

4970183 (66)

PD-AAD 732-A1

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY

1. Mission or AID/W Office Name USAID/Indonesia			2. Project Number 497-0183		
3. Project Title GENERAL PARTICIPANT TRAINING 14p.					
4. Key project dates (fiscal years) a. Project Agreement Signed 11/8/76			b. Final FY 77 Obligation		c. Final FY-input 1978 delivered
5. Total U.S. funding - life of project \$ 12,088,000			6. Date of this Evaluation Review 11/23/77		
6. Evaluation number as listed in Eval. Schedule 78-1		7. Period covered by this Eval. From: 9/8/76 To: 9/30/77		8. Date of this Evaluation Review 11/23/77	
		Month/year		Month/year	
9. Action Decisions Reached at Eval. Review, including items needing further study (Note--This list does <u>not</u> constitute an action request to AID/W. Use telegrams, aigrams, SPARS, etc., for action)			10. Officer or Unit responsible for follow-up		10. Date action to be completed

12. Signatures:

Project Officer		Mission or AID/W Office Director	
Signature	<i>Dan S. Terrell</i>	Signature	<i>Thomas C. Niblock</i>
Type Name	Dan S. Terrell	Type Name	Thomas C. Niblock
Date	11/23/77	Date	11/29/77
Evaluation Officer: Zimmerman <i>RJZ</i>			

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

When the GOI made the decision in 1964 to terminate USAID activities in Indonesia, many Indonesian participants were in the middle of training programs. It was jointly agreed by the U.S. and GOI that to continue their training was in the best interests of both governments, and a General Participant Training (GPT) project (990-179) was developed.

This original GPT was designed to permit :

- (1) A means to enable participants who had already begun their off-shore training under terminating TA projects to complete their programs.
- (2) A means to support GOI requests for specialized off-shore training.

During its life, FY 1964-66, this version of the GPT had a total expenditure of \$ 978,000. One hundred and twenty (120) training programs were extended and 131 additional participants either departed or were picked up from other donors.

Upon the resumption of AID activity in Indonesia after 1966, among the first requests from the new government was one to resume participant training. It particularly requested USAID to reactivate all of about 325 outstanding requests for training cancelled by the 1964 ban, and further to assist Indonesia to develop those technical and managerial skills necessary for stabilization and modernization.

The USAID honored the Cabinet Secretariat's request to resume substantial "new start" participant training and in FY 1967 the General Participant Training project (690-183) was begun. The project reflected the needs of 1966 - 1967 : manpower for stabilization; training for agriculture and technology transfer; continuation of on-going participants; and support as needed of the 4,017 returned participants.

During FY 1969, the GOI's priorities shifted from a stabilization to a development effort as outlined in the First Five Year Plan (REPELITA I). USAID priorities and the priorities of the GPT made a corresponding shift. Selected for training by the Cabinet Secretariat, the Indonesian Office coordinating this project, were candidates whose training would support or be ancillary to on-going TA projects as well as candidates whose training would be needed to work with proposed contracts and on anticipated loan funded projects. The primary areas of concentration were : Agriculture; Education; Public Works; Industry and Manpower; Applied Administration and Management; and Professional or Technical upgrading.

As a result of this project's strategy to address manpower development problems in specific priority areas of joint GOI-USAID interest, GPT was successful in "headstarting" many of the Mission's other TA projects. In this manner host country interest was aroused and impetus created for projects such as Higher Agriculture Education (NUCIA); Assistance to Agriculture and allied projects in that sector; the Family Planning and Health projects; the terminated Geological Survey project with the Geological Survey of Indonesia; Narcotics Control; and most recently Science and Technology.

While the General Participant Training project provided assistance to more than twenty GOI agencies and some private sector organizations, the majority of the participants each year were drawn from the departments of: Agriculture; Education and Culture; Finance; Health; and Public Works and Electric Power.

The only continuing major problem encountered during the life of the project has been the lack of wide spread English language competency which has hindered some worthy individuals from being sponsored for training in the U.S. or other English speaking countries. This language deficit has also required that nearly all participants undertake intensive language training at the Lembaga Indonesia-Amerika for one to six months with a consequent loss in on-the-job time with their GOI agency.

