

Reference Center **4980198** (12)  
 Form 1656 NS  
**PD# AAD-940-B1**  
 498-11-680-198, 3

AID 1020-25 (7-68) <b>PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)</b> (U-446) See M.O. 1026.1	SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>	001 PROJECT <b>498-11-680-198, 3</b>
--	--	---

002 PAR	MO.	DAY	YR.	003 U.S. OBLIGATION SPAN	004 PROJECT TITLE
AS OF:	6	10		FY 67 Thru FY 73	<b>Regional Education Development (Southeast Asia Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture - SEARCA)</b>

006 FUNDING TABLE												
AID DOLLAR FINANCING-OBLIGATIONS (\$000)	TOTAL	CON-TRACT (NON-ADD)	PERSONNEL SERVICES			PARTICIPANTS		COMMODITIES		OTHER COSTS		
			AID	PASA	CON-TRACT	DIR. PASA	CON-TRACT	DIR. PASA	CON-TRACT	DIR. PASA	CON-TRACT	
CUMULATIVE NET THRU ACTUAL YEAR (FY 1966)	351											
PROPOSED OPERATIONAL YEAR (FY 1970)	1,343											

CCC VALUE OF P.L. 480 COMMODITIES (\$000)	Thru Actual Year	Operational Year Program
---	------------------	--------------------------

**007 IMPLEMENTING AGENCY TABLE**

If contractors or participating agencies are employed, enter the name and contract or PASA number of each in appropriate spaces below; in the case of voluntary agencies, enter name and registration number from M.O. 1551.1, Attachment A. Enter the appropriate descriptive code in columns b and c, using the coding guide provided below.

TYPE CODE b	TYPE CODE c	a. IMPLEMENTING AGENCY	TYPE CODE		d. CONTRACT/ PASA/ VOLAG NO.	e. LEAVE BLANK FOR AID/W USE
			b.	c.		
1. U.S. CONTRACTOR	0. PARTICIPATING AGENCY					
2. LOCAL CONTRACTOR	1. UNIVERSITY					
3. THIRD COUNTRY CONTRACTOR	2. NON-PROFIT INSTITUTION					
4. PARTICIPATING AGENCY	3. ARCHITECTURAL & ENGINEERING					
5. VOLUNTARY AGENCY	4. CONSTRUCTION					
6. OTHER:	5. OTHER COMMERCIAL					
	6. INDIVIDUAL					
	7. OTHER:					

**PART I - PROJECT IMPACT**

**I-A. GENERAL NARRATIVE STATEMENT ON PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS, SIGNIFICANCE & EFFICIENCY.**

This summary narrative should begin with a brief (one or two paragraph) statement of the principal events in the history of the project since the last PAR. Following this should come a concise narrative statement which evaluates the overall efficiency, effectiveness and significance of the project from the standpoint of:

- (1) overall performance and effectiveness of project implementation in achieving stated project targets;
- (2) the contribution to achievement of sector and goal plans;
- (3) anticipated results compared to costs, i.e., efficiency in resource utilization;
- (4) the continued relevance, importance and significance of the project to country development and/or the furtherance of U.S. objectives.

Include in the above outline, as necessary and appropriate, significant remedial actions undertaken or planned. The narrative can best be done after the rest of PART I is completed. It should integrate the partial analyses in I-B and I-C into an overall balanced appraisal of the project's impact. The narrative can refer to other sections of the PAR which are pertinent. If the evaluation in the previous PAR has not significantly changed, or if the project is too new to have achieved significant results, this Part should so state.

008 NARRATIVE FOR PART I-A (Continue on form AID 1020-25 I as necessary):

**Project History**

A proposal to set up a regional center in agriculture was considered in November 1965, when the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education met with Mr. Eugene R. Black, a special envoy from President Johnson, to

MISSION DIRECTOR APPROVAL →	SIGNATURE	DATE
-----------------------------	-----------	------

SECURITY UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT NUMBER 680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

existing forms of regional cooperation in education. SEARCA was one of ten projects selected by the Education Ministers for primary attention. By November 1966, at the Second Conference of Southeast Asian Ministers of Education, the University of the Philippines' College of Agriculture (UPCA), located at Los Banos, had been selected as the site for the Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture. The Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council (SEAMEC) set up an Agricultural Advisory Council (AAC) to define general policy guidelines for SEARCA, to submit suggestions on academic matters (in coordination with UPCA), and to provide liaison with the individual member countries through their representatives on the Advisory Council. The AAC has met seven times to date, most recently in April 1970, in Bangkok.

In the summer of 1967, an Interim Center Project Office was established at Los Banos and Project officials were selected. The SEARCA staff set to work refining the Project Blueprint and preparing for the first group of regional students who arrived in July 1968. Because of delays in setting up the Permanent Funding Plan, the Project was continued on an Interim basis through June 1969, a year longer than had originally been anticipated. As of the present time, SEARCA has admitted two additional classes of regional graduate students, a professor from Taiwan has been added to the SEARCA faculty, the staff has begun several research projects with potential regional significance, plans have been formulated for the inauguration of regional seminars on agriculture, and construction of permanent SEARCA facilities (distinct from those of UPCA although located on the same campus) has started.

### Project Organization

The organizational scheme of the regional center is based on the general SEAMEC principle that regional activities and projects should make maximum use of and further develop available national institutions and resources rather than create new facilities which may duplicate those already existing. To this end SEARCA, while maintaining a separate character through its own personnel, funding arrangements, and other means, is closely coordinated with UPCA: its academic programs are fused with the existing programs of UPCA, and administrative functions of UPCA are extended to SEARCA whenever feasible. In addition to classrooms and office space, UPCA has made housing available for SEARCA students and faculty on a temporary basis until SEARCA's own accommodations are completed.

UNCLASSIFIED

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

Although the United States paid 100% of Operating Expenses during the two interim years of project operations, SEARCA permanent funding is based on a 50-50 arrangement between the USG and other donors for the initial five years. The US and the host country (the Philippines) share responsibility for Operating Expenses on a sliding scale, with the GOP paying approximately 20% of these costs to the United States' 80% during the first year and those percentages gradually reversing so that the shares even out to 50-50 over a five-year period. Capital construction costs also will be divided by the US and the Philippines, although the US is paying the major share of expenses so far (primarily construction of a library at \$1 million).<sup>1</sup> The 50-50 agreement over a five-year period with regard to scholarship money, on the other hand, is between the USG and SEAMES. As with the Philippine share of Operating and Construction costs, however, the regional institution can raise funds from any available source inside or outside the region to meet its Special Funds obligations for scholarships.

General Narrative

As the above sections indicate, considerable progress has been made in the development of SEARCA as a viable regional institution of higher learning and research in agriculture. However, there are some aspects of project implementation which will bear watching in the future. These include the regional composition of the SEARCA student body (which so far is skewed in favor of the Philippines and Thailand), the development of the international SEARCA faculty (proceeding very slowly at the present time), SEAMES fund-raising efforts (which affect the availability of scholarships for study at SEARCA), construction of facilities (especially student housing), and the actual spread of benefits from SEARCA research projects to all member countries. So far delays in some of these areas have not impeded the basic forward momentum of the Project, the most important consideration in the case of the embryonic institution. However, as SEARCA passes out of its initial phase, progress in the above categories will have to be weighed far more critically.

It is still too early in the Project's history to be able to judge SEARCA's impact on various sector and program goals. SEARCA is

<sup>1</sup>This will be matched by library acquisitions from non-USG sources.

UNCLASSIFIED

1b

UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT 498MPT-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

designed, for example, to provide two essential ingredients for agricultural development: a supply of trained manpower and a reservoir of knowledge and techniques derived from research. However, to date no students have graduated from SEARCA and returned to their home countries to apply what they have learned, no research projects of regional significance have yet been completed, and the first regional agriculture workshop is not scheduled until March 1971. Therefore, it is premature to attempt to evaluate SEARCA's contributions to national agricultural development.

