

PD-AAS-246

42418

AUDIT OF  
BOTSWANA AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY  
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT  
PROJECT NO. 633-0221

AUDIT REPORT NO. 3-633-86-02  
December 11, 1985

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 11, 1985

FROM: Richard C. Thabet, RIG/A/Nairobi

SUBJ: Audit Report On Botswana Agricultural Technology Improvement Project

TO: Mr. J. Paul Guedet, Director, USAID/Botswana

This report presents the results of audit of the Botswana Agricultural Technology Improvement project. This review included the elements of both program results and economy and efficiency audits. Review objectives were to (a) determine if the project addressed the development strategy of Botswana; (b) evaluate how well the project was progressing towards meeting stated goals and objectives; (c) determine whether AID-provided resources were being used as planned and in conformance with applicable laws, agency regulations and the project agreement; (d) ensure that the project resources were used in the most economical and effective manner; and (e) determine compliance with pertinent sections of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

The Office of the Regional Inspector General for Audit/Nairobi concluded that project objectives were in line with Botswana's agricultural policy. Botswana's strategy has focused government efforts on attaining self-sufficiency in basic grains and legumes, raising small holder incomes, creating employment in rural areas, and slowing rural to urban migration. The purpose of the project was to improve the capacity of the Government of Botswana's Ministry of Agriculture to perform research and to convey the results of that research to the small farmer.

At the time of our review, project accomplishments were limited to testing some new technologies including on-farm trials and training long-term participants. The lack of other accomplishments was caused primarily by faulty assumptions in the project's design, and a three-year drought which coincided with the project's implementation. Further, the Government of Botswana had not developed a research strategy to guide research efforts. The vast majority of the funds originally programmed for the seed production unit were no longer needed. In addition, we found that GOB contributions to the project were not documented and neither the GOB nor USAID/Botswana knew the value of those contributions which had been made. Finally, we noted that excess dollars programmed for local currency expenditures had accumulated because of an appreciation of the U.S. dollar over local currency.

RIG/A/N recommended that USAID/Botswana take certain actions to correct the cited deficiencies. We recommended that USAID/Botswana make revisions deemed necessary to enhance the project's chances for success, ensure the GOB develops a research strategy, reprogram unused funds originally allocated for a seed production unit, develop and implement procedures to monitor agreed-to GOB contributions, and deobligate or reprogram as necessary excess dollars accumulating from the appreciation of the U.S. dollar over local currency.

Please provide your comments on the actions planned or taken to implement the recommendations within 30 days. The assistance provided by your staff during the audit is sincerely appreciated.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Botswana Agricultural Technology Improvement Project grant agreement (No. 633-0221) was signed on September 30, 1981. The overall project purpose was to improve the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture to perform research and to convey the results of that research to the small farmer. Assistance to the Ministry of Agriculture consisted of technical assistance, technical support commodities, operations and support, and training. Life of project funding was \$12.3 million of which AID was to provide \$9.2 million. The Government of Botswana was to contribute \$3.1 million. As of September 30, 1985, \$8.2 million of AID funds had been obligated and \$2.6 million expended. The project assistance completion date was September 30, 1987.

The Office of the Regional Inspector General for Audit/Nairobi reviewed the project for program results and economy and efficiency. Audit objectives were to (a) determine if the project addressed the development strategy of Botswana; (b) evaluate how well the project was progressing towards meeting stated goals and objectives; (c) determine whether AID-provided resources were being used as planned and in conformance with applicable laws, agency regulations and the project agreement; (d) ensure that the project resources were used in the most economical and effective manner; and (e) determine compliance with pertinent sections of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

We concluded that project objectives were consistent with and supported Botswana's agricultural policy. Botswana's strategy focused government efforts for attaining self-sufficiency in basic grains and legumes, raising small holder incomes, creating employment in rural areas, and slowing rural to urban migration. Within this strategy, the purpose of the project was directed at the needs of small farmers while placing emphasis on increasing arable crop production.

At the time of our review, the most significant accomplishments of the project were limited to the testing of some new technologies including on-farm trials and training of long-term participants. The failure to accomplish more was caused primarily by faulty assumptions in the project's design, a three-year drought coinciding with project implementation, and other problems which had affected the project's progress. As a result, it appeared doubtful that the project will reach its goal without major revisions, an extension of the project assistance completion date and a reallocation of funds between components of the project. Accordingly, we recommended that USAID/Botswana make revisions deemed necessary to enhance the project's chances for success. In doing so, we offered numerous suggestions which are detailed in the official recommendation on page 5 of the report.

The project agreement stated that the GOB was to review its agricultural research priorities within the first year of implementation and prepare a research strategy statement to serve as a guide for planning further research efforts. Thereafter, the GOB was to review its strategy periodically to ensure that research staff, resources, and funds were being properly utilized. At the time of our audit no strategy had been developed. This was due initially to the former Director of Agriculture Research's reluctance to develop a strategy and, more recently, the procrastination among senior level GOB officials. Without a research strategy to guide future activity, it is difficult to coordinate and direct research to achieve the most needed information in both the short and long term. A strategy would be especially useful to help donor agencies guide their research for the best results. We recommended that USAID/Botswana ensure that the GOB develop a research strategy within a mutually agreed time frame.

To ensure that adequate supplies of needed seed for major agricultural crops were available for distribution to Batswana<sup>1/</sup> farmers, a major component of the project was to construct and equip a seed production unit, and provide technical assistance. This had not happened. Instead, it was decided that an existing facility was available which will accommodate the project's needs. The technical assistance originally envisioned under this element of the project was being funded under another project. Accordingly, AID funds allocated for this activity were not needed in the amount originally envisioned and thus \$355,000 can be reprogrammed for other project uses. We recommended that unneeded funds originally allocated for equipment and technical assistance for the seed production unit be reprogrammed.

The project agreement specified that the GOB would provide its share of funds and other resources needed for the project. We found that GOB contributions to the project were not documented and neither the GOB nor USAID/Botswana knew the value of those contributions which had been made. As a result, USAID/Botswana could not be assured that the GOB was meeting its agreed-to contributions. We recommended that USAID/Botswana develop and implement procedures to monitor agreed-to government contributions.

