

**USAID/LAND O'LAKES' COST-SHARING GRANT  
PDC-0209-G-SS-6182-00 (AS AMENDED)  
1989 ANNUAL REPORT  
AND  
1990 PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

This annual report for 1989 and proposed implementation plan for calendar year 1990 is submitted by Land O'Lakes (LOL) for consideration as compliance with the reporting requirements specified in Enclosure One, Section G, Paragraph Two of the Schedule dated September 19, 1986.

**I. MATCHING GRANT COST ELEMENT SUMMARY**

The cost elements of the grant, excluding the indirect cost element, are defined and encompass the following expenditures/match:

**A. LOL Program**

This cost element reflects non-development department expenditures which are reported as match (e.g., LOL farmer member match under the International Farmer Program, all third party match, etc.) and continues ahead of budget.

**B. IDU Program**

This cost element reflects development department expenditures for non-training activities which, for the most part, are reported as AID reimbursable expenses, with non-allowable expenditures reported as match.

**C. IDU Training**

This cost element reflects development department expenditures for training activities which, for the most part, are reported as AID reimbursable expenses, with non-allowable expenditures reported as match.

**D. Indirect Costs**

This cost element is calculated on IDU direct expenses at 44.8 percent.

## CORE FUNDS

## MISSION FUNDS

Cost Elements	BUDGET 1/1/86 - 12/31/90		ACTUAL TO DATE 1/1/86 - 12/31/89		BUDGET 1/1/86 - 12/31/90		ACTUAL TO DATE 1/1/86 - 12/31/89	
	AID/W Share	LOL Share	AID/W Share	LOL Share	AID/M Share	LOL Share	AID/M Share	LOL Share
	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
LOL Program	\$0	\$205,000	\$0	\$452,945	\$78,962	\$23,199		
IDU Program	223,262	155,739	181,311	51,653	166,427	48,873		NO
IDU Training	175,000	-	122,879	442	12,832	3,768		ACTIVITY
Indirect Costs	201,738	239,261	161,344	167,708	89,629	26,321		
Total	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$465,534	\$672,748	\$347,850	\$102,161		

## II. 1990 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The International Farmer Program (IFP) will continue in 1990, but the name will be changed to the International Agriculturalist Program, reflecting a broadened scope. This change was made after a USAID mission indicated an interest in training not only dairy production, but agribusiness in general. Its main focus will again be on young farmers from Jamaica. Revisions in program schedule and activities will respond to the findings of the 1989 IFP independent evaluation report and 1989 participant evaluations.

There will be continued follow-up on all trainees who receive training at LOL. The purpose is to work with the trainees upon returning home to:

1. Further strengthen and institutionalize the training function in their place of business.
2. Evaluate the relevance and applicability of the training received at LOL.
3. Use the evaluation results to improve the training programs offered by LOL.
4. Design and implement in-country training programs and provide follow-up technical assistance to ensure the dissemination of knowledge to a greater number of people within the operating business environment.

In 1990 the matching grant will be used in middle income countries to help those countries still in need of limited support continue to improve their economic status. Unobligated funds will be used with FVA/PVC concurrence on a case-by-case basis. This approach provides LOL access to potential business opportunities in countries which have made progress in competing in the world marketplace.

### III. ACTIVITIES TO DATE

#### A. GRANT ADMINISTRATION

**Purpose:** To further strengthen program management skills and systems to provide timely responses to requests for assistance.

**Status:**

- Grant administration is ongoing.
- Two LOL staff members traveled to Jamaica to research an article. It will highlight the comprehensive approach LOL has taken toward agricultural development in Jamaica, and will be used to gain support within LOL's membership and employees for international development activities. By using the article as a communication and educational tool, it is expected to shorten the response time for identifying the appropriate LOL staffperson for future technical assistance assignments. LOL's ability to respond in a timely manner to developing country requests is enhanced as a result.

**Cost Elements:**

	1989 <u>AID/W SHARE</u>	1989 <u>LOL SHARE</u>
LOL Program	--	\$28,336.81
IDU Program	\$ 9,876.90	--
IDU Training	--	--
	<u>\$ 9,876.90</u>	<u>\$28,336.81</u>

TOTAL: \$38,213.71

#### B. NEW PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

**Purpose:** To introduce LOL expertise to assist in resolving agribusiness problems in AID countries.

**Status:**

- Identified and developed in-country training possibilities in Turkey. Implementation deferred to 1990.
- Investigated technical assistance activity in dairy production in Jamaica.