Even when SEARCA is fully functioning, its contribution to agricultural development may not appear very large because of the small number of students to graduate each year. However, relative to the size of the graduating class, SEARCA is designed to have a greater impact on improving Southeast Asian agriculture than any other institution in the region because of the high quality of instruction and research which it is aiming for. On the other hand, despite the logic of the whole concept of a regional center of excellence in agriculture--that high level training is made available to all of the countries at a cost much reduced over that of either sending students outside the region for training or having to develop national institutions of equal quality in each of the Southeast Asian countries--a shift of students and financial support to SEARCA will not occur automatically. Success in changing the traditional patterns of agricultural education will depend both on SEARCA's ability to build its reputation and on the member countries' growing receptivity to what SEARCA has to offer.

SEARCA has much working in its favor as far as the ultimate success of the Project is concerned. In the first place, the coordinate institutions, UPCA, is a firmly established institution in its own right with a long history of contributions to agricultural studies. In regard to SEARCA itself, there are strong grounds for regional cooperation in agricultural education because of the importance of the agricultural sectors to the economies of most of the Southeast Asian countries and the similarity in the make-up of these agrarian economies. The fact that in the field of agriculture there are so many common problems which can be attacked in a concerted manner with the expectation that all participants will reap similar and substantial benefits encourages firm member-country support of SEARCA (e.g., through the AAC, by sponsoring students, etc.). The recognized importance of the agricultural sector in economic development, too, means that SEARCA should be an attractive project from the standpoint of drawing outside donors to support the endeavor.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

By its very existence and continued operation SEARCA is contributing to the strengthening of the whole regional educational cooperation effort under SEAMEC. The outstanding record of the Philippines as host country to the institution has set an important precedent for the other nations in the region who are also hosting SEAMEC projects. The satisfactory progress of SEARCA to date speaks in favor of the US policy of supporting regional projects organized and run by the Asians themselves with a minimum of US interference in project decisions. In fact, with SEARCA already proving its reliability, the US should be encouraged to improve the coordination between some of its bilateral scholarship and agricultural development programs and the Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture at Los Banos.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT NUMBER

498-11-680-198

## PART I-B - PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

009

## I-B-1 - OUTPUT REPORT AND FORECAST - (See detailed instructions)

1. CODE NO. AID/W USE ONLY	2. This section is designed to record progress toward the achievement of each project output target which was scheduled in the PIP, Part II. Where progress toward a target is significantly greater or less than scheduled, describe reason(s) beneath the target.	ACTUAL AND PLANNED OUTPUTS (ALL DATA CUMULATIVE)				6. PROJECTED TOTAL FOR PROJECT LIFE
		3 ACTUAL CUM. TO DATE	4. AS OF PRIOR JUNE 30 1970		5. PLANNED BY NEXT JUNE 30 1971	
			a. PLANNED	b. ACTUAL		
	<p>THE SEARCA PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO:</p> <p>1. Produce highly qualified graduates from the SEAMEO countries with Masters or Doctors degrees in agricultural specialties.</p> <p>Discussion: The SEARCA Project is still too new to have any statistics on graduates; however, some preliminary observations are in order. It was originally estimated that an MS Degree should take 2 years and a Ph.D., 3 years, <u>IF</u> all of the students were equally qualified at the beginning of their studies. Although the original 5 MS candidates should receive their degrees this June, and 10 more MS candidates and the first 5 Ph.D. candidates their degrees next June (1971), it is highly unlikely that this will occur. Because of the different education systems in Southeast Asia, the degree candidates (especially the Ph.D. students from Indonesia) entered with varied academic backgrounds and can be expected to take more than the prescribed 2 or 3 years to finish their courses. SEARCA entrance requirements have been deliberately made flexible, but graduation requirements remain high and inflexible. (See Special Note at end of Section, p. 2b.</p> <p>2. Promote and carry out research directed toward the identification and solution of Southeast Asian agricultural problems through:</p> <p>(a) Dissertation research</p> <p>Discussion: For the reasons discussed under (1) above, it is unlikely that the first Ph.D. students will complete their dissertation research by June 1971. To head off a controversy over accreditation, SEARCA accepted 5 Indonesian students</p>	3	5	(less than 5)	15	unlimited
		0	0	0	5	unlimited

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

## PART I-B - PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

009

## I-B-1 - OUTPUT REPORT AND FORECAST - (See detailed instructions)

1. CODE NO. AID/W USE ONLY	2. This section is designed to record progress toward the achievement of each project output target which was scheduled in the PIP, Part II. Where progress toward a target is significantly greater or less than scheduled, describe reason(s) beneath the target.	ACTUAL AND PLANNED OUTPUTS (ALL DATA CUMULATIVE)				
		3 ACTUAL CUM. TO DATE	4. AS OF PRIOR JUNE 30 1970		5. PLANNED BY NEXT JUNE 30 1971	6. PROJECTED TOTAL FOR PROJECT LIFE
			a. PLANNED	b. ACTUAL		
	<p>for the Ph.D. program although it was not convinced that the students' previous training in Indonesia was up to the SEARCA MS Degree level. SEARCA's estimate has been borne out since the students are taking much longer than should be necessary to complete degree requirements. (See Special Note, p. 2b).</p> <p>(b) SEARCA staff research projects</p> <p>Discussion: The projects completed or underway are: an article "Southeast Asian Agriculture Today" by the SEARCA Project Leader published as SEARCA's first research <u>Bulletin</u> (Nov 1969); a "Social Laboratory" project which works on opening the lines of communication between the farmers and the various local agricultural organizations which could help them; a study of "Accreditation and Degree Equivalencies" among agricultural institutions in Southeast Asia; and a survey of "Manpower Needs in Agriculture" in Southeast Asia. Future research projects are being contemplated on multiple cropping, narrowing the protein gap, and livestock.</p> <p>The number of projects shows satisfactory progress and they are all of potential regional focus. However, all of the projects but the first have had to start on a limited national basis and therefore regional benefits from the completed studies are still some time away: the Social Laboratory experiment has begun its pilot project in the Philippines; the Accreditation Study so far is focused only on the Philippines and Thailand; and the Manpower Survey is being done in Thailand. Some problems can be anticipated in the expansion of such research endeavors; in the first place, the SEARCA staff is extremely limited in size (see PAR Part II-A, Item No. 4) and all research projects rely on the participation of members of the non-regional UPCA faculty; secondly, the undertaking</p>	4	4	4	(4)	unlimited

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

498-17-680-198

## PART I-B - PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS

## 009 I-B-1 - OUTPUT REPORT AND FORECAST - (See detailed instructions)

1. CODE NO. AID/W USE ONLY	2. This section is designed to record progress toward the achievement of each project output target which was scheduled in the PIP, Part II. Where progress toward a target is significantly greater or less than scheduled, describe reason(s) beneath the target.	3. ACTUAL AND PLANNED OUTPUTS (ALL DATA CUMULATIVE)				6. PROJECTED TOTAL FOR PROJECT LIFE
		3 ACTUAL CUM. TO DATE	4. AS OF PRIOR JUNE 30 1970		5. PLANNED BY NEXT JUNE 30 1971	
			a. PLANNED	b. ACTUAL		
	<p>of these projects in successive Southeast Asian countries depends to a large extent on host government funding of all local costs (e.g., the Thai government is paying for a counterpart team from Kasetsart University in the manpower survey), and this could be an inhibiting factor to some countries in the region.</p> <p>3. Establish effective intra-regional communications in the agricultural sector through:</p> <p>(a) Academic publications and Clearing House activities</p> <p>Discussion: the first <u>SEARCA Bulletin</u> was published in November 1969 (see 2-b above) and distributed to appropriate agricultural and educational institutions throughout the region; a Documentation Center is planned within 2-3 years time (UNDP/Manila has already committed funds for a consultant for 6 months--presumably an expert from the FAO Documentation Center--to help prepare a blueprint).</p> <p>(b) Professional Seminars and Conferences</p> <p>Discussion: A workshop on Farming Associations is planned for March 1971 in Kuala Lumpur. All SEAMEO countries, including those such as Cambodia and Laos which are not formal members of SEARCA, will be invited to send two representatives each. SEARCA officials have a seminar on Multiple Cropping in mind for 1971-72.</p> <p>Special Note: Cable 5809 (Manila), 6/23/70, reports that all 5 Ph.D. students from Indonesia are being withdrawn because their services are needed at home. Only one of the 5 Thai MA students will receive his degree in June 1970.</p>	1	1	1	unlimited	
		0	0	0	1	unlimited