Project funds arising from the appreciation of the US dollar over Botswana's currency, the pula, were available for reprogramming or deobligation. These funds, about \$1.3 million, were excess because of the progressive appreciation of the dollar from P1.0983 (= \$1.00) in 1961 to P1.7513 (= \$1.00) at the time of our audit. Future expenditures in local currency will provide even more. USAID/Botswana had not adequately monitored

---

<sup>1/</sup> Batswana is the plural form for Botswana people.

these transactions even though a system existed to do so. As a result, no action had been taken to deobligate or reprogram the excess funds. We recommended that USAID/Botswana determine the amount of excess dollars and deobligate or reprogram them as necessary.

Office of the Inspector General  
Office of Inspector General

**AUDIT OF  
BOTSWANA AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<b>PART I - INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>A. Background</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>B. Audit Objectives And Scope</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PART II - RESULTS OF AUDIT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>A. Findings And Recommendations</b>	<b>3</b>
1. Changes Are Needed To Achieve Desired Outputs Of The Project	<b>5</b>
2. The Government Of Botswana Needs To Develop A Research Strategy	<b>9</b>
3. AID Funds Allocated For The Seed Production Unit Should Be Reprogrammed	<b>12</b>
4. Procedures Need To Be Developed And Implemented To Monitor Agreed-To Contributions	<b>14</b>
5. Excess Dollars Gained From The Appreciation Of The US Dollar Need To Be Deobligated Or Reprogrammed	<b>16</b>
<b>B. Compliance And Internal Controls</b>	<b>19</b>
1. Compliance	<b>19</b>
2. Internal Controls	<b>19</b>
<b>PART III - EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES</b>	
<b>A. Exhibits</b>	
1. Comparison Of USAID Actual Expenditures To Budgeted	
2. Comparison Of Achievements To Goals	
3. Government Of Botswana Agreed-To Contributions	
4. Calculation Of Present And Future Dollar Accumulations From Appreciation Of The US Dollar As Of March 31, 1985	
<b>B. Appendices</b>	
1. USAID/Botswana Comments	
2. List Of Report Recommendations	
3. List Of Report Recipients	

AUDIT OF  
BOTSWANA AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

PART I - INTRODUCTION

A. Background

On September 29, 1981, USAID/Botswana and the Government of Botswana (GOB) signed a six-year, \$12.3 million project grant agreement for the Agricultural Technology Improvement Project. The purpose of the project was to improve the capacity of the GOB's Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) to perform research and convey the results of that research to the small farmer. Implementation was the responsibility of the MOA. The project had three sub-purposes which were intended to contribute directly to the institutionalization of Farming Systems Research program in Botswana. The first sub-purpose was to improve the capacity of the MOA's Department of Agricultural Research to develop technologies appropriate for small farmer needs. The second sub-purpose was to improve the capability of the extension service to transfer technologies which can be utilized by small farmers and strengthen and institutionalize the linkage between the research and extension departments. The third sub-purpose was to ensure that adequate supplies of needed seed for major agricultural crops are available for distribution to Botswana farmers.

Midamerica International Agricultural Consortium (MIAC) is responsible for rendering technical advice to the GOB relative to the project. Other AID inputs included primarily technical support, commodities, operations and support, and training. As of September 30, 1985, USAID/Botswana had obligated \$8.2 million and expended \$2.6 million. See Exhibit 1 for a comparison of actual expenditures to budgeted amounts.

The GOB agreed to contribute the equivalent of \$3.1 million (25.4 percent of total project costs). The GOB's contribution was to be primarily in the form of construction and rent, technical assistance, technical support, long-term training and commodities. The project completion date was scheduled for September 30, 1987.

## B. Audit Objectives And Scope

This was the initial audit of the project and it covered the period from inception, September 29, 1981, through April 26, 1985. Certain financial information was updated to September 30, 1985. It was a combination economy and efficiency, and program results audit. Our objectives were to (a) determine if the project addressed the development strategy of Botswana; (b) evaluate how well the project was progressing towards meeting stated goals and objectives; (c) determine whether AID-provided resources were being used as planned and in conformance with applicable laws, agency regulations and the project agreement; (d) ensure that the project resources were used in the most economical and effective manner; and (e) determine compliance with pertinent sections of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. The field work was performed during March and April 1985.

We interviewed GOB, USAID/Botswana officials and contractor personnel. We examined progress and evaluation reports as well as related workpapers, correspondence and financial records. Field work included site visits to the central research station at Sebele, the research substation and two farmer project sites outside Mahalapye where on-farm trials were being conducted. During the period from inception to September 30, 1985 a total of \$2.6 million had been disbursed for this project. Our audit did not include a sample of vouchers submitted for costs incurred. Our audit coverage of host country contributions was limited because no system existed for identifying and tracking the funds.

Our audit was made in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Accordingly, we included such tests of the program, records, and internal control procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

AUDIT OF  
BOTSWANA AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

PART II - RESULTS OF AUDIT

A. Findings and Recommendations

The Office of the Regional Inspector General Audit/Nairobi concluded that project objectives were consistent with and supported the Government of Botswana's (GOB) agriculture policy of supporting self-sufficiency in basic grains and legumes, raising small holder incomes, creating employment in rural areas, and slowing rural to urban migration. Most of GOB's efforts in agriculture to date were concentrated on the highly remunerative livestock subsector. However, there became an awareness of the limitations of livestock production as a source of employment and income for the rural poor and the GOB has since placed considerably more emphasis on increasing arable crop production.

In addition, we noted that the project had made only limited progress towards meeting stated goals and objectives and that some slippage in implementation had occurred primarily in the testing, development and dissemination of new technologies and technological packages. We noted nothing in our review that indicated AID-provided resources were not being used as planned and in conformance with applicable laws, agency regulations and the project agreement or that project resources were not being used in the most economical and effective manner. Throughout our review nothing came to our attention which indicated non-compliance with those pertinent sections of the FAA.