Of the 1,469 individuals sent for training, 1,357 have completed their programs and returned to Indonesia, which is one of the highest return rates in the history of A.I.D. training assistance. Many former participants are now leaders in Indonesia's governmental agencies and higher education institutions.

This project terminated the end of FY 1977, although its original termination date was FY 1981, leaving 110 Indonesians still in study programs in the United States; of these 39 will require additional training funds in FY 1978, if they are to continue their programs uninterrupted. These persons will be continued with funds conserved from the FY 1977 allotment or transferred to other appropriate on-going USAID projects.

FY 1967 -- 1977 :

<u>INPUTS</u>						
- USAID grant funds	\$	12,088,000	
- GOI routine budget	\$	4,850,000	(rupiah equivalent)
 <u>OUTPUTS</u>						
- Participants trained and returned		1,357	
- Participants continuing		110	
- Participants who did not return:		2	
Total		<u>1,469</u>	

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

This is the fourth, regular, annual evaluation (see PAR for 1969; PAR 75 - 4, dated April 22, 1975 and PAR 76 - 4, dated April 22, 1976) of this project. The PROP, dated 12/15/70, while authorizing the project and containing detailed material on the strategy, scope and service elements of the project (English language training support and follow-up) did not contain an evaluation of this project.

Evaluation, however, has been conducted in accord with the "means of evaluation" section of the logical framework. Input data were collected for evaluation from Project Agreements; frequent planning and implementation sessions with the Cabinet Secretariat and training recipient GOI agencies; English language testing and performance reports; university and training institution reports; monthly status from AID/W; debriefing sessions and questionnaires completed by returned participants; visits by GOI and USAID officials to returnees; occasional/special evaluation studies, such as the "Survey On United States Trained Participants In West Java" (1972); and the May, 1976 audit report "USAID/Indonesia Comprehensive Review". Output data were collected as needed based on GOI records, reports, statistics and GOI/USG passport and visa statistics.

By its very design, though, the GPT project was to an extent exempt from the standard project criteria for project "completion," since it addressed itself potentially to any of a wide range of educational requirements that Indonesia might require until it become managerially and technically self-sufficient. The GPT project represented a flexible mechanism for responding to such needs apart from the usual project or loan for such time as the GOI lacked the capability to finance completely its overseas training requirements.

Key agencies and persons in the evaluation of the project have been the USAID Training Branch staff and the Cabinet Secretariat of the GOI.

15. Documents to be revised to reflect decisions noted page -1- (other side) :
- Project Paper (PP) Logical Framework CPI Network
 - Financial Plan PIO/T PIO/C PIO/P Project Agreement
 - Other

As project terminated in September, 1977 this is non-applicable.

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

None.

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

The Congressional decision made in FY 1977 not to continue the authorization of this project had a significant impact on the project in that it terminated general grant participant training four years (1981) prior to its projected conclusion. This untoward decision resulted in a curtailment of funding of "new start" participants in the fourth quarter of FY 1977 and placed in jeopardy the uninterrupted continuation to program completion of at least 39 Indonesians from twelve GOI departments and agencies. Seventy-one others are in training but funded through to completion.

"New Start" funding was suspended in order that approximately \$ 200,000 in FY 1977 grant funds could be carried over into FY 1978 to support second and third years of study for individuals in-training in the United States and third countries. This amount of funding, however, now appears insufficient, as training costs in FY 1978 have risen and there may be a short-fall in funding toward the end of the present fiscal year. To the extent possible on-going participants will be transferred to other discrete Mission grant or loan projects.

In FY 1979 for which no FY 1977 GPT grant funds could have been reserved, a minimum of twelve on-going participants will risk study termination, unless funding can be obtained from alternate sources. In FY 1980 four individuals, if not terminated earlier, will require funding support to complete their training as originally planned.

