

9310242(2)  
PD-AAC-537-B1

NO DESIGN DOCUMENT

(Project summaries/abstracts developed from  
PRO AGs, PIOTs, and PARs)

1. PROJECT TITLE NOAA Advisory Services 9314242001501			2. PROJECT NUMBER 0242	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/AGR
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u> B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>indef.</u> C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>indef.</u>			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) _____ 3p <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ <u>841,000*</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>841,000</u>			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>Oct. 77</u> To (month/yr.) <u>Sept. 78</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>Oct. 26, 1978</u>	

**8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR**

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., dirgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>It is recommended that the RSSA be continued through FY 1980 and in this connection it is noted that funding has been requested in the ABS and initial 1980 CP documents. Further analysis of budget requirements and the possibility of a change in the staffing mix during FY 1980 will be reviewed in March 1979 when further approvals and funding for the continuation of the RSSA is sought.</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em; margin-top: 20px;">NOAA (Dept. Oceanic and Atmospheric Admin. for ...)</p>	Jones	April 1979

\* Cumulative obligations through FY 1979

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS <input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>Action Memo</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIC/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan as required. C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project
11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles) Douglas M. Jones, DS/AGR/F Philip M. Roedel - NOAA on detail to AID/DS/AGR/F Richard A. Neal-NOAA on detail to AID/DS/AGR/F Kenneth Osborn-NOAA on detail to AID/DS/AGR/F	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature: <u>Dean Peterson</u> Typed Name: <u>Dr. Dean Peterson</u> Date: _____

## Summary

13. This activity continues to provide program support to the Fisheries Division under a RSSA with NOAA. As planned a call-forward was issued in the latter half of FY 1978 to fill the third position being provided under the RSSA and Dr. Kenneth Osborn ECD in May. All detailed RSSA staff are continuing to perform effectively and short term services are being utilized on an intermittent basis when special consultant assignments are required. There is no reason to change the basic form of the RSSA or to modify or change the staffing mix at this time.

During the evaluation period internal reorganization within NOAA resulted in some shifts of responsibility for NOAA project management. These shifts however were quite beneficial in that the responsible office is now located in Washington (Georgetown area) rather than in Rockville, Maryland and more frequent personal contact with the NOAA project coordinator now occurs.

14. Evaluation Methodology: Because of the nature of this activity no formal site visit or special analytical study is required. Evaluation, which is a constant process is conducted primarily through day to day review and conduct of routinely assigned responsibilities. The DSB project manager and the staff members assigned under the RSSA maintain dialogue on a daily basis. The primary effort to codify this ongoing evaluation process is reflected in the preparation of this report.

15-22. Not pertinent at this time.

23. The October 20 Information Memorandum for the Administrator from AA/SER (McDonald) and EOP/MB (Robinson) raises the question of whether some services being provided under RSSAs might be obtained under other procurement arrangements. The concern is whether the process for obtaining such services might be shifted to commercial contracting especially for the purpose of enlarging the universe of potential opportunities for minority businesses.

23. (Continued)

Consideration of the NOAA RSSA in the light of that memorandum suggests the following findings: The purpose of the NOAA RSSA is primarily to augment existing AID staff with well qualified full time personnel. Tasks routinely being undertaken by RSSA personnel fall into that category of activities described in Section 1 of Attachment B to the October 20 Memorandum and clearly are not appropriate for contract activity. Because the question of personnel ceilings was addressed by AID, NOAA and OMB at the time the RSSA was formalized some three years ago the personnel management question on the use of RSSAs as a means of avoiding AID personnel ceilings is not at issue. While the RSSA also provides for limited short term staff on a reimbursable basis, short term personnel have been used sparingly and only in cases where the individuals on detail provided unique talents to undertake specific job assignments.

It is concluded that for the type of services required by the Fisheries Division that the RSSA in its current form is both a useful and appropriate procurement instrument and should be continued in its same basic form.