The project had encountered significant problems in achieving its purpose. The purpose of the project was to improve and expand the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) to perform research and convey the results of that research to the small farmer and to provide adequate supplies of quality seed to all farmers. At the time of our review, with the exception of testing of some new technologies including on-farm trials and training of long-term participants, few desired outputs of the project had been met. We found that the inability to achieve the purpose was due primarily to faulty assumptions in the project's design and a three-year drought which coincided with project implementation. Further, the GOB had not developed a research strategy to guide research efforts. Also, the vast majority of the funds originally programmed for the seed production unit were no longer needed. In addition, we found that GOB contributions to the project were not documented and neither the GOB nor USAID/Botswana knew the value of those contributions which had been made. Finally, we noted that excess dollars programmed for local currency expenditures had accumulated because of an appreciation of the U.S. dollar over local currency.

RIG/A/N recommended that USAID/Botswana take various actions to correct the cited deficiencies. We recommended that USAID/Botswana make revisions deemed necessary to enhance the project's chances for success, ensure the GOB develops a research strategy, reprogram unused funds originally allocated for a seed production unit, develop and implement procedures to monitor agreed-to GOB contributions, and deobligate or reprogram as necessary excess dollars accumulating from the appreciation of the U.S. dollar over local currency.

## 1. Changes Are Needed To Achieve Desired Outputs Of The Project

The purpose of the project was to improve the capacity of the MOA to perform research and convey the results of that research to the small farmer. With the exception of testing of some new technologies including on-farm trials and training of long-term participants few desired outputs of the project had been achieved. The failure to accomplish more was caused primarily by faulty assumptions in the project design, a three-year drought coinciding with project implementation and other problems which had affected the project's progress. As a result, it appeared doubtful that the project would achieve its purpose without major revisions, an extension of the project assistance completion date (PACD) and a reallocation of funds between components of the project. See Exhibit 2 for a comparison of actual achievements to goals.

### RECOMMENDATION NO.1

We recommend that USAID/Botswana make revisions deemed necessary to enhance the project's chances for success. In doing so, we believe consideration should be given to:

- a. extending the project assistance completion date,
- b. reallocating funds between components of the project,
- c. establishing interim benchmarks by which to measure project progress,
- d. establishing a dialogue with Ministry of Agriculture officials to raise the educational level of farming systems research personnel,
- e. ensuring that a Government of Botswana counterpart is assigned to the contractor's team,
- f. increasing the computer capacity available to the contractor team, and
- g. finding a solution to the administrative workload of the contractor team.

### Discussion

The overall purpose of the project was to improve the capacity of the MOA to perform research and convey the results of that research to the small farmer. In designing the project it was anticipated that the establishment and institutionalization of a Farming Systems Research (FSR) program in Botswana would make research activities responsive to small farmer needs. This would ultimately result in higher yields per hectare, increased small farmer production, and increased small farmer income, all of which were at least partially dependent on factors external

to the project. Thus, the project had three sub-purposes which were to contribute directly to the institutionalization of an FSR program in Botswana:

- a. to improve the capacity of the MOA's Department of Agricultural Research (DAR) to develop technologies appropriate for small farmer needs.
- b. to improve the capability of the extension service to transfer technologies which can be utilized by small farmers and strengthen and institutionalize the linkage between the research and extension departments, and
- c. to insure that adequate supplies of seed for major agricultural crops are available for distribution to Botswana farmers.

According to the project paper, by the end of the project an on-going FSR approach would be institutionalized in Botswana. Within the context of that approach, the following outputs were to be accomplished during the life of the project:

- a. A strategy would be developed for agricultural research.
- b. A total of 100 new technologies would be tested in farmers' fields.
- c. Between 55 and 60 technological packages would be developed and disseminated to farmers by the extension service.
- d. A seed production unit would be completed and functioning.

As of September 30, 1985 a total \$2.6 million, or 27.9 percent of AID's life of project funding of \$9.2 million, had been expended. About 67 percent of the project's implementation period had elapsed.

Our review further showed that a research strategy had not been developed. Also, the need for a seed production unit of the type originally planned no longer existed. These two issues are discussed in subsequent sections of this report.

With regard to the testing, development and dissemination of technological packages, we found that some progress had been made. We noted several project achievements while visiting the central research station at Sebele, a research sub-station at Mahalapye, and two farmer sites outside Mahalapye. For example, we saw field trials being conducted, observed baseline survey data being collected and compiled, and examined many publications containing research results. Our review of project records showed that approximately 21 surveys or studies had been conducted to obtain baseline data. In addition, eight design stage trials and eight on-farm testing trials had been conducted. However, no technological packages had been

developed for dissemination to the farmer. In fact, USAID/Botswana officials and the contractor's team leader told us that no agreement had yet been reached on what constituted a technological package. As a result, the extension component of the project was limited to training sessions and workshops since no packages were available for dissemination.

According to USAID/Botswana officials and contractor personnel, project implementation was hampered by an unrealistic goal and faulty assumptions in project design. For example, the project paper established a time frame of seven years in which to accomplish its objectives. In actuality, research of the type under this project required between 15-20 years. The project paper also assumed that some basic technology would be on the shelf when the project was implemented. This was not the case. Also, a three-year drought had prevented some field trials from being conducted which had impacted adversely on the collection of baseline data.

Other problems identified which may cause the project to fail to attain its sector goal of improving the welfare of small farmers and increasing production by the PACD were:

- interim benchmarks were not established by which to measure project progress thereby alerting management to problems.
- the educational level for FSR personnel was not as high as needed to generate ideas in a research climate;
- a counterpart was not assigned to the contractor's team leader because of difficulties in recruiting a qualified individual;
- computer capacity was not adequate to handle the heavy workload in computing baseline as well as research data; and
- the administrative workload (80 percent) of the contractor team was excessive, prevent the maximum use of their expertise in technical matters.

USAID/Botswana officials were cognizant of the implementation problems and agreed that the project's purpose would not be achieved within the original time frame. Project management indicated to us that they were contemplating advancing the 1987 external project evaluation. Based on the results of this evaluation, a decision would be made concerning possible changes resulting in revision of the project, extension of the PACD, and reallocation of funds between components.