Additionally, the sudden termination of U.S. funding abruptly concluded in large part the Mission's ability to respond to special training requests from the GOI for short programs and further curtailed the USAID's ability to sponsor Indonesians to AID/W-created special interest training courses in labor, women in development, environment, etc.

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

"Self-sustained Indonesian economic and social growth through the development of a self-sufficient managerial and technical capability to address development problems, particularly in Rural Development, Food and Nutrition, Health, Economics and General Public and Fiscal Administration."

Human resources development projects such as the General Participant Training project are designed to meet the needs of the recipient country to eliminate manpower shortages in its capability to deal with

technical and managerial problems that hinder the attainment of national social and development efforts. During the eleven years of its life, this project has significantly helped the GOI to reduce its skilled employees gap through the training of nearly 1,500 Indonesian men and women.

This is an average, however, of only 150 persons trained per year and the skilled manpower shortage in Indonesia is so widespread and of such depth that the GOI increasingly finds it difficult to plan and manage its development programs. An excellent example is the continuing lack of the bureaucratic and administrative capacity to allocate resources to other development projects on a timely basis. Most donors as well as A.I.D. agree this situation has prevented speedy implementation of planned activities funded by both the GOI and foreign donors. This has been exaggerated by an increase in the past four years of the GOI development budget from 261.1 billion rupiahs in 1973/1974 for 2,394 development projects to 1,213.1 billion rupiahs in 1976/1977 for 3,176 projects.

The General Participant Training project, however, has played a significant role in developing and up-grading the GOI's capability to handle its own administration; has increased its capabilities in technical areas; and has increased its capacity to provide better quality higher education to the youth of Indonesia.

A recently prepared study, "Follow-Up Study On Returned Academic Participants Trained Under USAID Auspices 1970 - 1977," dated June 20, 1977 lists 365 selected returned participants, who hold significant positions within their respective GOI organizations. These include two Cabinet Ministers; 199 top ranking government officials; provincial officers related to development needs; officers of the Central Research Institute for Agriculture; Development Technology Centers officers; 11 university rectors; and 176 university deans and professors.

18. Evaluation findings about PURPOSE:

(a) Quote the approved project purpose. Cite progress toward each End-of-Project Status (LOPS) condition. When can achievement be expected? Discuss causes of progress or shortfalls.

"The purpose of this project is the support of Indonesia's economic and social growth through the creation of a significant and growing manpower resource of skilled men and women who are employed in functions and activities having a high developmental priority." (As extracted from page -2- of the FY 1977 Pro-Ag.)

Although the project with its average annual grant of 1.0 million dollars funded academic and non-academic, long and short-term training for individuals from approximately twenty GOI organizations as well as some persons from the private sector, emphasis was throughout placed upon those GOI departments with unquestioned concern with national development priorities. These entities were Education and Culture; Agriculture; Finance; Public Works and Electric Power; and Health.

Since the project's inception 1,469 Indonesians have been sent abroad for training in the United States and/or third countries, as of September 30, 1977, a total of 1,357 Indonesians had completed their programs and returned to Indonesia and 110 continued in training. Two participants did not return which is less than 0.1% of the total trained. This is a far better return ratio than any other USAID and is in excess of other donor experience.

The last audit conducted in 1976, "noted no serious implementation problems. The program is well managed and 99.5% of the participants who have completed their training returned to Indonesia." (USAID/Indonesia Comprehensive Review, dated May 26, 1976).

Based on USAID debriefing questionnaires and interviews, visits with former participants and such special studies as have been conducted since the commencement of the project, it is estimated that 95% of the trainees returned to date are utilizing their training. Many former participants are leaders in the Indonesian Government, hold influential positions in the higher education system and are frequent contributors to the development and administration of national programs.

(b) What is current priority of Project with the GOI? Do USAID and GOI share common perception of Project Purpose? How is this priority and common perception manifest in project implementation?

The project is held in high esteem by the GOI and considers it to be highly successful in its given purpose, which was to train Indonesians and bring them back into the economy with a meaningful position. The EHR staff have repeatedly been told by GOI officials and foreign experts working with the Government that the GPT has created a substantial amount of goodwill for the U.S. and been invaluable in many GOI offices in improving the GOI's standard of operation.

