Agamien	38,450
Etsa	Kalamshah	66,000
	El Gharak	37,400
	El Hagar	14,400
	Kalamshah	13,800
	Menyet El Heit	47,500
	Abu Gandir	48,600
Tamia	Dar El Salam	25,000
	El Rodah	15,500
	Sersena	29,000
	Monshat El Gammal	38,400
	Kasr Rashwan	47,500
Total in L.E.		1,017,900

Appendix Table

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Fayoum Governorate, 1981

POTABLE WATER

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Fayoum	a	35,000
Senoures	shat Bani Etman	375,000
	our El Quebleya	35,000
Ebsheway	lamouly	150,000
	iksah	20,000
	oun	35,000
Etsa	sharak	175,000
	lagar	35,000
	et El Heit	105,000
Tamia	an	000
	E.	000

Appendix Table

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in
Fayoum Governorate, 1981

OTHER

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Senoures	Ellahoun	10,000
Ebsheway	Tersa	10,750
	Abouksah	10,000
		<hr/>
	Total in L.E.	30,750

Appendix: Table 15

Projects Planned for BVS Funding in

Sohag Governorate, 1981

POTABLE WATER		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Tema	Meshta	21,000
	El Madmar	63,000
	El Rainah El Moalakah	63,000
	Salamon	42,000
	Om Domah	42,000
Tahta	El Safiehah	84,000
	Banga	63,000
	El Sawanah Garb	21,000
	Nazlet El Kady	63,000
Geheinab	Eineibes	42,000
	El Tolihat	42,000
El Maragah	El Aziziat	18,000
	Awlad Ismail	21,000
	El Betakh	42,000
	Shandaweel	84,000
	Banaweet	21,000
Sohag	Arrabet Abou El Zahab	42,000
	El Kawamel Bahary	21,000
	Balsaforah	30,000
	Geziret Shandaweil	21,000
	Tunos	42,000
	Rawafi El Kouseir	42,000
	Edfa	33,000
	Awlad Azzaz	42,000
El Manshak	El Dewierat	42,000
	El Gharbeyah	116,000
	El Azzal	63,000
		42,000

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Gerga	Biet Dawood	63,000
	El Awamer Bahary	42,000
	El Magabrah	21,000
	Biet Allam	21,000
	El Berba	105,000
El Balyanal	Bardies	42,000
	Awlad Elaiew	42,000
	Arrabet Abidous	84,000
	Beni Hemeil	84,000
Dar El Salam	El Khayam	63,000
	El Keshh	42,000
	Awlad Salem	63,000
	Awlad Yehya	42,000
Akhmeem	El Kolah	21,000
	El Hawawiesh	21,000
	Niedah	42,000
Sakoultah	Seflak	21,000
	El Gellaweyah	42,000
Total in L.E.		2,129,000

Appendix Table
 Projects Planned for BVS funds in
 Sohag Governorate, 1981

ROADS		
Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Tema	Meshta	60,000
	El Madmar	55,000
	Salamon	15,000
	Om Doumah	20,000
Tahta	El Safiehah	20,000
	Banga	56,000
	El Sawamah Garb	50,000
	Nazlet El Kady	70,000
	Shtourah	60,000
Geheinab	Geheinab El Sharkeyah	26,000
El Maragab	El Aziziat	25,000
	El Betakh	32,000
	Shandaweel	29,000
	Banaweet	28,000
Sohag	Bendar El Karmaniah	24,000
	Geziret Shandaweel	40,000
	El Salaa	2,000
	Rawafei El Kouseir	22,000
	Edfa	35,000
	Awlaad Azzaz	30,000
El Monsnan	El Dewierat	5,000
	El Zooak El Gharbeyah	30,000
	ad Salamah	7,000
	faie El Eisawayah	15,000
Gerga	Dawood	33,000
	wamer Bahary	52,000
	agabra	40,000

Markaz	Village Local Unit	Amount Appropriated
Gerga	Beit Allam	10,000
	El Berba	68,000
El Balyanah	Bardies	15,000
	Awlad Elaiew	15,000
	Arabet Abidous	28,000
Dar El. Salam	El Khayam	30,000
	El Keshk	10,000
	Awlaad Yehya	30,000
Akhmeem	El Kolah	31,000
	El Hawawiesh	28,000
	Niedah	30,000
Shakoultah	Seflak	27,000
	El Gellaweyah	28,000
Total in L.E.		1,321,000

Total all projects 3,450,000