#### Management Comments

USAID/Botswana stated that since March/April 1985 when the audit was made, the mission had adopted a phased approach to identify and implement changes needed in the project. The first phase

involved a project revision being implemented through a project implementation letter (PIL) to provide additional participant training in accordance with a previous evaluation; reallocating funds in the existing budget; and extending the PACD accordingly. This PIL had been presented to the GOB and, if they concur, should allow for new training to start in January. The second phase involved reprogramming some funds now allocated for the seed multiplication component. This reprogramming is to be accomplished by about January 1986 and is dependent upon a GOB policy decision on seed multiplication now being finalized, followed by short term seed consultant to review GOB plans and assist in reprogramming funds for this activity. They expected that some portion of the seed allocation will still be required with the balance to be reprogrammed for other project components. The final phase involved conducting a full scale external evaluation in May/June 1986 which could identify additional reprogramming needs.

Office Of Inspector General Comments

We concur with the actions being taken and contemplated by USAID/Botswana. We will retain our recommendation until advised that the comprehensive evaluation of the project has been initiated.

## 2. The Government Of Botswana Needs To Develop A Research Strategy

The project agreement stated that the GOB was to review its agricultural research priorities and prepare a research strategy statement to serve as a guide for planning further research efforts. Further, the GOB was to review its strategy periodically to ensure that research staff, resources, and funds were being properly utilized. At the time of our audit no strategy had been developed. This was due initially to the former Director of Agricultural Research's reluctance to develop a strategy and, more recently, the procrastination among senior level GOB officials. Without a research strategy to guide future activity, it is difficult to coordinate and direct research to achieve the most needed information in both the short and long-term. A strategy would be especially useful to help donor agencies optimize their research efforts for the best results.

### RECOMMENDATION NO. 2

We recommend that USAID/Botswana ensure that the Government of Botswana develops a research strategy within a mutually agreed time frame.

### Discussion

When the project paper was prepared in 1981, crop production research had been going on for decades. During this time Botswana grain and legume yields not only remained stable but were among the world's lowest. These low crop yield levels suggested a major opportunity to increase production and improve returns to farmers. In 1981, GOB began to increase its interest in arable agricultural research. As a substantial portion of the research program then was funded by donor agencies, little flexibility was provided to fit GOB's changing requirements.

The project paper identified the absence of an overall research strategy as contributing to the GOB's inability to deal with small farmer production problems in arable agriculture. The project paper further pointed out that the MOA's Departments of Agricultural Research (DAR) and Field Services (DFS), and Division of Planning and Statistics were at that time developing a research strategy which they anticipated would more effectively utilize GOB and donor resources in focusing on small farmer problems. A strategy would also strengthen the linkage between small farmers, DAR and DFS in this effort. Within the context of this research strategy, the GOB was reportedly committed to the broad principles of moving towards a commodity research focus in cereals and legumes at the national research level, supporting the establishment of an integrated FSR program in rural Botswana, and strengthening the linkage between research and extension.

To overcome this inability to deal with small farmer production problems in arable agriculture, the project agreement included a special covenant which specified that:

"The Cooperating Country during the first year of the project agrees to review its agricultural research priorities and prepare a research strategy statement to serve as a guide for planning further research programs. The cooperating country further covenants to review their strategy periodically to ensure that research staff, resources and funds are being utilized appropriately."

In the three years since the project was implemented no research strategy statement had been developed. We were unable to find in the project files any documentation which showed how the provisions of that special covenant had been met. We also learned that the previous Director of Agricultural Research had been steadfastly against developing a research strategy. The project evaluation summary, concluded on July 23, 1984, commented relative to institutionalizing the farming system approach to research that:

"Any reallocation of resources and person power in response to changes in direction or philosophy can be perceived as threatening to the status quo and to persons in crucial positions in the organizations."

Both USAID/Botswana officials and the contractor's team leader believed that a strategy would be developed before the PACD. This belief was based on the preparation of a paper to include input from all donor FSR projects throughout the country and addressing specifically the institutionalizing of the farming systems approach to research. The paper was expected to be finalized by the end of 1985 and presented to the GOB for its consideration and use in institutionalizing FSR. Although project personnel believed a research strategy will be developed, getting through the gamut of senior GOB officials will be difficult because of manpower and financial implications. No date for completing the research strategy was forthcoming.

In summary, the absence of a research strategy statement had impacted negatively on the project in that the GOB had not taken the opportunity for more than three years at least to consolidate new ideas and approaches to problem-solving in the agricultural sector. Such consolidation could have been used to develop an official research strategy which, changed as circumstances dictated, could be further used as a vehicle to lessen the difficulty in understanding the complexity of a new concept. Further, the GOB could not ensure that research staff, resources and funds were being utilized appropriately. USAID/Botswana officials stated that the absence of a research strategy could have future negative impacts as the new emphasis on specific crops and on an FSR approach to solving field

problems had never been formalized. Also, the absence of a research strategy statement affords no protection against sudden changes in GOR prioritization.

#### Management Comments

USAID/Botswana had no disagreement with the recommendation, but questioned whether the lack of a stated research policy has had a negative impact on the project to date. Several examples of congruency of project goals and the amount of effort on the part of the DAR were cited. Also cited was the fact that a substantial portion of the MOA resources had been allocated to the targeted areas of the project.

#### Office Of Inspector General Comments

The project paper identified the absence of an overall research strategy as contributing to the GOB's inability to deal with small farmer production problems in arable agriculture. The importance of having such a strategy statement with periodic reviews was emphasized through its inclusion as a special covenant in the project agreement. While the evidence of congruency of project goals and resources allocation is commendable, neither we nor project management had any idea of whether the effort was maximized in the proper mix, or if the allocation of resources was adequate. By having an official research strategy statement, project management can proceed in a more confident manner through effective utilization of GOB and donor resources, consolidation of new ideas and approaches to problem-solving, and reasonable assurances against sudden changes in GOB prioritization. Accordingly, we are retaining our recommendation until advised that an acceptable research strategy has been developed.

### 3. AID Funds Allocated For The Seed Production Unit Should Be Reprogrammed

To ensure that adequate supplies of needed seed for major agricultural crops are available for distribution to Botswana farmers, a major component of the project was to construct and equip a seed production unit, and provide technical assistance to the unit. This had not happened. Instead, it was decided that an existing facility was available which will accommodate most of the project's needs. The technical assistance originally planned under this project for the seed production unit was being funded under another project. Accordingly, AID funds allocated for this activity were not needed in the amount originally envisioned and most of \$355,000 can be reprogrammed for other project uses.

#### RECOMMENDATION NO. 3

USAID/Botswana reprogram unneeded funds originally allocated for equipment and technical assistance for the seed production unit.

#### Discussion

The Government of Botswana specifically requested that the project include a component to support the commercial seed production activity. The activity would include a building and attendant works (mainly railway siding, loading dock) and would be constructed at Pitsane. Initially, maize, sorghum, cowpeas and sunflower were to be handled, but other seed types could be added if demand required and processing capacity permitted. Funding was to come from GOB resources. The seed building was budgeted at \$723,629. Primarily, AID was to provide seed cleaning treatment and handling equipment, and four person-years of technical assistance in the form of a commercial seed production advisor. The seed equipment and advisor were budgeted at \$320,000 and \$100,000, respectively.

At the time of our audit nothing had transpired with regard to this component of the project. USAID/Botswana officials stated they were contemplating a feasibility study to see if the facility was necessary. Subsequent conversations with USAID/Botswana officials revealed that an existing seed facility could accommodate the needs of the project. Accordingly, it will only be necessary for approximately \$65,000 of the original funding of the component to be used for equipment for the existing facility. Also the advisor who was originally funded under the project was now being funded under another project thereby freeing those funds as well.

#### Management Comments

USAID/Botswana agreed with our recommendation and stated that funds would be reprogrammed following the full scale external evaluation planned for May/June 1986.

Office Of Inspector General Comments

We are retaining our recommendation until advised that USAID/Botswana has reprogrammed unneeded funds originally allocated for the seed production unit.

**4. Procedures Need To Be Developed And Implemented To Monitor Agreed-To Contribution**

The project agreement specified that the GOB would provide its share of funds and other resources needed for the project. We found that GOB contributions to the project were not documented and neither the GOB nor USAID/Botswana knew the value of those contributions which had been made. As a result, USAID/Botswana was not assured that the GOB was meeting its agreed-to contributions to the project.

**RECOMMENDATION NO. 4**

We recommend that USAID/Botswana:

- a. develop and implement procedures to monitor the agreed-to Government of Botswana contributions to the project;
- b. in cooperation with the Government of Botswana develop an acceptable report format, establish due dates for the reports, and provide sound estimates of those contributions.

**Discussion**

The project agreement specified that the GOB would provide its share of funds and other resources needed for the project in an equivalent amount of \$3.1 million during the life of the project. This amount represented 25.4% of total project costs. By the end of FY 1985 (the time period nearest to the time of our audit), GOB's contributions were to have amounted to the equivalent of \$2.3 million, or 73.6% of GOB's total agreed-to contributions. Specific project inputs and amounts to be provided by GOB are identified in Exhibit 3.

USAID/Botswana had no procedures for tracking the GOB's contributions to the project. Although some GOB prepared financial documentation was available and used by concerned USAID/Botswana project officers after reconciliation, none was used for this project. Without proper supporting documentation, USAID/Botswana was not assured that the GOB was providing its agreed-to contributions to the project.

In summary, USAID/Botswana needed to develop and implement procedures to monitor agreed-to GOB contributions, and to work with the GOB in developing a report format, due dates and provide sound estimates for those contributions.

**Management Comments**

USAID/Botswana stated that there was difficulty in monitoring contributions because they varied greatly from project to project and this project lay on the more difficult end of the spectrum. The reason was that GOB costs were buried in many different line items of the MOA budget and it would not be

possible to do more than estimate the actual inputs. USAID/Botswana was willing to pull such estimates together, but felt that since the 25 percent contribution factor was not really a statutory requirement, they were not sure what purpose would be served by doing so. Additionally, there was no evidence to date that the GOB contribution, in-kind or otherwise, had not been sufficient to reasonably support the project. The need for cost sharing, which the mission firmly believed in, will be taken into account during project and budget reviews and revisions.

#### Office Of Inspector General Comments

It was not our intention to imply that an elaborate, daily accounting system should be installed to account for GOB agreed-to contributions to the project. We accept USAID/Botswana's assessment of such difficulty and support its willingness to provide estimates of those contributions during project and budget reviews and revisions if soundly developed and accomplished at least annually. Accordingly, if it is determined that GOB contributions were sufficient to reasonably support the project, but were less than the agreed-to amount, USAID/Botswana should exercise its prerogative to amend the project agreement citing sufficient justification. Furthermore, the exercise of ascertaining GOB contributions will ensure inputs were adequate to achieve the purposes and objectives of the project as stated in the project agreement. Accordingly, we have retained but revised our recommendation.

5. Excess Dollars Gained From The Appreciation Of The US Dollar Need To Be Deobligated Or Reprogrammed

Project funds arising from the appreciation of the US dollar over Botswana's currency, the pula(P), were available for reprogramming or deobligation. These funds, about \$1.3 million, were excess because of the progressive appreciation of the dollar from Pl.0983 (= \$1.00) in 1981 to Pl.7513 (= \$1.00) at the time of our audit. Future expenditures in local currency will provide even more. USAID/Botswana had not adequately monitored these transactions even though a system existed to do so. As a result, no action had been taken to deobligate or reprogram the excess funds.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

We recommend that USAID/Botswana:

- a. ensure that the existing system for monitoring appreciation of the US dollar over local currency is applied to this project.
- b. determine what excess dollars have accumulated since project implementation, review budgeted amounts for potential accumulations, and deobligate or reprogram as necessary.

Discussion

During the project's implementation period, September 1981 to the time of our audit, appreciation of the US dollar over local currency (pula) had distorted budget estimates. As a result, pula expenditures had provided an unplanned accumulation of dollars, and future expenditures will provide more, all of which could be deobligated or reprogrammed. While a system existed for monitoring such accumulations, it had not been applied to this project.

The project agreement provided for \$2.2 million to be spent for budget elements Technical Support, and Operations and Support during the life of the project. As of March 31, 1985, \$558,347 had been spent for these two budget elements. According to controller personnel, about 98 percent of that amount was spent using local currency. At the time of the first local currency expenditure in 1981, the rate of exchange for the pula was Pl.0983 = \$1.00. At the time of our audit the rate of exchange was Pl.7513 = \$1.00. This difference in the rates of exchange reflected an appreciation of the US dollar of 59.5%.

Applying that appreciation percentage to pula expenditures to date and also to the remainder budgeted by the project assistance completion date (PACD), we believe that approximately \$325,572 was available for deobligation or reprogramming. An additional \$977,703 may be available by the

PACD. Our calculations are presented in Exhibit 4.

We recognized the imprecision of the calculation because of daily fluctuation rates in local currency, different percentages of amounts paid in dollars and probable other budget elements being involved. However, the potential accumulation of approximately \$1.3 million warrants management's closest attention to determine whether the excess can be deobligated or reprogrammed.

Our Audit Report, No. 3-633-85-6, dated December 14, 1984, noted a similar situation in Botswana's Rural Sector Grant project. In this report we recommended that USAID/Botswana expand its current monitoring procedure to identify, project-wide, excess dollars resulting from US dollar appreciation<sup>1/</sup> so they can be deobligated or reprogrammed. We deleted that recommendation when USAID/Botswana designed such a system. However, USAID/Botswana had not applied that system to this project because no mission procedure existed to ensure implementation of that specific system.

In summary, appreciation of the US dollar over local currency caused a present accumulation of approximately \$325,572 in excess dollars and a potential accumulation of \$977,703 from the time of our review to the completion of the project. As a result, more than \$1.3 million may become available for deobligating or reprogramming. Accordingly, USAID/Botswana needed to ensure that the existing system for monitoring US dollar appreciation is implemented and applied to ATIP.

#### Management Comments

USAID/Botswana stated that local currency expenditures, while significant, were not nearly as important and did not need the same degree of attention as those in another USAID/Botswana project (633-0077) mentioned in the report. For example, they were not as important as the inflation and contingency factors built into this project which have changed over time. However, revaluations of the budget is certainly an exercise which can be done periodically and is being initiated through a project implementation letter for the proposed additional long-term training. However, they did not believe it made sense to concentrate on only one element, and a relatively unimportant one at that, when doing so. They stated that the kind of running balance of exchange rate differences which was indeed appropriate under project 633-077 would not be particularly

---

<sup>1/</sup> That audit report commented on the devaluation of local currency. Subsequently, the situation was more accurately depicted as appreciation of a strong US dollar against the local currency.

meaningful under this project. They believed, however, that it was an easy mechanical figure to derive and if the final audit recommended that they trace this figure, they were willing to do so.

Office Of Inspector General Comments

We believe that any reasonable device which promotes the identification and deobligation/reprogramming of excess dollars is a means to further the effective and efficient use of valuable assistance dollars. Accordingly, we are retaining our recommendation until USAID/Botswana advises that excess dollars have been identified, deobligated, or reprogrammed.

## B. Compliance And Internal Controls

### 1. Compliance

We noted that the Government of Botswana (GOB) had not complied with the special covenant relative to preparing a research strategy statement during the first year of the project and that the strategy be reviewed periodically (See Finding No. 2). Otherwise, nothing came to our attention that indicated untested items were not in compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

### 2. Internal Controls

We found that USAID/Botswana did not have adequate monitoring systems for identifying and reprogramming unneeded AID funds (See Finding No. 3), ascertaining GOB agreed-to contributions (See Finding No. 4) and for determining excess dollar accumulations from the appreciation of the US dollar (See Finding No. 5). Other internal controls we tested appeared to be appropriate and operating in a satisfactory manner.

**AUDIT OF  
BOTSWANA AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY  
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

**PART III - EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES**

EXHIBIT 1

BOTSWANA AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY  
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT NO. 633-0221  
COMPARISON OF USAID ACTUAL EXPENDITURES TO BUDGETED  
(\$000)

<u>Element</u>	<u>LOPL/ Funding</u>	<u>Budget As of 9/30/85</u>	<u>As of 9/30/85</u>		<u>% Expended Of of Budget</u>
			<u>Earmarked</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>	
Technical Assistance	\$ 4,793	\$ 4,793	\$ 2,480	\$ 1,829	38.2
Technical Support	1,820	1,370	898	631	46.1
Commodities	320	320	19	17	5.3
Operations and Support	414	371	65	60	16.2
Training	849	849	43	25	2.9
Contingency	<u>984</u>	<u>872</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>.0</u>
TOTALS	<u>\$ 9,180</u>	<u>\$ 8,575</u>	<u>\$ 3,505</u>	<u>\$ 2,562</u>	<u>29.9</u>

---

1/Per Project Agreement

22

BOTSWANA AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT  
PROJECT NO. 633-0221  
COMPARISON OF ACHIEVEMENTS TO GOALS  
SEPTEMBER 29, 1981 THROUGH APRIL 19, 1985<sup>1/</sup>

<u>Components</u>	<u>Project Paper Goals</u> <u>PACD September 30, 1987<sup>2/</sup></u>	<u>Actual Accomplishments</u> <u>As Of April 19, 1985<sup>3/</sup></u>
<u>Goal:</u>	To improve the welfare of small farmers and increase national food production through the development, extension and adaptation of relevant technology.	Cannot be accomplished by PACD as research strategy requires approximately a 20 year time frame. Increases, if any, in food production cannot be measured due to other revenues earned by farmers.
<u>Purpose:</u>	To improve the capacity of the Ministry of Agriculture's research and extension programs to develop and effectively extend farming systems recommendations relevant to the needs of the small farmer.	No technology packages disseminated to date. Efforts thus far restricted to gathering baseline data and performing research. Major problem is limited flexibility in the system. Need to fine tune existing practices and develop new. Difficulty in finding consistency in research results.
<u>Sub-Purposes:</u>		
	a) To improve the capacity of the GOB's Ministry of Agriculture's Department of Agricultural Research to develop technologies appropriate for small farmer needs.	National research strategy and technologies have not been defined. Only 2 of 6 experienced senior staff on board. Conditions of service and morale poor.
	b) To improve the capability of the extension service to transfer technologies which can be utilized by small farmers and strengthen and institutionalize the linkage between the research and extension departments.	Improvements will be at best limited due primarily to the absence of experienced leadership, under educated staff, and lack of retention of experienced staff.
	c) To ensure that adequate supplies of needed seed for major agricultural crops are available for distribution to Botswana farmers.	Will not be accomplished as a result of this project. GOB has purchased and placed seed equipment in its facilities at Sebele thereby alleviating the need for a new seed production unit under this project.