When the GOI is officially notified that the project has been terminated it is expected that there will be a great deal of concern and dissatisfaction.

The USAID, the Cabinet Secretariat and each of the GOI departments and agencies participating in the project have shared a common perception of the Project Purpose. This has annually been reflected in the high priority given to GOI support of the project. Pro-Ags and PIO/Ps have been processed rapidly and it is believed that the U.S. has received the best candidates that the GOI has had to offer.

U.S. training is viewed in a most positive light, witness the host government's agreement to assume responsibility for the provision of international travel costs in April, 1975; the GOI's interest in signing the Higher Agricultural Education and the Higher Education Development training loans; as well as, its willingness to expand U.S. training through the acceptance of the Professional Resources Development I loan in 1977. Also its interest in the series of management development loans that are planned to follow PRD I.

In terms of GOI budgetary support, Development Budget inputs have increased each year and reached a new high in FY 1977 though the GOI's provision of \$ 801,000 in rupiah equivalent to support both international travel expenses, salaries of persons studying English in Indonesia and the continuation of salary support while participants are in training.

Finally, it should be noted that Indonesia's Second Five Year Plan (REPELITA II) assigns priority to the development of the country's manpower resources.

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

(a) Outputs - During the period 1969 to 1977 (discrete GPT statistics for the 248 persons funded in 1967/68 are not available) the General Participant Training project had 1,221 persons return. They were from approximately twenty GOI departments and agencies and trained in the U.S. and/or third countries. Seven hundred and five (705) persons received short-term training of nine months or less for a total of 2,283 person-months. Three hundred and eighteen (318) participants received degree training for a total of 9,738 person-months. One hundred and ninety-eight (198) additional participants received long-term non-degree training for a total of 2,454 person-months.

There are at present in the U.S. or third countries 110 participants who are continuing under GPT funding the majority of whom will complete their training in FY 1978 or FY 1979.

(b) Inputs - In support of GPT participants (1967 - 1977) the USAID provided a total of \$ 12,088 million and the GPT from its Development Budget contributed \$ 4,850 million in rupiah equivalent.

If the GOI's contribution appears somewhat low this is due to the fact that until April, 1975 the Government was not required to provide for the cost of international travel. After that date the GOI's contribution substantially increased. Each year though the GOI provided for the payment of regular salaries to all of its Government employees, while they were in English language training and while they were out of country undertaking training; for the cost of participant medical examinations; and for the cost of domestic (in-Indonesia) transportation.

USAID relations with the Cabinet Secretariat, which coordinated the project, and with the GOI institutions which received the training assistance were excellent and contact was frequently made on a daily basis. Each year all funds allotted to the project were sub-obligated and with the exception of a general inadequacy in English language proficiency among participant candidates, which was taken care for by intensive English language study prior to departure, no major implementation problems were encountered by either the GOI or the Mission.

705
318
198

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

This project has had no unplanned effects. As each participant chosen for GPT support was selected for education and professional upgrading in his or her sphere of expertise and, in accordance with that individual's position and work assignment within the GOI, the increased capability of the participant upon return to Indonesia was anticipated. As 99.9% of the participants completed their training and returned to Indonesia to assume their former positions, or assignments of higher responsibility, any increase in the GOI's ability to better manage and solve problems in host government activities was planned and does meet Project goals.

The failure of some participants to succeed in their overseas programs, despite rigorous selection, and the risk of a certain percentage of persons not proving effective on their return home is always an eventuality and therefore, while not planned, was also not unexpected. It is estimated based on Training Branch records, however, that only 5% of our returnees fell into this category.

Without the undertaking of a major and exhaustive follow-up survey such as the "Survey on United States Trained Participants in West Java" conducted by the Investment Consultant Bureau in Bandung (1972), the project's impact on social structure, ecological, health and economic factors is somewhat speculative. Still both the GOI and the Mission believe that GPT has been highly successful in supporting for training, training and seeing utilized participants whose work has, indeed, impacted on a broad range of GOI social and economic development constraints with the result that the host government's service to the people of Indonesia has been improved.

