

4930215005305

4930215 (10)
THAT PROJECT BILL
PD-AAF-957-D1

AIRGRAM

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

For each address check one ACTION | INFO

DATE REC'D.

TO - AID/W TOAID A- 538

1972 JUL 24 AM 11 11

A.I.D.
COMM BR

DATE SENT 7-20-72

DISTRIBUTION
ACTION
INFO.

3

FROM - Bangkok

SUBJECT - Evaluation of Contractor Performance Report
No. U-307 AID 493-006

REFERENCE -

Transmitted herewith as an attachment is the third and final evaluation report on the performance of the American Technical Assistance Corporation under the subject contract for the period from August 26, 1970 to February 26, 1972. This contract is financed and administered under Project No. 493-11-810-215 (NEED Plan Project). This report is submitted in accordance with M. O. 1423.10.

UNGER

Attachment: a/s *Key-limited & made a part of airgram*

PAGE 1 OF 6 PAGES

DRAFTED BY VNititham:rb	OFFICE EDI/EPP	PHONE NO. 278	DATE 6/30/72	APPROVED BY: Frederick F. Simmons Deputy Director
AID AND OTHER CLEARANCES		date		date
IA:BABoorady	AD/P:CRFritz	date	date	IA, M/CSC
AAF/M:JF Moore	AD/F:CNMartin	date	date	AD/F,
AD/M, EDI/CP, EDI/EPP, M/CR				

CLASSIFICATION

Final Evaluation of Contractor Performance Report No. U-307

Contract AID 493-006

Period: August 26, 1970 to February 26, 1972

Administrative Data

- A. **Name of Contractor: American Technical Assistance Corporation (ATAC)
Forrest E. Cookson**
- B. **Contract Number: AID 493-006**
- C. **Project Title and Number: NEFT Plan Project 493-11-810-215**
- D. **Cooperating Country: Thailand**
- E. **Cooperating Country Institution: National Economic Development Board (NEDB)**
- F. **Contract Period: August 26, 1970 to February 26, 1972 (18 man-months).**
- G. **Name and Title of Contract Representative: Osborne I. Hauge, Assistant
Director for Economic Development & Investment**
- H. **Name and Title of Person Preparing Report: Vilas Nititham, Development
Planning Officer, EDI/EPP**

II. Evaluation

This is the third and final evaluation report, covering the entire contracting period from August 26, 1970 to February 26, 1972.

A. Technical Performance

1. **Did the Contractor have a clear understanding of the scope and nature of the contract objectives?**

and

Yes, the contractor had a clear understanding of the scope / nature of the contract objectives.

The main objective of this contract was to provide technical assistance to the NEDB of the Royal Thai Government (RTG), working closely with the Director of the Economic and Social Planning Division of the NEDB and the Assistant Director for Economic Development and Investment of USOM. The contractor was to provide assistance to NEFB staff in preparing the macro-economics sections of the Third

UNCLASSIFIED

Five Year Plan. In addition, the contractor would advise in the preparation and presentation of alternative foreign assistance strategies and assist NEDB in relating regional and national planning.

2. Did the contractor establish intermediate goals which were adequate to assure completion of contract objectives within the contract period? Were the goals realistic?

Yes, the contractor did attain all of the contract objectives. The goals were realistic.

3. How far did the contractor progress toward attainment of each of his intermediate goals and the contract objectives? Was the work on schedule?

The contractor met and occasionally surpassed his intermediate goals. He was requested by high-ranking NEDB officials to broaden the scope of his advisory work, and he responded fully by working additional hours in the evenings and often during weekends. His work was on schedule.

4. Was the quality of performance satisfactory?

The quality of performance was superior.

B. Personnel

1. Were the contractor's personnel technically competent?

Yes.

2. Was the leadership reliable and effective?

Not applicable - one man contract.

3. Was the staff the proper size?

Yes.

4. Were good working relationships maintained with the Mission, the cooperating government, and the local populace?

Excellent working relationships were maintained with the Mission, cooperating country, and the local populace.

C. Training

1. Were local personnel adequately trained by the contract to continue the project after he completed his operation?

Yes, training was on schedule, and the quality of work was also improved.

2. Did participants trained under the contract return to the project? Are they filling responsible positions based upon their training?

Not applicable.

D. Procurement and Support

1. Did commodities and/or supplies arrive on schedule?

Commodities ordered at the beginning and in the middle of the contract period arrived on schedule. These were an IBM Selectric typewriter and a WANG computer and accessories, but these were not funded under the contract. These commodities are now the property of the RTG.

2. Did the contractor receive adequate backstopping support from his home office? From the Mission? From the cooperating country?

The contractor received adequate backstopping from his home office, the Mission and the cooperating country. Also both dollar and baht support to the contractor were good. In August, 1971, ATAC requested authorization to purchase \$200.00 in books and other publications in direct relation to this contract per Article III, Section B, Paragraph 1. However, these books were ordered prior to recognizing the need for advanced authorization or written approval of the Contracting Officer or his representative. In early September, 1971, the USOM Contract Representative wrote a memorandum to the contractor requesting a detailed copy listing the titles, prices and other related costs of these books. In addition, the memorandum requested the contractor to clearly state that the procurement of these books would directly benefit the objectives of this contract, and upon termination these books would be turned over to the Cooperating Government (NEPB) for future use. The contractor informed USOM that inquiry was made to ATAC's head office in Washington, D.C. Ten (10) months have elapsed with several inquiries to the contractor by USOM Contract Representative, and no justifications for the purchase of these books

were made to USOM by ATAC.

Contract Terms

Did the contractor comply with all the terms of the contract, i. e., local currency, equal employment, etc. ?

The contractor was slow in submitting vouchers for the reimbursement of local currency costs of salaries of local personnel. In addition reporting requirements under the terms of the contract were not met on a timely basis.

There were no problems with the timely submission of the dollar vouchers.

F. Reports

1. Did the contractor submit all required reports on time?

Monthly reports were frequently behind schedule. There was also delay in the submission of the contractor's final report, delay which made it necessary to defer payment for the last month of service under the contract.

The terms of the contract in part stated that thirty (30) days prior to the completion date of the ATAC's contract, the contractor shall submit a detailed final report in writing to the Director of USOM which shall include the following:

- a. Summary of all macro-planning carried out during the contract period including problems encountered and recommended solutions.
- b. Detailed recommendations for future macro-planning including perspective, five-year and annual planning.

As of this date (June 30, 1972), the contractor has not submitted the final report. The Contract Representative and/or his assistant have raised the status of submission of this final report on several occasions. The contractor has agreed to expedite the submission of this final report. Meanwhile, and in accordance with Article IV of the contract, the last monthly payment of \$4,485.00 has been withheld pending receipt and approval of the final report called for under Article I.B. 2.

2. Did the reports give a realistic, comprehensive and accurate reflection of his performance?

The reports as agreed to in the contract were short but comprehensive.

G. Source of Information

Is this evaluation based on an on-site inspection? What other sources were used in gathering information for this report?

This report is based on near daily contact with the contractor and the NEDB's officials. In addition, it is based on the written reports, work memoranda, project papers of the contractor and the verbal comments of both U. S. Mission and RTG officials.

H. Additional Comments

This U-307 report is the final evaluation of contractor performance report for the ATAC contract. The Contract Representative regrets the delay in presenting this report; a delay occasioned by the need (a) to clarify a claim for reimbursement for the purchase of books and (b) to receive the contractor's final report. With the processing of the final dollar voucher, this contract will be considered closed.