BOTSWANA AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT  
PROJECT NO. 633-0221  
COMPARISON OF ACHIEVEMENTS TO GOALS  
SEPTEMBER 29, 1981 THROUGH APRIL 19, 1985<sup>1/</sup>

<u>Components</u>	<u>Project Paper Goals</u> <u>PACD September 30, 1987<sup>2/</sup></u>	<u>Actual Accomplishments</u> <u>As Of April 19, 1985<sup>3/</sup></u>
<u>Outputs:</u>		
<b>Strategy</b>	GOB will develop a research strategy emphasizing small farmers during the first year of the project.	Not developed.
<b>Technology</b>	100 new technologies will be tested in farmers' fields.  50 new technological packages will be developed and tested at DAR  5-10 technological packages will be developed for dissemination.	Numerous tests and trials have been developed and conducted. However, "technology" and "technological packages" per se have not been defined. Also, educational level of extension workers does not generate ideas.
<b>Seed Production</b>	BAMB* seed production unit will be completed and functioning.	Not completed. GOB did not provide facilities due to fiscal restraints during the initial implementation period. Therefore, USAID/Botswana did not provide equipment or advisor. An existing seed facility is being used to accommodate the needs of the project.

---

<sup>1/</sup> Date of Project Agreement to date of audit.

<sup>2/</sup> The Project Paper's PACD was July 1, 1987 and the Project Agreement's PACD was September 30, 1987. For our purposes we used the latter.

<sup>3/</sup> Review of documentation and discussions with USAID/Botswana officials and contractor.

(A) There has been no project revision nor were interim goals (benchmarks) established.

\* Botswana Agriculture Marketing Board.

BOTSWANA AGRICULTURAL TECHNOLOGY  
IMPROVEMENT PROJECT NO. 633-0221  
GOVERNMENT OF BOTSWANA AGREED-TO CONTRIBUTIONS<sup>1/</sup>  
(EQUIVALENT US DOLLARS)

<u>Project Inputs</u>	<u>Contributions</u>	
	<u>Budgeted for</u> <u>Life of Project</u>	<u>Budgeted By</u> <u>September 30, 1985</u>
Technical Assistance	\$ 635,266	\$ 483,323
Technical Support	441,465	341,212
Commodities	190,970	154,810
Operations And Support	97,072	71,097
Construction And Rent	1,061,499	1,030,989
Training (long-term)	220,350	-0-
Inflation	<u>482,378</u>	<u>220,073</u>
TOTALS	<u>\$3,129,000</u>	<u>\$2,301,504</u>
	100%	73.6%

---

<sup>1/</sup> Per Project Agreement.

BOISWANA AGRICULTURE TECHNOLOGY IMPROVEMENT  
PROJECT NO. 633-0221  
CALCULATION OF PRESENT AND FUTURE DOLLAR  
ACCUMULATIONS FROM APPRECIATION OF THE US DOLLAR  
AS OF MARCH 31, 1985

Amount Expended	\$ 558,347	
Less 2% Paid in US \$	<u>- 11,167</u>	
Amount (98%) Paid in pula	\$ 547,180	
Appreciation Percentage	<u>x.595</u>	
Possible Accumulation of Excess Dollars		\$325,572
Total LOP Amount Budgeted	\$2,234,000	
Less: Amount Expended (from above)	<u>- 558,347</u>	
Budgeted Amount to PACD	\$1,675,653	
Less: 2% Paid in U.S. \$	<u>- 33,513</u>	
Amount (98%) to be paid in pula	\$1,642,140	
Appreciation Percentage	<u>x.595</u>	
Possible Accumulation of Excess Dollars		<u>977,703</u>
Total Potential Accumulation		<u>\$1,303,275</u>

Text Of USAID/Botswana's Comments

1. Mission believes draft audit report is constructive with generally sound recommendations. After reviewing the following commentary on the recommendations, you may want to make some changes in the recommendations to reflect these views. We also have some suggested word changes for other parts of the report.

2. RECOMMENDATION NO. 1: Since March/April 1985 when the audit was conducted, the mission adopted a phased approach to identify and implement changes needed in the project. This involves (a) a project revision being implemented through a project implementation letter to provide additional participant training in accordance with previous evaluation; reallocating funds in the existing budget and extending the PACD accordingly. This is being presented to the GOB and, if GOB concurs, should allow for new training starts in January; (b) reprogramming some funds now allocated for the seed multiplication component. This should be accomplished by about January 1986 and is dependent upon a GOB policy decision on seed multiplication now being finalized, followed by short term seed consultant to review GOB plans and assist in reprogramming funds for this activity. We expect that some portion of the seed allocation will still be required with the balance to be reprogrammed for other project components; and (c) conduct a full scale external evaluation in May/June 1986 which could identify additional reprogramming needs.

3. RECOMMENDATION NO. 2: USAID/Botswana has no disagreement with this recommendation and feels that the rationale is well stated in the last sentence of section 2, Page 23. It is questionable whether the lack of a stated research policy has had a negative impact on the project to date. As evidence of the congruency of project goals and amount of effort on the part of the Department of Agriculture Research, the following could be considered:

A. Of 21 professional staff working on staple food crops, 17 are working on sorghum, millet and pulses;

B. Of 28 professional staff working on other program areas, 19 are working on farming systems and seed technology;

C. In terms of the percentage of all funding for agricultural research, 29 percent goes to the staple food crops targeted by the project (sorghum, millet and pulses). Only seven percent was for maize, fruits and vegetables and oil seeds. In the other program category, farming systems and seed technology received 30 percent of the 42 percent allocated. The remaining 24 percent of funds was allocated to livestock and range management. Thus, the Ministry of Agriculture currently allocates a substantial portion of its resources, both of manpower and funding to the targeted areas of the project.

4. RECOMMENDATION NO. 3: We agree with recommendation. Funds to be reprogrammed as per timetable indicated in para two above.