21. Does this project have any impact on the five development criteria outlined in Section 102 (d) of the FAA (i.e.: a. increasing agricultural productivity through small farm labor intensive agriculture; b. reduce infant mortality; c. control population growth; d. promote greater equality in income distribution; and e. reduce rates of unemployment and underemployment). Explain.

Yes, the project during the course of its existence has provided substantial training to those host government departments and agencies that have responsibility for meeting the criteria set forth in the specified section of the FAA. GPT participant training assistance has annually provided manpower development assistance to GOI entities directly concerned with planning and implementing programs to meet the FAA's criteria. Additionally as described in the Summary Section (No. 13) of this PES and particularly in the early years of the project's life, GPT training programs were effective in "head-starting" discrete Mission projects that even more directly addressed the FAA criteria, such as our agriculture and family planning/health projects.

22. Who are the direct and indirect beneficiaries of this project? (Identify, describe nature of benefits and number of those benefiting). Finally, do the benefits justify the costs?

While the primary beneficiaries of this project have been the approximate 1,500 GOI administrators, researchers, medical personnel, technicians and officers who were trained, the ultimate beneficiaries are the people of Indonesia who are recipients of the social/economic development process that resulted from increased GOI capabilities.

The project's high rate of trainee return and the returned participants high percentage of utilization argues favorably for a resultant increase in social and economic benefits to the nation's population. The "Survey on United States Trained Participants in West Java" reported these conclusions:

"USAID-sponsored respondents (participants) have truly gained in knowledge and experience, which has its strong impact on their attitude outlook on life and maturity when faced with problems to be solved, and when performing their jobs especially in view of the country's development.

This gain in knowledge and experience is obvious in activities in which they have involved themselves in the fields of: training; research; evaluation; planning; and organization and administration.

Most of the respondents have been professionally promoted not merely because of their length of service but because of their special knowledge and experience.

Due to their knowledge, skill and experience, their attitude has become optimistic when faced with problems they have to solve and when performing their assigned tasks." (Chapter III, pages 20 - 21)

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

The General Participant Training project was terminated September 30, 1977. With the development and implementation of the series of Professional Resources Development loans, some GOI departments and agencies receiving USAID participant training assistance in the past will continue to do in an even more focused manner in the future; others will, however, not receive any USAID assistance. There can only be limited Mission support to AID/W generated and offered special training programs and such programs/supported will be only those that fall within the purview of this Mission's individual development projects.

24. LESSONS LEARNED - What advice can you give a colleague about development strategy -- e.g., how to tackle a similar development problem or to manage a similar project in another country? What can be suggestions about evaluation methodology?

(a) A general participant training project should be broad in scope, flexible and responsive to the unique manpower needs of the host country. The project's objectives should be tailored to host country plans, the overall development strategy of the USAID Mission and the activities of the other donors, if any;

(b) A general training program should be designed so that its development sector priorities, emphasis, approach and scope may be altered to reflect progress in the overcoming of specific manpower gaps in the host country's pool of skilled individuals;

(c) Although a general training program can be used to fill the manpower gaps left between discrete Mission projects; to assist host country entities without specific development project assistance; respond to specific host country requests; and to fund AID/W developed special or annual programs, such a project should also contain special concentrations of training assistance. In this way general training may be used over a period of years to create cadres of trained individuals, who are employed in specific host country entities.

For example, the General Participant Training project annually supported individuals from the Central Bureau of Statistics. (Total trained: 17) and in this manner GPT training greatly contributed to the present capability of this organization;

(d) A general training program can be used as a means of "head-starting" future USAID discrete technical projects. This can be done through the creation of host government interest in seeing a project established and by the creation of a fundamental cadre of officials, who can work with the Mission to design, plan and implement a separate new TA project.