**Cost Elements:**

	1989 <u>AID/W SHARE</u>	1989 <u>LOL SHARE</u>
LOL Program	--	--
IDU Program	\$600.62	--
IDU Training	--	--
	<u>\$600.62</u>	<u>\$0</u>

TOTAL: \$600.62

**Proposed CY 1990 Activity:**

- Implementation of in-country dairy production and dairy science course in Turkey.
- Have initiated discussion with USAID/Jamaica to do mission buy-in for Jamaica International Agriculturalist Program.

**C. REGION/COUNTRY UPDATE**

1. LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN (LAC)

JAMAICA

**Purpose:** To provide ongoing support to JADF's agribusiness development activities.

The International Farmer Program provides five months of practical, on-the-farm training for foreign farmers and one month of more academic technical training. The trainee learns by participating in every aspect of farm life, from the menial, everyday chores to understanding how U.S. farmers make management decisions. Through the introduction of new technologies, skill and concepts in dairy production, the foreign farmer's agricultural skills are improved. Trainees live as members of their host families, and personal and technical relationships are maintained well beyond the program's end.

**Status:**

- Eight young Jamaican dairy farmers were selected by LOL and Jamaican sponsoring organizations to participate in the 1989 program.
- All eight trainees received one-week scholarships through the matching grant for added technical training in dairy extension techniques at the end of their program.
- Three trainees opted to spend an extra month on-the-farm with their host families at the end of the regular program, taking part in harvest activities. This program extension enabled them to complete their participation in the entire cropping cycle.

- An independent evaluation of the 1988 IFP was completed to determine how trainees were using skills they had learned, one year after program completion. Interviews were conducted in Jamaica and in the U.S. with 1988 trainees, their current employers, and their host families.
- An outstanding trainee was selected as a result of the independent evaluation who, it was judged, was putting his IFP skills to best use. His host family was subsequently invited to participate further in the IFP as providers of technical assistance to their trainee's employer in Jamaica. This activity was patterned after AID's Farmer-to-Farmer program, with the farm couple's travel expenses paid by the matching grant, but their time being donated. LOL will benefit by the overseas experience they gained when they become facilitators at the 1990 IFP host family orientation.

**Cost Elements:**

	1989 <u>AID/W SHARE</u>	1989 <u>LOL SHARE</u>
LOL Program	--	\$157,367.11
IDU Program	\$ 40.11	--
IDU Training	<u>48,704.49</u>	<u>391.94</u>
	\$48,744.60	\$157,759.05

**TOTAL: \$206,503.65**

**Proposed CY 1990 Activity:**

- The name will be changed to the International Agriculturalist Program to reflect a broadened agricultural focus.
- Eight to ten young dairy farmers will be selected by LOL and Jamaican sponsoring organizations to participate in the 1990 program.
- Technical assistance will be provided for aiding in the formation of the Jamaica International Farmer Association (JIFA). The JIFA will help past IFP trainees form an active network of professional dairy producers for the purpose of facilitating ongoing education in dairy management. In-country training could be channeled through the JIFA to reach a greater cross-section of the Jamaican dairy sector.

**2. AFRICA**

**CAMEROON**

**Purpose:** To strengthen the dairy sector in Cameroon.

**Status:** Provided a scholarship for five weeks of U.S. technical training at LOL in rural extension techniques, cheesemaking, and dairy processing to a Cameroonian dairy farmer.

**Cost Elements:**

	1989 <u>AID/W SHARE</u>	1989 <u>LOL SHARE</u>
LOL Program	--	\$0
IDU Program	--	--
IDU Training	<u>\$6,912.00</u>	<u>--</u>
	\$6,912.00	\$0

TOTAL: \$6,912.00

**Proposed CY 1990 Activity:**

- Follow-up will be funded under LOL's dairy development grant for implementation of an in-country dairy production and extension training course.

3. ASIA/NEAR EAST

TURKEY

**Purpose:** To strengthen extension services and the dairy production and processing capabilities of the Turkish dairy sector.

**Status:** Three partial scholarships were offered to the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Rural Affairs, Government of Turkey, for U.S. extension and dairy production training at LOL. Due to Turkish government restrictions, visas could not be obtained for them to participate.

**Cost Elements:**

	1989 <u>AID/W SHARE</u>	1989 <u>LOL SHARE</u>
LOL Program	--	--
IDU Program	--	--
IDU Training	<u>\$52.93</u>	<u>--</u>
	\$52.93	\$0

TOTAL: \$52.93

**Proposed CY 1990 Activity:**

- Plan and implement a dairy production and extension training course in Turkey in conjunction with the U.S. Feed Grains Council/Turkey, per pending discussions.

**Attachments:**

1. 1989 International Farmer Program Training Booklet for Trainees
2. 1989 International Farmer Program Training Booklet for Host Families
3. International Farmer Program 1988: An Evaluation
4. 1989 International Farmer Program: Final Report
5. Jamaica Trip Report: Dan and Muriel French, December 20, 1989

**JAMAICA TRIP REPORT  
DAN AND MURIEL FRENCH  
December 20, 1989**

Climate plays a major role in all agricultural production, and Jamaica is blessed with a wonderful climate for grass for dairy production. Because of the climate, dairying in Jamaica is totally different than the upper midwest. My main goal was to observe the differences caused by climate between the two areas.

We spent several hours each day observing regular farming practices, and in discussions with Mr. Grant and Mr. Dias, we inquired as to why they did each practice and in the manner they did it.

Because of the warm climate all their cattle, from calves to milk cows, are pastured 12 months a year. With proper pasture management, there is no need to harvest any forage at all. They have approximately sixty pastures in production or development at the present time. They are currently pasturing about 300 cows, 150 heifers, and 70 calves.

The farm has four men who have the title of "Milker", two milker trainees, a calf man and assistant, a tractor driver and assistant, a manager and assistant, and a secretary. They also hire day labor daily for any other jobs that come up.

Their day starts at 3:00 a.m. with the milking, and finishes at about 5:30 p.m. Cows are milked twice a day in an eight-stall herringbone parlor with Bov-Matic equipment. They have weigh jars from which they record every milk weight of every milking.

There are not many insects in Jamaica, but the cows are somewhat bothered by small flies. They do have a major problem with ticks. They spray all animals on the farm every ten to fourteen days for ticks.

Llandovery Farms Ltd. is about 1,100 acres, but currently only a little over 500 acres is being used. The other 600 acres are a headache to management with illegal drug shipments, stealing of sand (a national crime), squatters, and many others raising crops and pasturing land in the hills.

They have one 70-HP tractor and six pieces of equipment (trailer, water trailer, mower, fertilizer spreader, two-row harrow and Sorghum chopper) for the entire farming operation. Most work is done by hand. There is a tremendous problem getting equipment, and an even worse problem getting parts and service. All equipment and technology is very expensive, scarce, and in many cases, impossible to get.

After a very short time it was apparent to us that their (farm management's) biggest problems were:

- Pasture management
- Security
- Employee quality & effectiveness
- Owner's lack of understanding of farming
- Lack of communication (no phone or two-way radio)
- No pick-ups (for picking up or moving supplies, etc.)

Jamaica is ahead of the U.S. in grassland management, so we had nothing to offer in that area, but instead tried to learn as much as possible for use on our own farm.

Regarding security, we recommended the owners purchase a safe, because money was stolen twice while we were there. We also recommended building houses for employees on high spots around the farm to cut down theft (four animals were stolen while we were there).

We spent 95 percent of our time talking to Mr. Grant (farm manager) and his assistant, Mr. Dias, about employees. We suggested an incentive program for catching heats that they are adopting. We talked about expectations for milkers, especially in the sanitation area. We met with the milkers and explained the importance of keeping milk clean.

We strongly suggested to management that they fire several employees with apparent bad attitudes, and promote or hire others. The "bad apples" are causing morale problems.

A major cultural problem is that employees expect to do only one thing on a job; this leads to a gross waste of manpower on the farm. We suggested less employees, more pay, more responsibility leading to better productivity and less management headaches.

We also recommended they get some riding horses, especially for management purposes. The place is huge and they have no effective way of keeping track of what is going on. Horses would help them in cattle moving and counting, pasture and water management, checking on their workers during the day, and for security.

### CONCLUSIONS

We feel strongly that the trip was very worthwhile. We have a much better grasp on the differences and similarities of Jamaican and U.S. dairy farming.

Our suggestions are:

- A. Give trainees much more training on host farms in repair and service.
- B. Have host families start to help the trainees realize the importance of the history of U.S. farms (they have not been interested, but machinery and methods of 20-30 year ago fit their problems much better than those of today, in many cases). A tour of some Amish farms might be very helpful to them.

On December 6 we spent a long time talking to Mr. and Mrs. Motta (Michael's parents) about the program and about the future of agriculture, especially dairying in Jamaica. Mr. Motta knows several of the trainees, and his connections have lined up several jobs for them.

I expressed my concern that too many trainees are being trained and then ending up on large corporate farms who could afford to train their own people. He agreed, and said he had discussed that concern with Dr. Keith Roache. Mr. Motta also shared his concern that there were no medium-sized dairy farms in Jamaica

(a concern also noted by Evrod Nam, Director of Island Dairies). I also later discussed this with Dr. Keith Roache in a telephone conversation. He said JADF was trying to find funds to loan the farmers (especially some trainees) trying to start medium-sized farms.

One thing that stood out in all my conversations was the expense and scarcity of equipment for this size operation. The old bucket systems abandoned on many Minnesota and Wisconsin dairy farms would be perfect for them. If we could find a way to source and collect them, JADF would ship them down.

One of the things I would like LOL staff to look into would be the possibility of bringing trainees to the U.S. and placing them with mechanics and dairy equipment service people. A glaring weakness in their whole system is lack of service. If dairying is going to grow, they have to find a way to meet this need.

Also, during the technical training the entire cooperative system needs to be stressed more, along with the value of coops, how to form them, how to manage them, and how to keep the focus and goals on which the co-op was founded. Cooperatives in Jamaica have not done well because of poor management and lack of focus (trying to be everything for everybody).

I recommend that Jim Frantz schedule some time in January to talk to Mr. Motta and Dr. Roache about the short- and long-term goals of the International Farmer Program of Land O'Lakes.

The trip was great; we felt able to help, but most of all to learn. The program is great. It is very valuable and very respected in Jamaican ag circles. It definitely should be expanded, if possible.

WRDPFCT/JAMIFP  
12/20/89-cjy

# Land O'Lakes, Inc.

4001 LEXINGTON AVE. N., ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA

Mailing address: P.O. Box 116, Minneapolis, MN 55440-0116  
Telephone: (612) 481-2222

## LAND O'LAKES

### 1989 International Farmer Program

#### Final Report

October, 1989

#### Background

In 1989 Land O'Lakes selected Jamaica as its target country for the International Farmer Program for the second year in a row. It was recognized that 1) working with Jamaica, 1988 had been the most successful year (in terms of trainee performance) in the history of the six-year program, 2) there was good organizational support in Jamaica, and 3) broad financial backing existed in 1989 to involve more sponsors than in 1988. These important reasons led us in 1989 to endeavor to build on our past success in Jamaica.

Eight trainees were selected for the 1989 program. They were sponsored by the Jamaica Agricultural Development Foundation (4), Alcan Jamaica Ltd. (2), Serge Island Dairies Ltd. (1), and National Commercial Bank Ltd. (1).

#### Changes from 1988

We were more restrictive in our trainee selection in 1989, limiting them to 20-25 years of age instead of 20-30 (only one exception was made). Interestingly, this year's group seemed to be more settled and mature than their 1988 counterparts, though younger. The make-up of the group also varied in that one woman was included among the eight chosen.

Several other changes were made in the 1989 program. One was a second on-farm visit to trainees by the program coordinator. During these two visits (after the trainee had been on the farm one and three months) he would talk separately with the trainee and the host family to see how well they were adjusting to each other. This extra visit was a very positive change (one recommended by 1988 trainees and host families). Both groups felt that they had better support from Land O'Lakes staff as a result. The visit improved communication between all parties, which was not as easily achieved by regular telephone contact.

- 11 -

A new option that was added in 1989 was a seventh month of training, to take place on the trainee's original host farm. This was designed to take advantage of the harvest season and allow the trainee to see the completion of the cropping cycle which they had participated in since their spring arrival. Three trainees took advantage of this opportunity.

The visit to Land O'Lakes' Answer Farm (our agricultural research facility) in rural Iowa was moved from September to late June, a timely break in the farm routine. In 1988 it was incorporated into the technical training month in September, as operations were unfortunately beginning to wind down for the season. Trainees were able to learn and see more on the Answer Farm this year in June. Placing this visit in June effectively added several days to their technical training month at the end of the program. We found, not surprisingly, that it was refreshing and energizing for trainees to get away from the farm for several days and be with their Jamaican compatriots.

### General Impressions

As in 1988, on-farm training was the biggest challenge for trainees. Adjusting to a new family, a new culture, new food, a threatening climate, and a vigorous work routine kept them occupied 24 hours a day. Very few complaints were heard during this time in 1989 relative to past years. This could be at least partially due to the excellent orientation held in Jamaica for the trainees prior to their departure, which was planned by the Jamaica Agricultural Development Foundation. 1989 trainees were able to benefit from the experience of last year's group as they listened to them at the Kingston orientation.

While the technical training portion of the program was easier and more fun for trainees, there was a sincere realization and appreciation by most of them of the value of the long hours of work they put in on their host farms. Like one 1988 trainee put it, the U.S. farmer is successful largely because of his/her diligence and hard work. It is a difficult concept to teach, but the work ethic appears to have been enthusiastically adopted by most of our trainees.

The ambition and dedication shown by the 1989 group to their host families was impressive. While the group lived in Minneapolis several trainees, including the three who stayed for the seventh month, would often go back to someone's host farm on weekends to work with their "adopted" families during the beginning of the busy haying season. Their enthusiasm

for the farm was surprising, since instead of having fun and staying out late in the city (after five months of very hard work on their host farms), they instead chose to work long, hard hours on these weekends. They, too, were proud of their ambition.

### Adjustments

In general, trainees and families adjusted very well to each other. Half of the eight trainees had what could be termed "excellent" relationships with their host families. These trainees varied considerably in personal traits - some were very quiet and timid, some more outgoing and very assertive. Half of their host families had previous IFP experience, and half were new at it. All four trainees with the best host family relationships were very serious about making the most of their learning experience, and most did outside studying about agriculture at night after chores were done. They fit marvelously into their host families, and would often babysit or mix socially with their "adopted" siblings and friends. One family invited over 60 people to a going-away party for their trainee, and had napkins printed with his name on them.

Many tears were shed upon the departure of these four, especially by the younger children in the family who often referred to them as their brother. This reminded us that there is more to "international development" than technical training, like the fostering of long-lasting relationships across cultures and races.

The other four trainees had more distant relationships with their host families. Both groups of trainees and host families varied in exactly the same manner as the groups above, so it is difficult to make conclusions based on personal traits or past experience. Some felt that they were treated like hired hands, and in one instance, we felt there may have been some basis for that. There were efforts made by that host family to change the situation, though generally only when Land O'Lakes staff would directly intervene. Since the trainee didn't want to change farms and did not consider the problem very important, he remained on that farm. The relationship remained tolerable.

Every year we hear many comments from trainees, almost in disbelief, about how hard the U.S. farmer and his/her family works. This is why they are warned of hard work and long hours in their pre-selection interview. It is often difficult for us to differentiate legitimate complaints of unfair work demands from those comments or complaints that we

know everyone makes in the beginning months of the program. We ask trainees if they are asked to work longer hours or harder than their host farmer. (The answer is almost invariably negative.) We must gauge these situations by talking to the host family about it, too. We then look to see if the trainee's attitude changes after a reasonable period of adjustment. If there is a legitimate problem, we make suggestions to the host family, but it is still up to the host family to implement the change.

One host family for 1988 and 1989 continued to have problems this year with the relationship they had with their trainee. The two IFP trainees they'd hosted were very different from each other, and the difficulties experienced with them varied considerably, too - one was quite young, had a temper, and was not very highly motivated, and the other was more mature, became uncommunicative and sullen, and while appearing to try very hard, had an impossible time following certain simple procedures. The first had more work-related problems, and the second had problems more of an interpersonal nature, which affected his on-the-job training. Both had reasonably good relationships with Land O'Lakes staff, who monitored the situation very closely.

The interpersonal situation between this trainee and his host farmer had deteriorated by May to the point that the farmer felt the trainee had rejected his host family, completely isolating himself from the family and not participating in any activities with them. Since after much investigation Land O'Lakes staff thought this seemed true, the trainee was put on probation and told that he had to improve in four areas: to show willingness to do a good job, to show respect to his hosts, to take part in some family social activities, and to speak directly to his host farmer when he was dissatisfied or saw a problem arise. This was the turning point in his experience, and his relationship with his host family showed marked improvement immediately. It continued on a much-improved basis, to his credit, throughout the remainder of his farmstay. No further disciplinary action was necessary.

Another trainee complained of having to do all the menial chores on the farm. In investigating this, we found that the situation was more complex, and that there was a personality conflict underlying the problems. Land O'Lakes had dealt extensively with this family in 1988, because they had hosted a Jamaican IFP trainee. The 1988 trainee had had nothing but praise and respect for this family, and in fact said his host farmer was "like my father." In their dealing with LOL

staff, they were exemplary in their concern for his welfare and their willingness to go out of their way to help the him in whatever way they could.

An investigation of the complaint was made, anyway. The trainee appeared to be having trouble adjusting to a rural, socially limited living situation, and invented or exaggerated illnesses and other excuses to get off the farm and out of work. The trainee was not accustomed to the intensity of the work and the concept of being a trainee in a trainer-trainee relationship. Though the host family did expect the trainee to perform menial chores, their situation was no different than at any other host farm. It is explained to all trainees that they will, in all likelihood, be asked to do menial work, just like all family members must do from time to time.

This was the first year Land O'Lakes selected a female trainee for the IFP. While unquestionably one of the brightest of the group, after several months on the farm she finally told her host farmer that she thought she should not have to work as hard as her male counterparts in the program. She was, in fact, told by the program director in her initial interview that she would be treated just the same as any male trainee. Unfortunately, she harbored some underlying resentment because of it, and it impacted negatively on her relationship with her host family. While they are very patient and understanding people with a healthy sense of humor, their patience was tried with her attitude. To try to improve the situation, Land O'Lakes staff arranged a four-day visit to a veterinary clinic where the trainee was able to observe procedures and work with the staff. This visit was very meaningful for her, and improved her attitude. While this incident will not make Land O'Lakes limit the IFP to males only, it does point out the importance of creating the proper expectations ahead of time. This cannot be emphasized enough. Even when trainees are told exactly what to expect, the prospect of being chosen to go to the United States for six months can make them forget important details and obligations.

### Racism

As in 1988, Land O'Lakes staff felt that it was important to openly face the potential for racism and prepare trainees and families for the possibility. This was done in preliminary interviews and during orientation. As black Jamaicans entering a white Midwest rural community, trainees were well

aware of being visibly different. Land O'Lakes staff heard of two separate, minor incidents which occurred, which involved strangers and which never amounted to anything serious. The trainees reacted in a mature, controlled way, and the incidents were diffused.

### Technical Training

More technical training was incorporated into the 1989 program as a result of trainee requests in 1988. As mentioned previously, the Answer Farm visit took place in June, allowing three extra days during the last month for other training. An entire week of technical training in rural dairy extension was added as an option at the end of the program, which all eight trainees took advantage of. This expanded upon the one day of rural extension training they had already received, and allowed them to learn teaching methodologies and develop materials. It was very well received by trainees.

Also in response to comments on 1988 technical training, we eliminated visits to large dairy farms and processing plants. Extra training was added in record-keeping, farm equipment maintenance, cheesemaking, and milking machine use and its relation to mastitis. A tour of an embryo transplant facility was included this year.

Evaluations of each training segment were made by trainees to determine relative usefulness of each unit. They will be used in planning next year's technical training program.

### Final Comments

Land O'Lakes has been impressed with the dedication and tenacity of all the Jamaican trainees who have participated in the IFP, but especially the 1989 group. Each one worked very hard to succeed and fully earned the graduation certificate they were granted. The extra studying and research done by some impressed their families and Land O'Lakes staff greatly, and earned them much respect. Some experienced more difficulties than others, but all were successful and grew in their technical knowledge as well as in personal ways, such as in self-confidence. They should be proud of their accomplishment. They possess the capability to make important contributions to the Jamaican dairy sector.

A number of deep friendships have resulted from the IFP, and the trainees should be proud of this as well. They represented their country in an exemplary manner, and have

taught many more people than their host families what it means to be Jamaican. Jamaica has become more than a tiny island in the Caribbean to the parents and children that had a Jamaican brother or sister this year. Rural communities benefited, too, through the Jamaicans' visits and lectures to churches, schools and civic groups, such as Future Farmers of America and 4-H clubs.

Land O'Lakes' collaboration in this program with the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Jamaica Agricultural Development Foundation, as well as other Jamaican organizations trying to improve the domestic dairy industry, like Alcan, Serge Island and National Commercial Bank, has also had a positive affect on Land O'Lakes training programs and our farmer-members. Based on our past success, Land O'Lakes intends to continue to work with Jamaica in 1990 in training those who have the potential to be the next leaders of Jamaica's dairy industry.