5. RECOMMENDATION NO. 4: Section 110(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act is referred to several times in this section of the draft with the general contention being that this section requires the GOB to contribute 25 percent of the costs during the life of the project and that USAID must, therefore, carefully monitor these costs during this period. The mission feels, however, that the auditors may have misinterpreted this part of the FAA which reads as follows: Quote: No assistance shall be furnished by the United States Government to a country under sections 102 through 106 until that country provides assurances to the President and the President is satisfied that such country provide at least 25 per centum of the costs of the entire program or activity with respect to which such assistance is entire program or activity with respect to which such assistance is to be furnished, except that the costs borne by such country may be provided on an quote in kind unquote basis. Unquote.

Firstly, sections 103 through 106 refer to the functional sub-divisions of development assistance. It therefore seems clear that section 110(A) does not apply to projects funded from economic support funds, as this project is. We mention this point because the difficulty in monitoring such contributions varies greatly from project to project and this project lies on the more difficult end of the spectrum. The reason for this is that GOB costs are buried in many different line items of the Ministry of Agriculture budget and it will not be possible to do more than estimate what the actual inputs were. We are willing to pull such estimates together, but since the 25 percent contribution factor is not really a statutory requirement, we are not sure what purpose would be served by doing so. Additionally there is no evidence to date that the GOB contribution, in-kind or otherwise, has not been sufficient to reasonably support the project. The need for cost sharing, which the mission firmly believes in, will be taken into account during project and budget reviews and revisions. Finally, the statutory criteria checklist in the project paper (Annex V-D, . Page 10, Item D) indicates quote N/A unquote after the FAA sec. 110(A) item<sup>1</sup>/.

6. RECOMMENDATION NO. 5: We do not disagree with the auditors view that there are excess dollars accumulated in this project because of changing Pula-dollar exchange rates. However, local currency expenditures, while significant, are not nearly as important and do not need the same degree of attention as those in the other USAID/Botswana project (633-0077) mentioned

---

<sup>1</sup>/ We revised our finding and recommendation to delete reference to the FAA Section 110(A).

in the report. They are not as important as the inflation and contingency factors also built into this project which have changed over time. Revaluations of the budget is certainly an exercise which can be done periodically and which USAID is initiating through a PIL for the proposed additional long term training, however, we don't believe it makes sense to concentrate on only one element, and a relatively unimportant one at that, when doing so. The kind of running balance of exchange rate differences which was indeed appropriate under project 633-077 would not be particularly meaningful under his project. It is, however, an easy mechanical figure to derive and if the final audit recommends that we trace this figure, we are certainly willing to do so.

7. Suggested changes to text contained in other sections of audit are as follows:

Pg 7: footnote 2. Should be output of 1,000 Kgs from 4 HA.<sup>2/</sup>

Pg 8: Line 5 Annual food requirements are 180-200 thousand.<sup>2/</sup>

Pg 8: line 14. Other areas with similar annual amounts of rainfall instead of Agro-climatic environment.<sup>2/</sup>

Pg.8: Line 17. in returns to labor instead of crop yields.<sup>2/</sup>

Pg.13: line 6. Insert work predefined before benchmarks.

Pg.14: line 10. Add after income all of which are at least partially dependent on factors external to the project.

Pg.16: line 4. insert after unit, of the type originally envisaged.

Pg.18: Line 11. Change 1986 to 1987 and insert word crop external unquote after the date. This conforms to USAID's project implementation schedule presented in annex 1, page 22. Suggest words quote in favor of a more comprehensive review unquote.

Pg.19: line 7. Either delete sentence beginning; this was..... as does not serve useful purpose, or could be replaced with quote this was due to difficulties in formulation of a strategy consistent with changes occurring in the agricultural sector as a whole over the last few years unquote.

Page 20: line 7. TYPO. should be substantial portion.

Page 22: line 14. finalized by end of 1985

line 16. use in institutionalizing farming systems research.

Line 17,18,19: replace with quote believe a policy on research will be developed, it will require considerable negotiation because of manpower and financial implications.

pg.23: line 1. could impact negatively on the project should the GOB change its priorities.

pg.24: line 3. Accommodate most of the project's needs.

Line 7. and thus most of the dols 355,000 can be...."

---

<sup>2/</sup> Deleted from final report.

LIST OF REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

<u>RECOMMENDATION NO.1</u>	<u>Page</u>
<p>We recommend that USAID/Botswana make revisions deemed necessary to enhance the project's chances for success. In doing so, we believe consideration should be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. extending the project assistance completion date,</li><li>b. reallocating funds between components of the project,</li><li>c. establishing interim benchmarks by which to measure project progress,</li><li>d. establishing a dialogue with Ministry of Agriculture officials to raise the educational level of farming systems research personnel,</li><li>e. ensuring that a Government of Botswana counterpart is assigned to the contractor's team,</li><li>f. increasing the computer capacity available to the contractor team, and</li><li>g. finding a solution to the administrative workload of the contractor team.</li></ul>	5
<u>RECOMMENDATION NO. 2</u>	9
<p>USAID/Botswana should ensure that the Government of Botswana develops a research strategy within a mutually agreed time frame.</p>	
<u>RECOMMENDATION NO. 3</u>	12
<p>USAID/Botswana reprogram unneeded funds originally allocated for equipment and technical assistance for the seed production unit.</p>	
<u>RECOMMENDATION NO. 4</u>	14
<p>We recommend that USAID/Botswana:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. develop and implement procedures to monitor the agreed-to Government of Botswana contributions to the project;</li></ul>	

- b. in cooperation with Government of Botswana develop an acceptable report format, establish due dates for the reports, and provide sound estimates of those contributions.

RECOMMENDATION NO. 5

16

We recommend that USAID/Botswana:

- a. ensure that the existing system for monitoring appreciation of the US dollar over local currency is applied to this project.
- b. determine what excess dollars have accumulated since project implementation, review budgeted amounts for potential accumulations, and deobligate or reprogram as necessary.

List of Report Recipients

Director - USAID/Botswana	5
Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa (AA/A)	1
Office of Southern Africa Affairs (AFR/SA)	1
AFR/Controller	1
AA/XA	1
LEG	1
GC	1
AA/M	2
Office of Financial Management (M/FM/ASD)	2
SAA/S&T	1
PPC/CDIE	3
IG	1
AIG/A	1
IG/PPO	1
IG/EMS/C&R	12
IG/II	1
IIC/II	1
Other RIG/As	1