(e) A general training program should be well coordinated with the host country, preferably with a central contact point, such as the GOI's Cabinet Secretariat, in order that annual funds are used in an appropriate manner; that no single host country entity receives a disproportionate amount of assistance; that participants are well selected; and are utilized upon their return home; and

(f) General training programs should be kept as free of over-planning as feasible, but should at the same time be frequently reviewed by both the USAID and the host country to ensure that sectors worthy or needful of assistance are identified and that progress toward project goals are realized.

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

General Participant Training proved itself to be one of the most successful human resources development projects in the history of A.I.D. Such a statement is less than modest, but it is not untrue. A few years ago SFR/IT proposed that based on GPT's recognized success a world-wide seminar be held in Indonesia on how to establish, operate and evaluate such a project. This unfortunately was not done.

The Government of Indonesia has repeatedly affirmed its appreciation of and desire for this project. There are throughout Indonesia dedicated persons now employed in high priority jobs that would never have received overseas training had not the GPT existed.

A general training program may be viewed by some persons as a risk - the focus is seen to be too broad and the approach too much like a shotgun blast - yet if well monitored by donor and recipient institutions, the impact of such a project can be substantial both in the creation of skilled manpower; the promotion of host government programs; and in the creation of nation-wide goodwill for the United States.

- (b) Overall assessment of project performance.

Un satisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Narrative statement explaining ranking:

This project is assessed as having been highly successful and as the USAID's follow-up program produces new evidence in support of returned participant utilization, we expect that an even higher rating will be possible.

Project Title & Number: GENERAL PARTICIPANT TRAIN
Project No. 497-11-690-18.