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

PART I-B - Continued

010

B.2 - OVERALL ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT TARGETS

Place an "X" within the bracket on the following seven-point scale that represents your judgment of the overall progress towards project targets:



PART I-C - PROJECT SIGNIFICANCE

011

C.1 - RELATION TO SECTOR AND PROGRAM GOALS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1)

This section is designed to indicate the potential and actual impact of the project on relevant sector and program goals. List the goals in col. b and rate potential and actual project impact in cols. c and d.

a. CODE NO. (AID/W USE ONLY)	b. SCALE FOR COLUMN c: 3= Very Important; 2= Important; 1= Secondary importance SCALE FOR COLUMN d: 3= Superior/Outstanding; 2= Adequate/Satisfactory/Good; 1= Unsatisfactory/Marginal	c. POTENTIAL IMPACT ON EACH GOAL IF PROJECT ACHIEVES TARGETS	d. ACTUAL IMPACT ON GOAL TO DATE RELATIVE TO PROGRESS EXPECTED AT THIS STAGE
	b. SECTOR AND PROGRAM GOALS (LIST ONLY THOSE ON WHICH THE PROJECT HAS A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT)		
	(1) To improve the agricultural sectors of the economies of Southeast Asian countries	2	2
	(2) To promote regional cooperation in education	2	2
	(3)		
	(4)		

For goals where column c. is rated 3 or 2 and column d. is rated 1, explain in the space for narrative. The narrative should also indicate the extent to which the potential impacts rated 3 or 2 in column c. are dependent on factors external to the achievement of the project targets, i.e., is there a substantial risk of the anticipated impact being forestalled by factors not involved in the achievement of project targets. If possible and relevant, it also would be useful to mention in the narrative your reading of any current indicators that longer-term purposes, beyond scheduled project targets, are likely or unlikely to be achieved. Each explanatory note must be identified by the number of the entry (col. b) to which it pertains.

012 NARRATIVE FOR PART I-C.1 (Continue on form AID 1020-25 1);

- (1) The ultimate aim of SEARCA is to have its graduates return to their home countries in Southeast Asia and apply what they have learned at Los Banos through teaching, further research, or government work in putting advanced agricultural methods into practice, all aimed at increasing agricultural productivity, diversifying the agricultural sector, or otherwise improving the performance of the agrarian economies. Although it is too early in the project's history to be able to point to any specific examples of SEARCA's contribution to national agricultural programs, certain features of the project suggest that such contributions will not be long in coming. Even though the number of SEARCA graduates per year may never be very large--even with the projected development of the SEARCA student body to 250 students over a ten-year period--

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

the SEARCA project is designed to have a significant impact on the national economies relative to its small number of graduates. Basically this is because of the high quality of training which the institution is aiming for: it is designed to be THE center of excellence for graduate studies in agriculture for the entire Southeast Asian region. Also, since the agricultural economies of the countries in the region are similar in many respects, the advanced techniques learned at Los Banos should automatically have wide applicability in Southeast Asia.

Success, however, depends not only on SEARCA's ability to build up its credentials (i.e., to fulfill project output targets), but also on the receptivity of the Southeast Asian countries to what SEARCA has to offer. In other words, once trained, the students must be willing both to remain in the field of agriculture and to return to their home countries to work, and the Southeast Asian governments on the other hand must be willing to provide employment positions for SEARCA graduates that are commensurate with their training and which will allow them to translate what they have learned into action directed towards improving the local agricultural economies. In the case of the SEARCA project, the students already have had undergraduate and perhaps graduate training in the field of agriculture, and therefore are already committed to the field. The students are nominated for SEAMES scholarships by their home governments, which select candidates upon the recommendation of various agricultural and educational institutions within the country, and the Ministers of Education have an understanding with SEARCA that the students will return to jobs related to their studies. A reduced salary is paid to students by their home governments while they are at SEARCA, so links with their respective countries are maintained. Until SEARCA's reputation has grown, however, it may have to face up to the fact that its graduates may receive less key positions or positions at less salary than fellow students who have received agricultural training in the US or Europe. Education abroad still carries considerable prestige in these countries; it will take time and a determined effort by SEARCA to break this tradition.

The short-term course in up-to-date agricultural techniques which SEARCA is to initiate during the coming academic year (July 1970-June 1971) should have an even more direct effect on improving agriculture in Southeast Asia than will the longer-term degree programs (although the magnitude of the impact of these shorter

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

courses may not be as great). The short courses are designed as in-service training for agricultural personnel; therefore the trainees are already in positions to apply what they learn at Los Banos. Their home governments will continue to pay their full salaries while they are at SEARCA, so there is no question of job continuation. The subjects studied will be specific in nature, and designed for immediate application.

Beyond the above considerations, SEARCA hopes to broaden its membership to include other Southeast Asian countries (Laos, Cambodia, and perhaps even non-agricultural Singapore), in order to widen the distribution of projects benefits. Steps are already being taken in this direction with the inclusion of these countries in some of the agricultural workshops planned.

- (2) Although it is only one example of a more widespread cooperative program, by its very existence and continued operation SEARCA supports regional cooperation in education. Designed by Southeast Asian officials as a supplement, rather than a competitor, to national agricultural education endeavors, SEARCA depends on the continued cooperation of the regional Ministers of Education through SEAMEO (for scholarship money and other support) and on the continued cooperation of the five SEARCA member-countries through the Agricultural Advisory Council (AAC) for advice and sanction for its activities. Although the AAC has tended to be a rubber-stamp for work carried out by SEARCA officials at Los Banos, nonetheless, it is an available forum for the expression of national opinions about the regional project. The Malaysian and Vietnamese representatives, for example, have spoken out on several issues affecting SEARCA's development. Then too, the initiation of the short courses during the coming year is an indication of the responsiveness of SEARCA to the educational needs of the region.