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATOR																																																																																																						
<p>Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <p>Self-sustained Indonesian economic and social growth through the development of a self-sufficient managerial and technical capability to address development problems, particularly in Rural Development, Food and Nutrition, Health, Economics and General Public and Fiscal Administration.</p>	<p>Measure of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GNP/GDP statistics indicate that growth is at or near 7.5% per annum as targeted in Repelita II; GNP/GDP per capita average annual increase is sufficient to reach the Repelita II target of 25% to 35% overall increase in the Five-Year period; GOI records of successful performance and/or programs in rural development, economics and general public and fiscal administration; Immediate impact of project on Health, Food and Nutrition sectors would be difficult or impossible to measure during life of project, however, goal achievement in target sectors could be measured at discrete future data based on general statistics in the health and food and nutrition sectors. 																																																																																																						
<p>Project Purpose:</p> <p>Creation of a significant and growing manpower pool of skilled Indonesians effectively working in various functions and activities having a high developmental priority.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Generalized manpower requirement analyses and subsequent priority training programs will lead to overall reduction of critical shortages of skilled manpower in the Public Sector, and to a lesser degree, in the Private Sector. Autonomous Indonesian capability to recognize and identify trained manpower requirements, and to plan and implement program to meet such needs. Ongoing Indonesian institutions qualified and capable meeting some of the high priority domestic educational and manpower needs through the development of trained and competent teaching and managerial staffs. 																																																																																																						
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>A cadre of returned Indonesians effectively utilizing their training in contributing to the management and problem-solving activities associated with the nation's developmental priorities.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: Trained Participant Returnees</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">FY</th> <th colspan="2">Short Term</th> <th colspan="2">Degree</th> <th colspan="2">Long Term</th> </tr> <tr> <th>(Part.)</th> <th>(p/m)</th> <th>(Part.)</th> <th>(p/m)</th> <th>(Part.)</th> <th>(p/m)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>69</td><td>39</td><td>296</td><td>39</td><td>1,376</td><td>4</td><td>46</td></tr> <tr><td>70</td><td>120</td><td>466</td><td>51</td><td>1,440</td><td>71</td><td>607</td></tr> <tr><td>71</td><td>100</td><td>382</td><td>75</td><td>2,150</td><td>39</td><td>406</td></tr> <tr><td>72</td><td>70</td><td>247</td><td>35</td><td>1,180</td><td>10</td><td>123</td></tr> <tr><td>73</td><td>43</td><td>181</td><td>23</td><td>838</td><td>23</td><td>336</td></tr> <tr><td>74</td><td>71</td><td>225</td><td>22</td><td>694</td><td>17</td><td>229</td></tr> <tr><td>75</td><td>101</td><td>242</td><td>25</td><td>473</td><td>23</td><td>125</td></tr> <tr><td>76</td><td>37</td><td>78</td><td>18</td><td>337</td><td>11</td><td>335</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>18</td><td>59</td><td>8</td><td>216</td><td>2</td><td>26</td></tr> <tr><td>77</td><td>51</td><td>108</td><td>23</td><td>975</td><td>2</td><td>21</td></tr> <tr><td>TOT.</td><td>705</td><td>2,283</td><td>318</td><td>9,738</td><td>136</td><td>2,434</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	FY	Short Term		Degree		Long Term		(Part.)	(p/m)	(Part.)	(p/m)	(Part.)	(p/m)	69	39	296	39	1,376	4	46	70	120	466	51	1,440	71	607	71	100	382	75	2,150	39	406	72	70	247	35	1,180	10	123	73	43	181	23	838	23	336	74	71	225	22	694	17	229	75	101	242	25	473	23	125	76	37	78	18	337	11	335	10	18	59	8	216	2	26	77	51	108	23	975	2	21	TOT.	705	2,283	318	9,738	136	2,434												
FY	Short Term		Degree		Long Term																																																																																																		
	(Part.)	(p/m)	(Part.)	(p/m)	(Part.)	(p/m)																																																																																																	
69	39	296	39	1,376	4	46																																																																																																	
70	120	466	51	1,440	71	607																																																																																																	
71	100	382	75	2,150	39	406																																																																																																	
72	70	247	35	1,180	10	123																																																																																																	
73	43	181	23	838	23	336																																																																																																	
74	71	225	22	694	17	229																																																																																																	
75	101	242	25	473	23	125																																																																																																	
76	37	78	18	337	11	335																																																																																																	
10	18	59	8	216	2	26																																																																																																	
77	51	108	23	975	2	21																																																																																																	
TOT.	705	2,283	318	9,738	136	2,434																																																																																																	
<p>Inputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> GOI/USAID discussions for development of priority areas for management/technical training. Selection: (GOI annually presents to USAID approximately 500-1000 candidates to be screened for overseas training). Screening: (Screen candidates for professional qualifications and potential contribution to Indonesian development). English: (Test proposed candidates for English proficiency & provide English training) Orientation: (Provide sufficient cultural and administrative information before training takes place and provide individual professional & personal consultation. f) Training: Provide relevant training, as identified in the PIO/P, to enable each participant to make his agreed contribution to development. 	<p>Implementation Target (Type and Quantity)</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">FY</th> <th colspan="2">Planned</th> <th colspan="2">Actual Oblig.</th> <th rowspan="2">Expen.a/o Sert.77 (\$100)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>(\$100)</th> <th>(NO.)</th> <th>(\$100)</th> <th>(NO.)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>69</td><td>1,791</td><td>453</td><td>1,617</td><td>367</td><td>1,537</td></tr> <tr><td>70</td><td>1,500</td><td>415</td><td>1,130</td><td>321</td><td>1,130</td></tr> <tr><td>71</td><td>1,176</td><td>400</td><td>979</td><td>246</td><td>969</td></tr> <tr><td>72</td><td>1,600</td><td>164</td><td>717</td><td>135</td><td>713</td></tr> <tr><td>73</td><td>1,280</td><td>250</td><td>904</td><td>164</td><td>373</td></tr> <tr><td>74</td><td>1,150</td><td>299</td><td>1,140</td><td>157</td><td>649</td></tr> <tr><td>75</td><td>1,000</td><td>159</td><td>1,026</td><td>150</td><td>303</td></tr> <tr><td>76</td><td>995</td><td>173</td><td>995</td><td>161</td><td>111</td></tr> <tr><td>10</td><td>100</td><td>11</td><td>100</td><td>20</td><td>100</td></tr> <tr><td>77</td><td>1,800</td><td>277</td><td>1,783</td><td>202</td><td>1,266</td></tr> <tr><td>TOT.</td><td>12,392</td><td>2,601</td><td>10,391</td><td>1,924</td><td>9,243</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>GOI</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Contr.</th> <th>FY</th> <th>69</th> <th>70</th> <th>71</th> <th>72</th> <th>73</th> <th>74</th> <th>75</th> <th>76</th> <th>10</th> <th>77</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>(\$100)</td> <td></td> <td>329</td> <td>380</td> <td>365</td> <td>488</td> <td>384</td> <td>400</td> <td>755</td> <td>474</td> <td>20</td> <td>801</td> <td>5,156</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	FY	Planned		Actual Oblig.		Expen.a/o Sert.77 (\$100)	(\$100)	(NO.)	(\$100)	(NO.)	69	1,791	453	1,617	367	1,537	70	1,500	415	1,130	321	1,130	71	1,176	400	979	246	969	72	1,600	164	717	135	713	73	1,280	250	904	164	373	74	1,150	299	1,140	157	649	75	1,000	159	1,026	150	303	76	995	173	995	161	111	10	100	11	100	20	100	77	1,800	277	1,783	202	1,266	TOT.	12,392	2,601	10,391	1,924	9,243	Contr.	FY	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	10	77	TOTAL	(\$100)		329	380	365	488	384	400	755	474	20	801	5,156
FY	Planned		Actual Oblig.		Expen.a/o Sert.77 (\$100)																																																																																																		
	(\$100)	(NO.)	(\$100)	(NO.)																																																																																																			
69	1,791	453	1,617	367	1,537																																																																																																		
70	1,500	415	1,130	321	1,130																																																																																																		
71	1,176	400	979	246	969																																																																																																		
72	1,600	164	717	135	713																																																																																																		
73	1,280	250	904	164	373																																																																																																		
74	1,150	299	1,140	157	649																																																																																																		
75	1,000	159	1,026	150	303																																																																																																		
76	995	173	995	161	111																																																																																																		
10	100	11	100	20	100																																																																																																		
77	1,800	277	1,783	202	1,266																																																																																																		
TOT.	12,392	2,601	10,391	1,924	9,243																																																																																																		
Contr.	FY	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	10	77	TOTAL																																																																																											
(\$100)		329	380	365	488	384	400	755	474	20	801	5,156																																																																																											

SUMMARY
 FRAMEWORK

Life of Project:
 From FY 1967 to FY 1977
 Total US Funding \$12,000,000
 Date Prepared: November, 1977

MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Records and Reports from USAID, The Cabinet Secretariat, and other GOI agencies and Departments.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving goal targets:</p> <p>Problem-solving within overall national economic and social development is dependent upon managerial and technical capabilities. Increased training of manpower will help to solve current technical and managerial shortages.</p> <p>Other donors will continue to provide training.</p>
<p>- GOI Manpower Statistics - GOI and private educational institutions reports and records</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs:</p> <p>Overseas training will assist in filling skilled manpower vacancies and will, in turn, lead to development of indigenous skilled manpower training institutions and facilities focused on assessed National Priorities.</p>
<p>GOI Manpower Statistics, Training Records and Reports.</p> <p>GOI Personnel Statistics.</p> <p>GOI and USG Passport and Visa Statistics.</p>	<p>Assumptions for achieving outputs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participant will complete training and return to Indonesia and remain in their country. 2. Will be assigned work commensurate with their training. 3. Training received remains relevant to Indonesia's development needs.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual Pro-Ag signed by GOI 2. Training Division records - applications Training Division records - PIO/P statements 3. Training Division records - English test results and performance reports. 4. Performance records from universities and other trainers. 5. Monthly status reports from participants to AID/H 6. Periodic visit reports by GOI and AID officials to participants. 	<p>Assumptions for providing inputs:</p> <p>USAID funding and consultancy advisory assistance available and timely.</p> <p>GOI funding for international travel costs, as well as other local costs requirements.</p> <p>Continuation of a GOI institutionalized "agency" or office for the development of inter-departmental cooperation and coordination, Department of State For Administrative Reform.</p>