SEARCA and the other SEAMEO centers were designed to provide an indigenous solution to regional trained manpower needs, so that qualified personnel were not attracted to universities and subsequent jobs outside Southeast Asia. So far there is no evidence that the establishment of SEARCA has caused a reversal of this "brain drain." Although it is too early in the project's history legitimately to expect such a shift to take place, it is useful to examine the situation to see what SEARCA is up against. As mentioned briefly in Section (1) above, education abroad in any field still carries considerable prestige in the Southeast Asian

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

countries. Not only do the students prefer to travel outside the region for training, but the governments reinforce this trend by treating scholarships for study abroad as political plums and by rewarding such study with superior jobs at superior salaries once the students return. In a way, therefore, the continuation of this practice is an indicator that support of the regional center at Los Banos by the countries in the region is not yet as strong as it could be. SEARCA officials admit that student performance has not been outstanding because the institution has not yet been able to attract the top-quality students in the region. It will take time for SEARCA's reputation to grow; the Asian Institute of Technology (AIT), for example, is only now becoming highly respected after 10 years. However, in the meantime, SEARCA can play a positive role in encouraging regional support for the institution by improving the quality of its staff and curriculum (see PAR Part II-A-1(4)), and through advertising campaigns to keep member countries informed both of students' achievements and of all that SEARCA has to offer to national agricultural programs.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PART I-C - Continued

## C.2 - GENERAL QUESTIONS

These questions concern developments since the prior PAR. For each question place "Y" for Yes, "N" for No, or "NA" for Not Applicable in the right hand column. For each question where "Y" is entered, explain briefly in the space below the table.	MARK IN THIS COL.
013 Have there been any significant, unusual or unanticipated results not covered so far in this PAR?	N
014 Have means, conditions or activities other than project measures had a substantial effect on project output or accomplishments?	N
015 Have any problems arisen as the result of advice or action or major contributions to the project by another donor?	Y
016 If the answer to 014 or 015 is yes, or for any other reason, is the project now less necessary, unnecessary or subject to modification or earlier termination?	N
017 Have any important lessons, positive or negative, emerged which might have broad applicability?	Y
018 Has this project revealed any requirement for research or new technical aids on which AID/W should take the initiative?	Y
019 Do any aspects of the project lend themselves to publicity in newspapers, magazines, television or films in the United States?	Y
020 Has there been a lack of effective cooperating country media coverage? (Make sure AID/W has copies of existing coverage.)	N
021 NARRATIVE FOR PART I-C.2 Identify each explanatory note by the number of the entry to which it pertains. (Continue on form AID 1020-25 I as necessary):	

015 Because SEARCA is a regional endeavor, there are other donors to the project besides the United States. Even the Philippines is a "co-donor" to the project rather than an aid recipient in the bilateral sense. Other than USG and GOP contributions, financial support for the project is mainly channelled through SEAMEO, the regional organization. Specifically, from its Special Funds, SEAMES provides scholarships for SEARCA students and operating expenses for meetings of the AAC.

SEAMES has had some problems in fund-raising--despite the US promise to provide 50% of Special Funds costs over a five-year period--and these difficulties in turn have affected SEARCA: for example, SEAMES inability to provide scholarships for the 1969-70 school year caused SEARCA to reduce the number of new students it could take from 30 to 20.<sup>1</sup> Also, the US was called on to finance 100% of Special Funds costs for SEARCA during that year with the proviso that SEAMES would shoulder enough of the burden later to maintain the 50-50 sharing formula over a five-year period.<sup>2</sup> Similar

<sup>1</sup>Letter of 4 March 1969 from SEARCA to SEAMES.

<sup>2</sup>Scholarships were held in reserve during the 1969-70 year for four students who were not able to come to SEARCA after all (see PAR Part II-A-1 (5)). Although RED has not yet been notified by SEARCA that these funds are outstanding, such notification is expected with the end of the fiscal year. The funds are not transferrable for use in liquidating other SEARCA operating expenses and therefore will have to be returned to the USG.

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

problems plague the 1970-71 academic year. This time the US has agreed to put up 100% of Special Funds for the first two quarters, thereby giving SEAMES more time to raise its share of the expenses. (During the coming year, SEAMES will pay 100% of the last two quarters, or 50% of total Special Funds costs for the year).

Delays have occurred because it has taken SEAMES time to adjust to the unfamiliar concept of institutional fund-raising. The US has provided consultants to help in this matter, but until recently the period of consultation was generally too short to make substantial headway. SEAMES current plans include development of an Endowment Fund in the amount of \$20-25 million over the next five years, designed to generate the estimated \$2 million per year needed for Special Funds expenses of all SEAMES projects.<sup>1</sup> In the meantime, SEAMES is employing various ad hoc measures to raise needed funds. In the particular case of Los Banos, SEARCA has helped SEAMES raise scholarship money by encouraging the Rockefeller Foundation to donate \$30,000 to SEAMES, earmarked for SEARCA during the 1970-71 year. Should SEAMES not be able to come up with its share during the coming year, there is a fall-back agreement that the host country (the Philippines) will meet these expenses so that the US will not be called upon again to provide 100%. Therefore, although SEAMES' contributions to SEARCA have been troublesome in the past, there is ground for cautious optimism that through interim measures and the long-term Endowment Fund plan the problems are being worked out.

<sup>1</sup>At the present time, the SEAMEO member countries are being asked to pledge \$7 million to the Endowment Fund, with the remaining capital to be raised from 13 or so other nations and international organizations interested in Southeast Asian Development. The money will be invested as it comes in over the next 5 years.

- 017 SEARCA stands as a lesson in how well a project can succeed when considerable responsibility is placed on the shoulders of the cooperating countries. The local and regional officials involved in the SEARCA project are an impressive group which has worked diligently and capably on all facets of project organization and development.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

- 018 SEARCA officials have mentioned a need on the Los Banos campus for improved research and laboratory equipment, including such major items as an electron microscope and a larger computer. USAID might look into this in the future.

SEARCA could also benefit from expansion of the USAID-funded and US Department of Interior-staffed Rhodent Control Research Center already located at Los Banos. Although research projects at the Center are currently geared specifically to rat conditions in the Philippines, the work is of potential benefit to the entire region.<sup>1</sup> Not only are the results of the Center's basic research applicable to countries besides the Philippines, but also the Center could be of great value in training regional students in rhodent research methodology so that further specific research could be carried on by the students in their home countries. With an expanded faculty and additional laboratory facilities, Rhodent Control could become a new field of graduate specialization at Los Banos. Ways of better coordinating the work of the Rhodent Center with SEARCA should be investigated.

<sup>1</sup>A high percentage of the rice crop in all these countries is lost to rats each year.

- 019 The regional aspect of SEARCA lends itself to publicity in the US. For the second time, Time magazine is now offering free space for full-page color advertisements for each of the SEAMEO endeavors.

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

## II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 - INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

(a) PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN, ONE COLUMN		
		(1) BEHIND SCHEDULE	(2) ON SCHEDULE	(3) AHEAD OF SCHEDULE
1.	Organization of temporary project headquarters at Los Banos, including the appointment of a Director and Assistant Director of SEARCA--summer 1967		X	
2.	Organization of permanent SEARCA institution-- July 1968  Discussion: The permanent center was delayed for one year (until July 1969) because both SEAMES and SEARCA needed more time to prepare their permanent funding plans. As a result, the USG paid full operating costs for the additional interim project year. However, considerable progress was made during this period: a Project Leader (Thai) was appointed and began work by April 1968, and the first group of SEARCA students began their studies on July 1, 1968. Consultants were provided to help in preparing the permanent funding plans. Because fund-raising was an entirely new concept which SEAMES had to deal with, it was felt that the original estimate of only one year in which to prepare the permanent funding plans had been unrealistic.	X		
3.	Development of contacts with national educational and agricultural institutions for the recruitment of staff and students and for the dissemination of information on agriculture--  e.g.--the holding of national seminars on SEARCA's objectives in August 1967. --the organization of a regional meeting on SEARCA in September 1967. --the establishment of the Agricultural Advisory Committee (AAC) with representatives from the SEARCA member-countries --first meeting in June 1967 --7 meetings to date --annual notification of the regional Ministries of Education of SEARCA scholarships, and solicitation of nominations.		X	
4.	Recruitment of professional staff and curriculum expansion--	X		

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 - INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN, ONE COLUMN																																															
		(1)	(2)	(3)																																													
		BEHIND SCHEDULE	ON SCHEDULE	AHEAD OF SCHEDULE																																													
	<p>Discussion: Beyond appointment of administrative officials (Director, Assistant Director, and Project Leader), only <u>one</u> SEARCA professor has been recruited: Dr. Chi-Wen Chang of Taiwan. Furthermore, this professor teaches only one course, being mainly involved in the Social Laboratory research project, and his contract is due to expire after June 1971. One SEARCA tenure professor "may" be hired during 1970-71, and only <u>one</u> additional one is budgeted for 1971-72. Since the SEARCA goal remains 19 academic staff members by 1973-74 (see TABLE below), staff development is behind schedule.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">TABLE: STAFF DEVELOPMENT</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Staff Projection as of 1966-68<sup>a</sup></th> <th>Staff Projection as of 1969<sup>b</sup></th> <th>Actual No. of Staff</th> <th>Nationality</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1967-68</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2</td> <td>2 Phil.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1968-69</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td>2 Phil.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1969-70</td> <td>7</td> <td>3 (+3 Admin.)= 6</td> <td>4</td> <td>2 Phil., 1 Thai, 1 Taiwan</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1970-71</td> <td>13</td> <td>7 ( " )=10</td> <td>4(5)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1971-72</td> <td>17</td> <td>8 ( " )=11</td> <td>(3-5)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1972-73</td> <td>21</td> <td>14 ( " )=17</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1973-74</td> <td>23</td> <td>19 ( " )=22</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1978-79</td> <td>28</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>(academic and administrative officials) (all numbers cumulative)</p>	Year	Staff Projection as of 1966-68 <sup>a</sup>	Staff Projection as of 1969 <sup>b</sup>	Actual No. of Staff	Nationality	1967-68			2	2 Phil.	1968-69			3	2 Phil.	1969-70	7	3 (+3 Admin.)= 6	4	2 Phil., 1 Thai, 1 Taiwan	1970-71	13	7 ( " )=10	4(5)		1971-72	17	8 ( " )=11	(3-5)		1972-73	21	14 ( " )=17			1973-74	23	19 ( " )=22			1978-79	28						
Year	Staff Projection as of 1966-68 <sup>a</sup>	Staff Projection as of 1969 <sup>b</sup>	Actual No. of Staff	Nationality																																													
1967-68			2	2 Phil.																																													
1968-69			3	2 Phil.																																													
1969-70	7	3 (+3 Admin.)= 6	4	2 Phil., 1 Thai, 1 Taiwan																																													
1970-71	13	7 ( " )=10	4(5)																																														
1971-72	17	8 ( " )=11	(3-5)																																														
1972-73	21	14 ( " )=17																																															
1973-74	23	19 ( " )=22																																															
1978-79	28																																																
	<p><sup>a</sup>Memorandum of Understanding between the University of the Philippines College of Agriculture and SEAMEC; also, Funding Scheme, prepared in October 1968, SEARCA/AAC4/PD/H03.</p> <p><sup>b</sup>PROP on SEARCA Project prepared by RED, 21 November 1969. Actual PROP listing was only for visiting and tenure professors, therefore administrators were added.</p> <p>Discussion (continued): In addition to slow staff development, no additional fields and no new courses have been added to the UPCA curriculum since the advent of SEARCA, although it is explained that existing courses are now being taught from a more regional</p>																																																

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

## PART II -- IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

## II-A -- STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 -- INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

(a) PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS -- PLACE AN "X" IN, ONE COLUMN		
		(1) BEHIND SCHEDULE	(2) ON SCHEDULE	(3) AHEAD OF SCHEDULE
	<p>point of view. As a result, the basis is questionable for SEARCA <u>yet</u> to claim that it is any more <u>THE</u> regional center of excellence for graduate studies in agriculture than UPCA originally was.</p> <p>Causes: Jealousy over the high SEARCA salaries has been mentioned as the reason for no appointment of certain UPCA faculty as SEARCA professors (a move included in the original plans). The reason for little intra- or extra-regional staff recruitment is even less clear--perhaps because of the salary burden this would entail. The hope for greater progress in the recruitment of highly qualified international staff members should be mentioned to SEARCA officials.</p>			
5.	<p>Recruitment of Students</p> <p>Discussion: The recruitment of SEARCA students is somewhat behind schedule both in terms of numbers and in terms of regional distribution (see TABLE below), but this is not considered particularly damaging to the project (yet).</p>	X		

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

## PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

## II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 - INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN, ONE COLUMN																																		
		(1) BEHIND SCHEDULE	(2) ON SCHEDULE	(3) AHEAD OF SCHEDULE																																
	TABLE: STUDENT RECRUITMENT (all numbers cumulative)																																			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Student Projection as of 1966-68<sup>a</sup></th> <th>Student Projection as of 1969<sup>b</sup></th> <th>Actual Number of Students</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1968-69</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>10<sup>c</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1969-70</td> <td>40</td> <td>30</td> <td>26<sup>d</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1970-71</td> <td>100</td> <td>80</td> <td>50 (56)<sup>e</sup></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1971-72</td> <td>140</td> <td>100</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1972-73</td> <td>180</td> <td>130</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1973-74</td> <td>200</td> <td>160</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1978-79</td> <td>250</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Student Projection as of 1966-68 <sup>a</sup>	Student Projection as of 1969 <sup>b</sup>	Actual Number of Students	1968-69			10 <sup>c</sup>	1969-70	40	30	26 <sup>d</sup>	1970-71	100	80	50 (56) <sup>e</sup>	1971-72	140	100		1972-73	180	130		1973-74	200	160		1978-79	250					
Year	Student Projection as of 1966-68 <sup>a</sup>	Student Projection as of 1969 <sup>b</sup>	Actual Number of Students																																	
1968-69			10 <sup>c</sup>																																	
1969-70	40	30	26 <sup>d</sup>																																	
1970-71	100	80	50 (56) <sup>e</sup>																																	
1971-72	140	100																																		
1972-73	180	130																																		
1973-74	200	160																																		
1978-79	250																																			
	<sup>a</sup> Memorandum of Understanding between the University of the Philippines College of Agriculture and SEAMEC; also, Funding Scheme, prepared in October 1968, SEARCA/AAC4/PD/H03.																																			
	<sup>b</sup> PROP on SEARCA Project prepared by RED, 21 November 1969.																																			
	<sup>c</sup> Fifteen students were accepted; however, 5 students from Malaysia dropped out--due mainly to the political disagreement between the Philippines and Malaysia over the sovereignty of Sabah--leaving 5 students from Thailand (for the MS degree) and 5 from Indonesia (for the Ph.D. degree).																																			
	<sup>d</sup> Twenty new students were accepted, 10 less than planned because sufficient scholarship money was not available from SEAMES Special Funds. Of these, 16 arrived: 4 Vietnames, 5 Filipinos, and 7 Thais. Positions (and scholarships) were held for the remaining 3 Vietnamese and 1 Filipino; however, these students did not arrive during the 1969-70 academic year.																																			
	<sup>e</sup> Thirty new students have been accepted for the coming year beginning on 1 July 1970. This number includes the return of 2 of the Malaysian students who left in 1968-69. Six positions (and scholarships) are being held for Vietnamese students who will receive undergraduate degrees in Vietnam in July and are expected at SEARCA in the fall of 1970. Therefore, 24 students are expected to begin degree work in July 1970; 11 from Thailand, 9 from the Philippines, and 4 from Malaysia (bringing the total SEARCA student body to 50 in July 1970). In addition to degree candidates, however, a number of regional agricultural personnel will receive SEARCA scholarships for short-term up-to-date training in various agricultural subjects at Los Banos in 1970-71.																																			

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 -- INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

(a) PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS, CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN, ONE COLUMN		
		(1)	(2)	(3)
		BEHIND SCHEDULE	ON SCHEDULE	AHEAD OF SCHEDULE
	<p>Discussion (continued): As far as the overall success of the project is concerned, the important thing is that SEARCA has gotten off the ground and is a functioning institution with a growing body of SEAMES-sponsored graduate students from the Southeast Asian region. Student recruitment projections were best estimates, and were not designed to be used as measures of the success or failure of the project. Nevertheless, certain preliminary observations can be made. So far, for example, the lack of physical facilities (e.g., dormitories) has not been an inhibiting factor in student recruitment. On the other hand, problems with scholarship availability have already had an effect on the size of the student body (see footnote "d" to the TABLE above, and also PAR Part I-C-2 Sect. 015 for a discussion of SEAMES Special Funds problems). In general, however, it has been politico-social conditions within the SEAMEO countries, rather than any lack on SEARCA's part, which have caused some delays in student recruitment. The break in diplomatic relations between the Philippines and Malaysia, the security situation in Indochina, non-coinciding school years in some countries, a lack of qualified students (e.g., in the case of Laos), and the inability of some nations to spare scarce agricultural personnel for extended training abroad, have all played a role. So far, Thailand leads the list with 23 students at SEARCA, and the Philippines follows with 14 students. Considerably behind the leaders come Indonesia with 5 students, and Malaysia and Vietnam with 4 each.</p> <p>There are no clear cut ways to improve the regional distribution of the student body; many of the current problems should resolve themselves over time. Time, too, is needed for SEARCA's reputation to grow and thereby increase its drawing power among students and sponsoring agricultural institutions. In the meantime, however, one way SEARCA is working on the problem is through the initiation in the coming year of short-term refresher courses in advanced agricultural techniques for in-service personnel from the Southeast Asian region. This should increase national participation in SEARCA activities: Indonesia, for example, is sending representatives to</p>			

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 - INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN ONE COLUMN		
		(1) BEHIND SCHEDULE	(2) ON SCHEDULE	(3) AHEAD OF SCHEDULE
	<p>to the short course although it did not feel it could spare students for the longer degree programs this year.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>US leverage in the matter of student recruitment is very limited because of the regional nature of the project. However, there are various indirect ways the US could help to strengthen SEARCA, mainly by better coordinating the bilateral aid programs with the regional endeavor. Currently, for example, the bilateral aid agreements with the governments of South Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines all permit the awarding of US fellowships for the study of agriculture in the United States. This support for sending students abroad conflicts with the SEAMEC (and SEARCA) goal of reversing the brain drain by establishing and supporting regional centers of excellence in various fields. As a specific example, Indonesia is getting a \$7 million USAID project to improve its agriculture which includes \$500,000 a year for participant training in the US, while the Indonesian government does not feel it can "spare" students for study at SEARCA. And again, a War-on-Hungary AID contract was awarded to North Carolina State for conducting a seminar on Southeast Asian agricultural institutional development. SEARCA could have played a major role in these endeavors.</p>			
6.	<p>Provision of academic facilities</p> <p>Discussion: According to several project communications,<sup>2</sup> construction of "SEARCA facilities" on the Los Banos campus was to begin during FY 1969; however, Phase I of GOP-financed construction did not begin until Jan 1970 (FY 70) and Phase I of USC-financed construction is not likely to begin before fall 1970 (FY 71). The</p> <p>During the initial years of the short-term training program, scholarships are to be awarded to students from Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Singapore and Vietnam, with none going to either the Philippines or Thailand who are heavily represented in the regular degree programs. See: "Projection of Activities During SEARCA's Extended Interim Period: 1 July 1968 - 30 June 1969"; and Telegram, Bangkok 2724, 5 March 1969.</p>	X		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT NUMBER

498-11-995-128

## PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

## II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 - INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

(a) PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN, ONE COLUMN		
		(1) BEHIND SCHEDULE	(2) ON SCHEDULE	(3) AHEAD OF SCHEDULE
	<p>Philippine construction which is underway does not include any academic facilities, and the library is the only "academic" item (although a major one) in the US construction package. The fact that the library is "behind schedule" has not directly hindered the academic program in the same way that insufficient classrooms would have. In the case of general academic facilities, SEARCA has benefitted from the concurrent large scale expansion of UPCA teaching and laboratory facilities which the two institutions share. On the other hand, the delay in building the library has put off the day when SEARCA can claim to have research and study facilities superior to others available in the region and equal to the best available outside the region.</p> <p>SEARCA construction has been slowed down by many factors: time was needed at the beginning to arrive at construction packages mutually acceptable to the donors (two examples: the USG wanted SEARCA facilities to be distinguishable in certain ways from general UPCA expansion plans, and the GOP wanted to include housing for married students although the USG declined to share this cost); a switch from USG to GOP funding of the A&amp;E work resulted in a 3-4 month delay while details were re-worked; the USG construction package was unexpectedly changed to FY-70-funding instead of FY 69, causing several months delay after the completion of the A&amp;E work; and the need to conform to detailed US Capital Project Guidelines has caused the Philippine engineers unexpected work in preparing the plans. In addition, differing interpretations of the effect of the current floating Philippine Peso rate on the construction program have led to some ambiguity within US circles as well as Philippine circles about the wisdom of proceeding rapidly with construction at this time. Regardless of these factors, however, there is general agreement among SEARCA officials and within RED that USG-financed construction will get underway in the fall of 1970. Because the construction delays do not appear to have had serious consequences (such as preventing the holding of classes, or damaging US/RED - Philippine/SEARCA relations to a point where the project was jeopardized), the possibility that these past delays could have been avoided is not debated here.<sup>1</sup></p> <p><sup>1</sup>The advisability of invoking US Capital Project Guidelines in the case of the regional SEARCA endeavor has been debated particularly heatedly in US circles. While the issue has been "decided" for the current USG construction package, there is sufficient merit to the argument against application of these guidelines for the issue to be reexamined well in advance of additional SEARCA construction, or in relation to construction at the other SEAMEO regional centers.</p>			

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

## PART II - IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

## II-A - STATUS OF SCHEDULE

022 A-1 - INDIVIDUAL ACTIONS (See detailed instructions M.O. 1026.1). This is a listing of major actions or steps which were scheduled for physical start or continuing implementation in the reporting period as reflected in the Project Implementation Plan, Part I.

(a)		(b) STATUS - PLACE AN "X" IN ONE COLUMN		
PIP ITEM NO.	MAJOR ACTIONS OR STEPS; CAUSES AND RESULTS OF DELAYS; REMEDIAL STEPS	(1)	(2)	(3)
		BEHIND SCHEDULE	ON SCHEDULE	AHEAD OF SCHEDULE
7.	<p>Provision of student and staff housing</p> <p>Discussion: Student and staff housing was to be built "as needed"; although SEARCA would have preferred to have begun construction at an earlier date, the lack of finished facilities to date has not held up student or staff recruitment and therefore can be considered "on schedule." COP-funded construction of 3 staff houses and 6 houses for married students began in Jan. 1970 and the USG-funded construction package to begin soon includes 3 more staff houses and one student dormitory. If building commences in the fall of 1970 as currently planned, the dormitory should be completed by July 1971, when it will definitely be needed to house the expanding SEARCA student body. The three staff houses under construction are to be assigned to the Visiting Professor from Taiwan, the Project Leader, and either the Director or Assistant Director. Since the staff is to expand only by a net total of one at the most by June 1972 (see Section 4 above), there is some question about SEARCA's ability to fill the six houses now planned. Since the USG is to finance 10 of the 13 additional staff houses planned for construction, SEARCA's <u>need</u> for this housing should be carefully reexamined in light of actual staff expansion in the next few years.</p>		X	
8.	<p>Provision of facilities for information services, seminars, etc</p> <p>Discussion: It is still too early to be able to evaluate the timeliness of progress in this category. The Documentation Center and press facilities are planned for 2-3 years hence, (consultant services for preparation of the blueprint have already been arranged). It has been mentioned that the Workshop on Agricultural Associations planned for March 1971 is to be held in Kuala Lumpur because auditorium facilities are lacking on the SEARCA (UPCA) campus. No conference facilities such as an auditorium are included in the basic construction program; undoubtedly this will be considered in future SEARCA development. It is significant that the lack of such facilities is <u>not</u> inhibiting the planning of conferences under SEARCA auspices at other locations.</p>		X	

UNCLASSIFIED

498-11-680-198

PART II - Continued

023

II-A.2 - OVERALL TIMELINESS

In general, project implementation is (place an "X" in one block):

- (a) On schedule
- (b) Ahead of schedule
- (c) Behind schedule 
  - (1) AID/W Program Approval
  - (2) Implementing Agency (Contractor/Participating Agency/Voluntary Agency)
  - (3) Technicians
  - (4) Participants
  - (5) Commodities (non-FFF)
  - (6) Cooperating Country
  - (7) Commodities (FFF)
  - (8) Other (specify):

**BLOCK (c):** If marked, place an "X" in any of the blocks one thru eight that apply. This is limited to key aspects of implementation, e.g., timely delivery of commodities, return of participants to assume their project responsibilities, cooperating country funding, arrival of technicians.

II-B - RESOURCE INPUTS

This section appraises the effectiveness of U.S. resource inputs. There follow illustrative lists of factors, grouped under Implementing Agency, Participant Training and Commodities, that might influence the effectiveness of each of these types of project resources. In the blocks after only those factors which significantly affect project accomplishments, write the letter P if effect is positive or satisfactory, or the letter N if effect is negative or less than satisfactory.

1. FACTORS-IMPLEMENTING AGENCY (Contract/Participating Agency/Voluntary Agency)

024	IF NO IMPLEMENTING AGENCY IN THIS PROJECT. PLACE AN "X" IN THIS BLOCK:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	032 Quality, comprehensiveness and candor of required reports
025	Adequacy of technical knowledge		033 Promptness of required reports
026	Understanding of project purposes		034 Adherence to work schedule
027	Project planning and management		035 Working relations with Americans
028	Ability to adapt technical knowledge to local situation		036 Working relations with cooperating country nationals
029	Effective use of participant training element		037 Adaptation to local working and living environment
030	Ability to train and utilize local staff		038 Home office backstopping and substantive interest
031	Adherence to AID administrative and other requirements		039 Timely recruiting of qualified technicians
			040 Other (describe):

2. FACTORS-PARTICIPANT TRAINING

041	IF NO PARTICIPANT ELEMENT IN PROJECT. PLACE AN "X" IN THIS BLOCK:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	TRAINING UTILIZATION AND FOLLOW UP
	PREDEPARTURE		052 Appropriateness of original selection
042	English language ability		053 Relevance of training for present project purposes
043	Availability of host country funding		054 Appropriateness of post-training placement
044	Host country operational considerations (e.g., selection procedures)		055 Utility of training regardless of changes in project
045	Technical/professional qualifications		056 Ability to get meritorious ideas accepted by supervisors
046	Quality of technical orientation		057 Adequacy of performance
047	Quality of general orientation		058 Continuance on project
048	Participants' collaboration in planning content of program		059 Availability of necessary facilities and equipment
049	Collaboration by participants' supervisors in planning training		060 Mission or contractor follow-up activity
050	Participants' availability for training		061 Other (describe):
051	Other (describe):		

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION <b>UNCLASSIFIED</b>	PROJECT NUMBER <b>498-11-680-198</b>
--	---

## PART II-B - Continued

## 3. FACTORS-COMMODITIES not until start of construction

PLACE AN "X" IN APPROPRIATE BLOCK:	062 EFF	065 NON-EFF	064 NO COMMODITY ELEMENT	X		(FY /1)
					072 Control measures against damage and deterioration in shipment.	
065 Timeliness of AID/W program approval (i.e., PIO/C, Transfer Authorization).					073 Control measures against deterioration in storage.	
066 Quality of commodities, adherence to specifications, marking.					074 Readiness and availability of facilities.	
067 Timeliness in procurement or reconditioning.					075 Appropriateness of use of commodities.	
068 Timeliness of shipment to port or entry.					076 Maintenance and spares support.	
069 Adequacy of port and inland storage facilities.					077 Adequacy of property records, accounting and controls.	
070 Timeliness of shipment from port to site.					078 Other (Describe):	
071 Control measures against loss and theft.						

Indicate in a concise narrative statement (under the heading a. Overall Implementation Performance, below) your summary appraisal of the status of project implementation, covering both significant achievements and problem areas. This should include any comments about the adequacy of provision of direct hire technicians as well as an overall appraisal of the comments provided under the three headings (b, c & d) which follow. For projects which include a dollar input for generation of local currency to meet local cost requirements, indicate the status of that input (see Detailed Instructions).

Discuss separately (under separate headings b, c & d) the status of Implementing Agency Actions, Participants and Commodities. Where above listed factors are causing significant problems (marked N), describe briefly in the appropriate narrative section: (1) the cause and source of the problem, (2) the consequences of not correcting it, and (3) what corrective action has been taken, called for, or planned by the Mission. Identify each factor discussed by its number.

079 NARRATIVE FOR PART II-B: (After narrative section a. Overall Implementation Performance, below, follow, on form AID 1020-25 I as needed, with the following narrative section headings: b. Implementing Agency, c. Participants, d. Commodities. List all narrative section headings in order. For any headings which are not applicable, mark them as such and follow immediately below with the next narrative section heading.)

## a. Overall Implementation Performance.

Overall implementation performance for this project has been good; even where delays have occurred, the general progress of the project has not been damaged. In many ways, SEARCA is the most advanced of all the SEAMES projects: the institution is already going into the second year of its permanent funding plan; the third entering class of students will arrive by July 1970, and the construction of physical facilities is underway. The Project has proceeded carefully, with all personnel involved aware that the Project was breaking new ground as a regional endeavor and that whatever decisions were made for SEARCA would set precedents for succeeding SEAMES projects.

As noted in detail in PAR Part II-A-1, there have been some delays in student and staff recruitment. The student problem mainly revolves around socio-political conditions in the member countries which have in some cases prevented students from attending SEARCA, and thereby affected the regional distribution of the student body. Difficulty with SEAMES Special Funds for SEARCA scholarships has also been a factor, and a lack of dormitory space may prove troublesome if construction is not completed during the coming fiscal year. However, the student body is growing, and there are students from all of the SEARCA member countries. These are significant achievements in themselves.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

PART II-B

## a. Overall Implementation Performance (continued)

Staff recruitment should be proceeding more rapidly than is the case. Although the administrative positions have been filled by well qualified people, there is a lag in the development of the academic faculty. It was the intention of SEARCA to attract outstanding professors in agriculture from both within and without the Southeast Asian region in order to develop an agricultural graduate school of superior quality. The only move in this direction has been the employment of one professor from Taiwan who is largely engaged in research. SEARCA needs to expand its faculty (and in other ways show evidence of an up-grading of its academic program) in order to legitimize its claim to the title of regional center of excellence for agricultural studies.

b. Implementing Agency--not applicable.

c. Participants--not applicable.

d. Commodities--not applicable.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PART III - ROLE OF THE COOPERATING COUNTRY

The following list of illustrative items are to be considered by the evaluator. In the block after only those items which significantly affect project effectiveness, write the letter P if the effect of the item is positive or satisfactory, or the letter N if the effect of the item is negative or less than satisfactory.

SPECIFIC OPERATIONAL FACTORS:		
080	Coordination and cooperation within and between ministries.	P
081	Coordination and cooperation of LDC gov't. with public and private institutions and private enterprise.	P
082	Availability of reliable data for project planning, control and evaluation.	P
083	Competence and/or continuity in executive leadership of project.	P
084	Host country project funding.	P
085	Legislative changes relevant to project purposes. (Exemption from Philippine taxes)	P
086	Existence and adequacy of a project-related LDC organization. (SEAMEO, SEARCA, UPCA...)	P
087	Resolution of procedural and bureaucratic problems.	P
088	Availability of LDC physical resource inputs and/or supporting services and facilities. (provided by UPCA)	P
089	Maintenance of facilities and equipment.	P
090	Resolution of tribal, class or caste problems.	
091	Receptivity to change and innovation.	
092	Political conditions specific to project.	P
093	Capacity to transform ideas into actions, i.e., ability to implement project plans.	P
094	Intent and/or capacity to sustain and expand the impact of the project after U.S. inputs are terminated.	P
095	Extent of LDC efforts to widen the dissemination of project benefits and services.	P
096	Utilization of trained manpower (e.g., participants, counterpart technicians) in project operations.	
097	Enforcement of relevant procedures (e.g., newly established tax collection and audit system).	
098	Other:	
HOST COUNTRY COUNTERPART TECHNICIAN FACTORS:		
099	Level of technical education and/or technical experience. SEARCA staff	P
100	Planning and management skills.	P
101	Amount of technician man years available.	P
102	Continuity of staff.	P
103	Willingness to work in rural areas.	
104	Pay and allowances.	P
105	Other:	

In the space below for narrative provide a succinct discussion and overall appraisal of the quality of country performance related to this project, particularly over the past year. Consider important trends and prospects. See Detailed Instructions for an illustrative list of considerations to be covered.

For only those items marked N include brief statements covering the nature of the problem, its impact on the achievement of project targets (i.e., its importance) and the nature and cost of corrective action taken or planned. Identify each explanatory note.

106 NARRATIVE FOR PART III (Continue on form AID 1020-25 I):

The Philippine contribution to the SEARCA project has been outstanding. SEARCA officials (including the Project Leader from Thailand) are eminently qualified: not only do they have Ph.D's in agricultural studies but they are also good administrators. Physical support for the Project has been readily available through UPCA: administrative offices, classroom space, interim housing and supporting services have been provided for SEARCA at Los Banos, outside of the host country's 50% share of operating expenses. The GOP financial support record is good, with no defaults or tardiness in payments. In fact, the Philippine government receives higher marks for timeliness in the provision of funds than the USG to date.

Working relations within the Philippines are excellent: SEARCA is on good terms with the University of the Philippines, and with both the Education and Finance Ministries. Relations between the Philippines and the US have been cordial throughout the project's history with

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

106 NARRATIVE FOR PART III (continued)

compromises having been arrived at as necessary. The one problem which perhaps caused the most difficulty was the question of a salary scale for the SEARCA staff. The US not only felt that a high international pay scale for staff members raised project expenses unnecessarily, but also questioned the duplication of salaries in the case of some staff members. SEARCA and the GOP elected to keep the high salaries, but in return it was agreed that the USG would never pay more than 50% of these salaries (thus applying the overall 50-50 payment formula to a sub-category of Operating Expenses) and that in the case of a duplication of salaries, SEARCA would pay only the difference between the staff member's regular salary and the higher salary attached to the SEARCA position be also held. There were some ruffled feelings over this salary issue, but things have been smoothed over with no damage to the basically excellent working relations between the US and the Philippines.

Philippine domestic conditions are somewhat unstable at the current time. Political tension still runs high following the presidential election in the fall of 1969. The Peso exchange rate is temporarily unpegged and floating. Anti-Americanism has increased considerably in recent years. Although such conditions have affected the Project--for example, the Legislature has been slow in passing the tax exemption bill for SEARCA,<sup>1</sup> and there was a student demonstration at Los Benos against US funding of the new SEARCA library building--they have not hindered Project progress.

The Philippine government remains committed to SEARCA, and fully intends to make good on its promise to take over responsibility for all operating expenses of the institution after 1973. To this end, SEARCA has been looking into various fund-raising schemes in order to shoulder part of the responsibility for its own financing in the years ahead. A forestry concession has been applied for and approved by the Philippine government; however, the area lies in Central Luzon, a region considered too insecure for timber operations at the present time because of Huk terrorist activities. Other timber areas in Mindanao and marshlands in Northern Luzon for use as fisheries are available, but these areas are too far away from SEARCA for effective management control. The most promising project within a 2-3 year time span appears to be the establishment of a vegetable and dairy farm on some UP land not too

<sup>1</sup>As an added complication, the Philippine Legislature has not yet ratified the overall SEAMEO Charter. Therefore in order to establish a juridical personality to qualify for tax exemption, SEARCA has had to go through the extra step of applying for status as an independent, non-profit corporation under Philippine law.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION  
UNCLASSIFIEDPROJECT NUMBER  
498-11-680-198

## PAR CONTINUATION SHEET

This sheet is to be used for any Narrative Sections for which sufficient space has not been provided on the form. Identify each narrative by its Part and Section Designation.

106 NARRATIVE FOR PART III (continued)

far away from SEARCA, to supply the growing Manila market. Also on the horizon are possible contracts for community development and agricultural extension work in connection with Mekong Basin development planning.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

UNCLASSIFIED

PROJECT NUMBER

498-11-680-198

## PART IV - PROGRAMMING IMPLICATIONS

## IV-A - EFFECT ON PURPOSE AND DESIGN

Indicate in a brief narrative whether the Mission experience to date with this project and/or changing country circumstances call for some adjustment in project purposes or design, and why, and the approximate cost implications. Cover any of the following considerations or others that may be relevant. (See Detailed Instructions for additional illustrative considerations.) Relevant experience or country situations that were described earlier can simply be referenced. The spelling out of specific changes should be left to the appropriate programming documents, but a brief indication of the type of change contemplated should be given here to clarify the need for change. For example, changes might be indicated if they would:

1. better achieve program/project purposes;
2. address more critical or higher priority purposes within a goal plan;
3. produce desired results at less cost;
4. give more assurance of lasting institutional development upon U.S. withdrawal.

107 NARRATIVE FOR PART IV-A (Continue on form AID 1020-25 I):

No changes in the Project are recommended at this time. However, thought should be given to possible expansion and closer coordination of the US-funded Rhodent Control Research Center at Los Banos with SEARCA, as an aid to up-grading curriculum and strengthening the SEARCA institution in general. (See PAR Part I-C-2, 018.)

There could also be considerable improvement in the coordination of USAID bilateral scholarship programs and bilateral agricultural improvement programs with the regional SEARCA project. (see final paragraph of PAR Part II-A-1(5).)

In addition, a reduction in projected US-funded construction of staff housing should be kept in mind if staff expansion continues to proceed slowly. (See PAR Part II-A-1(7).) US hopes for expansion of the SEARCA faculty should be mentioned to SEARCA officials.

## IV-B - PROPOSED ACTION

108 This project should be (Place an "X" in appropriate block(s)):

1. Continued as presently scheduled in <del>PIP</del> <del>X</del>	
2. Continued with minor changes in the PIP, made at Mission level (not requiring submission of an amended PIP to AID/W).	X
3. Continued with significant changes in the PIP (but not sufficient to require a revised PROP). A formally revised PIP will follow.	
4. Extended beyond its present schedule to (Date): Mo. ___ Day ___ Yr. ___. Explain in narrative, PROP will follow.	
5. Substantively revised. PROP will follow.	
6. Evaluated in depth to determine its effectiveness, future scope, and duration.	
7. Discontinued earlier than presently scheduled. Date recommended for termination: Mo. ___ Day ___ Yr. ___. Explain in narrative.	
8. Other. Explain in narrative.	

109 NARRATIVE FOR PART IV-B:

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION