

PD-ABP-202  
94298

UNCLASSIFIED

Department of State  
Agency for International Development  
Washington, D.C. 20523

Project Paper Supplement

Uganda - Manpower for Agricultural Development  
Project No. 617-0103

March 1985

UNCLASSIFIED

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A

UGANDA - MANPOWER FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECT PAPER SUPPLEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Problem Statement	1
Background	1
Technical Assistance Contract	2
Reprogramming PIO/P	3
Effect on Original Project Analyses	4
Technical	4
Economic	6
Social	7
Administrative and Environmental	8
Revised Budget and Implementation Schedule	8
Human Rights Review - 116(a)	9
Congressional Notification	9
Recommendation	9

ATTACHMENTS

Tab	A. Revised Project Budget
	B. Revised Implementation Schedule
	C. 116(a) Human Rights Review
	D. Advice of Program Change
	E. Authorization Amendment

B

<b>AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT</b> <b>PROJECT DATA SHEET</b>	<b>1. TRANSACTION CODE</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A = Add <input type="checkbox"/> C = Change <input type="checkbox"/> D = Delete	<b>Amendment Number</b> <u>2</u>	<b>DOCUMENT CODE</b> <u>3</u>
--	---	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------

<b>2. COUNTRY/ENTITY</b> UGANDA	<b>3. PROJECT NUMBER</b> <u>617-0103</u>
------------------------------------	---

<b>4. BUREAU/OFFICE</b> AFRICA <span style="float: right;"><u>06</u></span>	<b>5. PROJECT TITLE (maximum 40 characters)</b> <u>Manpower for Agricultural Development</u>
--	---

<b>6. PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION DATE (PACD)</b> MM DD YY <u>09 30 88</u>	<b>7. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION</b> (Under 'B.' below, enter 1, 2, 3, or 4) A. Initial FY <u>83</u> B. Quarter <u>4</u> C. Final FY <u>87</u>
--	--

8. COSTS (\$000 OR EQUIVALENT \$1 = )						
A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY			LIFE OF PROJECT		
	B. FX	C. L/C	D. Total	E. FX	F. L/C	G. Total
AID Appropriated Total						
(Grant)	( 6,853 )	( 168 )	( 7,021 )	( 12,932 )	( 168 )	( 13,100 )
(Loan)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other U.S.						
1.						
2.						
Host Country					3,009	3,009
Other Donor(s)						
<b>TOTALS</b>	6,853	168	7,021	12,932	3,177	16,109

9. SCHEDULE OF AID FUNDING (\$000)									
A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	C. PRIMARY TECH. CODE		D. OBLIGATIONS TO DATE		E. AMOUNT APPROVED THIS ACTION		F. LIFE OF PROJECT	
		1. Grant	2. Loan	1. Grant	2. Loan	1. Grant	2. Loan	1. Grant	2. Loan
(1) ENX	EN	080		4,392		3,600		13,100	
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
<b>TOTALS</b>				4,392		3,600		13,100	

<b>10. SECONDARY TECHNICAL CODES (maximum 6 codes of 3 positions each)</b> 600      963	<b>11. SECONDARY PURPOSE CODE</b> 121
--	--

<b>12. SPECIAL CONCERNS CODES (maximum 7 codes of 4 positions each)</b>			
A. Code	R/AG	XII	PVOU
B. Amount			

**13. PROJECT PURPOSE (maximum 480 characters)**

To assist the Government of Uganda to rehabilitate, retrain and redirect its agricultural manpower and institutional capability in food crops production.

<b>14. SCHEDULED EVALUATIONS</b> Interim MM YY MM YY      Final MM YY <u>07 86</u> <u>09 88</u>	<b>15. SOURCE/ORIGIN OF GOODS AND SERVICES</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 000 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 941 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
---	--

**16. AMENDMENTS/NATURE OF CHANGE PROPOSED (This is page 1 of a \_\_\_\_\_ page PP Amendment)**

This PP Supplement adds \$3,600,000 to total LOP funding to cover the costs of:  
 (1) a higher-than-expected technical assistance contract; (2) 25% danger pay for employees in Uganda; (3) higher commodity prices due to inflation; and  
 (4) additional commodities not included in the original PP engineering appraisal.

<b>17. APPROVED BY</b>	Signature <u>[Signature]</u> Title <u>Mission Director, USAID/Kampala</u>	<b>18. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID/W DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION</b> Date Signed MM DD YY <u>03 15 88</u>
------------------------	--	---

11

ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, AFR

FROM : *Irvin D. Coker*  
Irvin D. Coker, Mission Director, USAID/Uganda

SUBJECT : Supplement to the Uganda Manpower for  
Agricultural Development Project Paper 617-0103

Problem:

Your action is required to (1) approve this document as a supplement to the Project Paper for the Uganda Manpower for Agricultural Development Project 617-0103; and (2) approve related amendments to the project authorization, and technical assistance contract for the subject project which reflect various changes in the way the project is being implemented and funded.

Background:

The purpose of the Manpower Development Project is to assist the Government of Uganda to rehabilitate, retrain, and redirect its agricultural manpower and institutional capability in food crops production. This purpose is to be achieved by rehabilitating agricultural institutions in research, teaching and extension, primarily Makerere University Faculty of Agriculture and research farm at nearby Kabanyolo, and the Ministry of Agriculture's research station at Serere in the northeast. Project activities are to include the retraining of agricultural research and teaching staff, rehabilitation and re-equipping of agricultural research, teaching and office facilities, support for individual agricultural research proposals, retraining of extension staff, and the development of linkages between agricultural research and extension activities. AID funds are earmarked to finance the retraining, technical assistance, facilities rehabilitation, a small grant research program, and commodities and equipment.

This PP supplement is necessary to explain the impact on, and changes in the project resulting from (1) the signing (10/22/84, effective 9/1/84) of a technical assistance contract (including the programming of participant training) with Ohio State University in the amount of \$6.891 million whereas only \$2.417 million plus an add-on of \$500,000\* and \$1.048 million for participant training were budgeted for technical assistance and training in the PP (a difference of \$2.717 million when

\*This refers to Amendment No. 1 to the PP which covered the increased costs of an additional Prime Contractor position (Administrative/Supply Management Officer) and further renovation to the research stations.

these and other factors are taken into account); (2) the reprogramming of PIO/P funds from Mission to Ohio State Contract action; (3) increases in commodity and other costs requiring an adjustment in line item budget allocations; (4) events and circumstances that have called for changes in the project implementation and procurement schedules; and (5) the recent approval of 25 percent danger pay for employees serving in Uganda, effective December 9, 1984 which will require that an additional \$266,477 be added to the OSU Contract budget under Special Allowances on the assumption that employees are entitled to danger pay throughout the life of the project. Utilization of this Special Allowance will be authorized, subject to the authorization that allows AID DH to receive danger pay.

Despite these changes in the project compared to the PP, the project goal and purpose still remain valid and the life of project funding period and project completion date have not been altered. There are no fundamental changes in the quantity and characteristics of project outputs, targets and goals as a result of these changes. The adjustments called for in the project inputs are expected to improve the quality of project activities. Unfortunately the PP did not provide a detailed budget with which to make a line item comparison between the PP and the revised project budget.

#### Technical Assistance Contract

The difference in the value of the Ohio State University contract and the technical assistance budget in the PP are mainly due to underestimated (by design team) line item costs, plus the inclusion of both an additional technical advisor and participant training costs in the Ohio State contract. The basic elements of the project technical assistance activity remain intact but will be enhanced by a few modifications. The Ohio State Contract includes the services of an Administrative/Supply Management Advisor (subcontracted to Experience, Inc.) which was not included in the original PP, but approved at the ECPR and in the final project authorization. This change was made before preparation of the PIO/T and RFTP. The Technical Proposals included this position when they were submitted to AID/W. This individual is already in-country (since September 5, 1984) and will be located at Kabanyolo. He is working under the supervision of the Team Leader. His responsibilities include coordination of commodity procurement effort with procurement service agents (PSAs), maintenance of an adequate inventory control and security of all commodities, and providing leadership for the installation of machinery and equipment, repair of machinery, rehabilitation of facilities and buildings. The Advisor has provided indispensable assistance in helping the Mission and GOU prepare for the arrival of the other technical advisors, procuring commodities and start up of the rehabilitation of the

research stations and technical assistants' houses. Given the fact that the Mission and GOU have limited manpower, the functions of this advisor are extremely important in getting commodities procured and the project implemented in a timely fashion.

The PP proposed that four PVO Volunteers be employed to supervise and train Ugandans in the fields of mechanics and building repairs and construction at the Serere and Kabanyolo research stations. These individuals were envisioned by the PP design team to be Peace Corps or IVS types who would receive nominal compensation for their services. But in the Technical Proposals and now in the Contract, these employees are to be Management Assistants with practical knowledge, skills and mechanical ability who, because of these more highly professional qualifications, would be compensated much more than a nominal fee. A considerable amount of work and skills is required to rehabilitate and maintain the research stations. Therefore it is deemed necessary that the individuals contracted to do this work should be highly experienced, technically qualified individuals. The estimated funds in the PP for technical assistance was \$2.417 million. However, the technical assistance contractor's budget amounts to \$5.544 million which is an increase of \$3.127 million over the budgeted amount for technical assistance.

With Management Assistants, the rehabilitation and maintenance at the stations will undoubtedly be more professionally done and accomplished on a more timely basis. There have been many delays in project implementation which places a premium on these individuals' ability to get tasks completed as quickly and accurately as possible. The change in this category of technical assistance accounts for approximately \$1.5 million over that budgeted in the PP for this line item.

It should be noted that the Ohio State University Contract included such items as POL and office supplies plus furniture. When these costs and all the other factors (as mentioned above) are accounted for, there is a net difference of \$2.717 between the Ohio State Contract and what was itemized in the PP for the services and commodities provided through this contract.

#### Reprogramming PIO/P Action

It was originally planned that USAID would use standard AID PIO/P procedures to send selected Ugandans for training in the U.S. and to the International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs). The Contractor would then have provided the remaining training to the other selected participants. Due to USAID's limited manpower capacity to prepare, process and implement the PIO/P activities as expected (especially placing participants in international research institutions), the sending of 15 Ugandans for training was suspended. Only 2 participants were

successfully placed. To move this project activity forward, participant training is now a Contractor activity with funds to accomplish this provided in the Contract. Thus, in the first instance, both the implementation schedule and responsible party for project training have been changed. In addition, the PP budget contained \$1.048 million for training in the U.S. and IARCs but the contract funding level is \$1,346,385 for this training--an increase of \$298,385.

#### Effect On Original Project Analyses:

##### Technical Analysis

Concerning the technical matters in the project, the revised technical assistance compensation figures and support costs has enabled Ohio State to field the best available technical advisors. These individuals are central to the components of the project involving the team leadership, Makerere University-Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry staff development, curriculum and training activities, as well as the establishment of on-the-job training and guidance of a Research Division within the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, coordination of research activities and assistance in the operation, maintenance and repair of the new and existing equipment and facilities at Serere Research Station, and also the initial rehabilitation and maintenance of both the Serere and Kabanyolo Research Stations. The added services of an Administrative/Supply Management Advisor are critical to the proper and timely implementation of the project regarding both the technical assistance and commodities provisions in the project.

As of September 1984, approximately \$2.280 million worth of commodities was earmarked out of a total of \$3.250 million that was budgeted for commodities. If every line item budgeted in the PP is procured, there may be a shortage of approximately \$390,000 for commodities. This shortage of funds is due to an underestimated amount and cost of commodities (including freight charges) in the PP. Also, costs were in part underestimated because of the impact of inflation on prices as a consequence of a later start (approximately 6 months) in commodity procurement than was anticipated. For example, a number of necessary items for renovation such as plumbing and electrical supplies, paint, and lumber were either not budgeted for in the PP or an insufficient quantity was estimated. In addition, several of the commodity specifications were not appropriate. Commodity procurement was held up further by delays caused by a supplier in Nairobi whose contract had to eventually be terminated because of his inability to deliver on a timely basis.

Project Management deems it necessary for the project to procure two-way, high frequency, single side band radios to set up a communications network between the main project sites

at Entebbe, Kampala, Kabanyolo and Serere for security reasons as well as to facilitate project implementation. These radios, costing approximately \$30,000 were not included in the project budget. But they are considered vital to project implementation and the security of the technical advisors and their families. On many occasions there have and will be the need for prompt communications between members of the project or sites where much time and effort is expended in communicating directly because either no telephones exist or they do not work properly. In times of emergency, they will be invaluable, particularly for those who will be located at the more isolated sites--Kabanyolo (four families) and Serere (three advisors).

During the early days of reestablishing the USAID Mission in Uganda, and during the implementation of the Food Production Support Project, support for repair and maintenance of technical assistance housing, and other support was provided by the Embassy GSO. However, during the early stages of implementing this Manpower Development project, it was learned that GSO could not take on the added responsibilities of providing such support for this new technical assistance team, and in fact could not continue to provide support for the existing technical assistance team. Since 8 of the technical assistance team members will reside from 12 to over 200 miles from Kampala, a field support team of local technicians and Third Country Nationals will be put together to provide field support and services similar to that provided by a GSO. In support of this effort Mission and Project Management decided that it would be necessary to procure one more truck under this project. This 7.5 ton truck will be procured at a cost of approximately \$25,000.

In recent months, starting about mid-1984, Uganda began to experience serious electrical problems in the form of frequent outages for up to a week, extreme surges, and brownouts. This necessitates procurement of standby generators to avoid loss of food, but also to operate security lights. The USAID Mission has already procured generators for its direct-hire staff, and the Embassy is now in the process of procuring generators for its direct-hire staff. Project Management and the Mission has made the determination that it is essential that standby generators (two of 16.25 KVA and two of 26 KVA ratings) be procured to provide more adequate support for the technical assistance team members and their families. These electrical problems did not exist at the time the PP was design. However, they are expected to continue for the foreseeable future since the national electrical grid system has suffered from lack of maintenance for the past several years, and there is currently no work going on to rehabilitate the system. Consequently the expenditure of about \$75,000 for nine to eleven standby generators were not planned for during PP design.

Now that one of the Renovation Management Assistants is

at Serere Research Station, it became evident that the station did not have even the basic tools (e.g. hammers, wheelbarrows, nails, etc.) necessary to begin renovation. Provision of these tools will increase the GOU contribution to the project by \$297,143 and lack of these tools has contributed to delays in renovation (especially housing). However, the GOU has now made funds available, and these tools are being procured.

During implementation of the project, it has been determined that private contractors must be employed to renovate some of the houses. As an illustration of the problem, the Engineering Department at Makerere cannot be depended upon to renovate Makerere technical assistance houses or teaching and research facilities as they were expected to do according to the PP. Project Management now believes this renovation work would place more responsibility on the Engineering Department than they can handle in the necessary (hurry up) time frame now required by the project since they have many other demands on their time from several departments in the university. In view of the fact that private firm contracting for renovation was not included in the PP budget, this will add approximately \$300,000 to (AID) foreign exchange costs of the project and \$75,000 to GOU costs.

No other project technical components have been altered. In fact, these components can be expected to be more efficiently utilized or applied as a result of being guided by the best possible technical assistance team now working in a more realistic setting.

Thus, the modifications that have been mentioned above do enhance the technical soundness of the project as well as improve the quality of outputs and likelihood of reaching project targets.

### Economic Analysis

The economic aspects of the Manpower Development Project revolve around the main thrust of the project--revitalization of the agricultural institutional structure of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and Makerere University in the areas of research and extension. Clearly the technical assistance, commodity procurement and renovation/maintenance of the research stations are important means of achieving this objective. The technical assistance staff will provide important input into the decision-making process that will determine the direction of agricultural research and extension in these two institutions. They will also provide critical guidance in the training program. The rehabilitation of the Makerere University and Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry research stations will be instrumental in enabling the present and retrained staff of these institutions to carry out their mandates. The availability of high-order research skills and

adequate research facilities represents an important source of agricultural productivity growth in a developing country like Uganda. Sufficient technical assistance funds to field a good, well equipped group of technical advisors along with properly rehabilitated and equipped research facilities, good guidance and coordination of the training program will all provide greater assurance that the productivity of these project components will have the expected medium to long term benefits and returns Uganda should receive from this investment in research.

Neither a benefit/cost ratio nor an internal rate of return (IRR) analysis was done in the PP because of the non-revenue producing nature of the project. But as stated in the PP, ex-post evaluations have shown exceptionally high IRRs of agricultural research around the world. In this respect, it is unlikely that the changes in project costs and possible benefits would alter the fact that a favorable (theoretical) IRR for this project would still apply. On the other hand, this investment in agricultural research in Uganda should be supported not on the basis of a possible high rate of return but simply because agricultural research is a critical factor leading to increases in agricultural productivity. Increases in agricultural productivity is in turn, one of the most important means of economic growth in Uganda.

### Social Analysis

Since the essential direction and scope of the project has not been affected by the above mentioned changes, the number, types or characteristics of beneficiaries will not have been affected. It is worth reiterating that, although the primary focus of this project is on institutional rehabilitation (research and extension), the proposed achievements of this project will have a major beneficial impact on Uganda's small farmers, who comprise up to 90 percent of the total population.

As noted in the original PP's social analysis, crop production and productivity have declined dramatically throughout the troubled years of the 1970's and early 1980's. Uganda's once progressive and productive farmers no longer have access to improved seeds, technologies and farming techniques. While most have proven themselves very resourceful and resilient in continuing at least a subsistence level of production throughout a difficult period, they can be much more productive with increased access to improved resources. With these improved resources, available as a result of this project, farmers can improve their own standards of living as well as contribute to increased food availability for all Ugandans and to national economic growth.

Thus, although small farmers are not the most immediate and direct beneficiaries of this project, the major impacts of successful implementation will be significant improvements in the production and productivity of small farmers leading to

significant improvements in their incomes and subsequent standard of living as well as increases in the availability of agricultural products for domestic consumption and export.

#### Administrative and Environmental Analysis

The modifications and changes in the Manpower Development Project detailed in this PP Supplement are not expected to have any significant effects on the findings of the PP's original environmental considerations and administrative analysis. The only difference of note in the latter is that the administration and monitoring of the project's participant training component will now be undertaken by the prime contractor (Ohio State University) instead of USAID/Uganda. The relatively minor increase (approximately Dols 300,000) that results from this implementation approach is far less than the opportunity costs associated with USAID's direct staff involvement, if as previously planned the Mission was to continue to undertake this exercise.

#### Revised Budget and Implementation Schedule:

The modifications in the project mentioned above require changes in the original project's budget and implementation schedule. An illustrative new budget can be found in Table 1 (refer to Tab A) and a revised implementation schedule is attached.

The major reasons for delays in implementation and for the need to revise the implementation schedule are: (a) the PP design team's unfamiliarity with implementation constraints in Uganda led to the development of an unrealistic implementation schedule, (b) the list of materials for renovation work developed by an engineer was inadequate--requiring that the renovation material specifications be redone by a construction contractor and procurement be changed from a single to a multiple procurement action which contributed to 6-10 months delay in completion of renovation, (c) the new Federal Acquisition Regulations went into effect April 1, 1984, prohibiting the use of the old supply contract format--so any procurement over \$25,000 had to be shelved until a new supply contract format was developed causing a six months delay in major procurement actions, (d) although a contract was signed by April 1984 with a PSA in Nairobi, Kenya to procure renovation materials and supplies for the technical assistance houses, these materials and supplies were not received until September 2, 1984 and only 80 percent of what was ordered did arrive, contributing to about 10 months slippage in renovation, (e) the arrival of the technical assistance team has been held up because renovation of their houses was delayed as a result of the factors mentioned above, and finally, (f) although the PIO/T that earmarked funds for the services of a stateside PSA was prepared in March 1984, as of this date there is no

stateside PSA on contract to handle procurement in the U.S. Mission understands that due to SER/CM's prior workload commitments, the related request for proposals for procurement services has as yet, to the best of our knowledge, to be advertised.

The revised implementation schedule (Attachment B), while perhaps somewhat optimistic, is believed to be much more realistic than the schedule contained in the PP. While 6-12 months of slippage in project implementation has occurred, it is the opinion of Project Management that with the momentum of implementation that has been built up during the past five months, it is still possible to achieve both project purpose and goal within the present LOP. This is assuming there is no further slippage in this revised implementation schedule and that the GOU provides adequate local budgetary support in a timely fashion.

The approval of this document will increase the life of project funding of the Manpower for Agricultural Development project from U.S. \$9,500,000 originally approved in August, 1983, to U.S. \$13,091,809, an increase of U.S. \$3,591,809.

116(a) - Human Rights Review:

In a letter dated November 13, 1984 from the Administrator to the Chairman of the HR Sub-committee on Human rights, it was stated that the subject project will "...rebuild Uganda's capacity for carrying out agricultural research and getting the results to the farmers." The implication of this statement is that the project will benefit the neediest of the needy. In support of this view we have included a 116(a) analysis and attached it as Tab C to this Supplement.

Congressional Notification:

Congress has not been advised previously of the additional funds proposed under this Amendment. Therefore, a Congressional Notification (CN) for FY 85 funding is required. Toward this end an advice of program change is attached to this Supplement as Tab D.

Recommendation:

That you (1) approve this Project Paper Supplement (including an increase in the amount of Dols 3,732,161 to fully fund the OSU Technical Assistance Contract) and (2) sign the attached Amendment No. 2 to the Project Authorization, thereby approving an increase in total project funding of Dols 3,591,809 to the grant to the Government of Uganda for the Manpower Project No. 617-0103.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Disapproved: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Drafters: AE, F. Sands and PDO, W. McPhie

Clearance:

ADO: WCook WC

PA: VCoker VC

PROG: EMcPhie EMcPhie

LEGAL \_\_\_\_\_

MANPOWER PROJECT SUPPLEMENT (617-0103)

ATTACHMENTS

MANPOWER FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT  
Revised Budget

TAB A

CATEGORY :	YEAR-1	YEAR-2	YEAR-3	YEAR-4	YEAR-5 :	TOTAL
<b>I. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE :</b>						
<b>1. Technical Advisors :</b>						
Main State TA :						
Campus Coordinator :	32,648	20,960	22,427	15,998		92,033
Fiscal/Admin. Asst. :	7,500	8,025	8,587	9,188		33,300
Secretary :	7,500	8,025	8,587	9,188		33,300
Training Coordinator :	12,500	13,375	7,156	7,657		40,688
Chief of Party (COP) :	63,129	67,548	72,276	77,336		280,289
Ag. Advisor :	37,500	40,125	42,934			120,559
Fiscal/Admin Officer :	18,000	19,260	20,608	22,051		79,919
Office Assistants :	8,000	8,560	9,159	9,800		35,519
Experience Inc. TA :						
Project Manager :	6,000	6,000	3,000			15,000
H.D. Input to PSA :	4,000	2,000				6,000
Admin/Supply Officer :	40,500	42,525	44,651			127,676
Rehab Mgmt Asst-1 :	18,500	19,425				37,925
Rehab Mgmt Asst-2 :	22,000	23,100				45,100
Rehab Mgmt Asst-3 :	32,760	34,938				67,698
Rehab Mgmt Asst-4 :	30,000	31,500				61,500
Univ. of Minnesota TA :						
Project Manager :	9,340	10,454	10,969			30,763
Accountant :	4,910	5,148	5,386			15,444
Agric. Research Advisor :	44,411	46,632	48,963			140,006
Admin. Assistant :	4,500	4,725	4,962			14,187
IADS TA :						
Project Manager :	2,730	2,866	3,010			8,606
Secretary :	365	383	402			1,150
Farm Mgmt. Specialist :	51,000	53,550	56,228			160,778
	457,793	469,124	369,305	151,218		1,447,440
2. Consultants (O'Seas) :	32,630	41,184	21,606	15,132		110,552
3. Fringe Benefits :	72,523	74,606	72,840	25,184		245,154
4. Travel & Transportation :	399,020	218,606	164,062	52,704		834,392
5. Allowances :	204,083	164,251	111,680	28,879		508,892
Special Allowances * :	86,568	93,493	65,591	20,825		266,477
6. Other Direct Costs :	119,371	67,407	57,885	17,283		261,946
7. Nonexpendible Equipment :	50,120					50,120
8. Expendible Mat/Supplies :	88,285	14,040	13,740	12,840		128,905
9. Participant Training :	167,445	554,940	316,000	180,000	128,000	1,346,385
10. Indirect Costs :	969,169	363,057	258,999	117,873		1,709,098
Subcontract Fees :	61,746	53,108	26,215	0		141,068
<b>Sub-Total :</b>	<b>167,445</b>	<b>3,096,248</b>	<b>1,874,875</b>	<b>1,341,923</b>	<b>569,938</b>	<b>7,050,430</b>

\* TA Danger Pay

12

(Continued)

CATEGORY	YEAR-1	YEAR-2	YEAR-3	YEAR-4	YEAR-5	TOTAL
<b>II. COMMODITIES</b>						
1. Farm Machinery & Gen.			550,000			550,000
2. Generators		74,250				74,250
3. Water Pumps		13,000	12,000			25,000
4. Lab Equipment			475,000			475,000
5. Farm Supplies			140,000			140,000
6. Books			70,000			70,000
7. Transportation		320,000	100,000	150,000		570,000
8. Radio System		30,000				30,000
9. PDL (LC cost)		42,000	42,000	42,000	42,000	168,000
Sub-Total		479,250	1,389,000	192,000	42,000	2,102,250
<b>III. OTHER</b>						
1. Rehabilitation						
Farms		400,000				400,000
Houses	42,250	287,750				330,000
Makerere Univ.	2,200	272,800				275,000
2. Maintenance (TA housing)		25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	100,000
3. Research Grants		20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	80,000
Sub-Total	44,450	1,005,550	45,000	45,000	45,000	1,185,000
Sub-Total	211,895	4,581,048	3,308,875	1,578,923	656,938	10,337,680
Contingency @ 10%	21,190	458,105	330,888	157,892	65,694	1,033,768
Sub-Total	233,085	5,039,153	3,639,763	1,736,816	722,632	11,371,448
Inflation @ BZ Comp'ed	-	403,132	605,657	451,072	260,501	1,720,362
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>233,085</b>	<b>5,442,285</b>	<b>4,245,419</b>	<b>2,187,888</b>	<b>983,133</b>	<b>13,091,809</b>

Revised Implementation Schedule - (617-0103)

(Ref.: See Kampala 4525 - 12/17/84)

<u>Event</u>	<u>Approx. Date</u>	<u>Agent</u>
Project Authorization	July 1983	USAID/REDSO
Grant Agreement Signed	August 1983	USAID/GOU
PIO/T for Title XII Univ. issued	December 1983	AID/Washington
RFQ issued for Title XII Univ.	January 1984	AID/Washington
PIO/Ps prepared for 15 participants	March 1984	USAID/Uganda
PIO/T prepared to obtain services of U.S. PSA	March 1984	REDSO/ESA & USAID/U
TPs received in AID/Washington from Title XII Universities	April 1984	AID/Washington & Title XII Universities
Selection of PSA - Kenya	April 1984	REDSO/ESA
1st PIO/Cs prepared for 1st procurement in Kenya	April-December	USAID/U & REDSO/ESA
Selection of Title XII University	May 1984	AID/W, USAID/U MOAF & Makerere University
PIO/Cs for vehicles, farm equipment, 7 supplies prepared	May-July 1984	USAID/U, REDSO/ESA
PIO/Cs prepared for U.S. procurement	May-July 1984	USAID/U & REDSO/ESA
Rework materials list for renovation of TA housing & teaching & research facilities	August-Dec. 1984	USAID/U & Contractor
PIO/Cs for renovation supplies and materials for TA housing amended	August-Dec. 1984	USAID/U, RFMC & REDSO/ESA
Receipt of 1st shipment of renovation materials for TA houses & renovation of housing starts	September 1984	PSA, USAID/U MOA & Makerere & Contractor

14

<u>Event</u>	<u>Approx. Date</u>	<u>Agent</u>
OSU Administrative/ Supply Management Advisor arrives	September 1984	OSU, USAID/U
1st project vehicle procured	September 1984	USAID/U, OSU
2nd project vehicle procured	October 1984	USAID/U, OSU
Technical Assistance contract signed with OSU & made effective 9/1/84	October 1984	AID/W & OSU
Supply contract awarded for additional renovat- ion materials for TA housing	November 1984	USAID/U & REDSO/ESA
1st Rehabilitation Assistance (construction) for Serere arrives	November 1984	OSU, USAID/U, MOA
OSU Team leader arrives	December 1984	OSU, USAID/U,
PP amendment adding additional funds	January 1985	USAID/U,
2nd shipment of materials for TA housing renovation arrives	January 1985	USAID/U, OSU, REDSO/ESA & Contractor
Contracts awarded for Project vehicles	January 1985	REDSO, OSU, USAID/U
PIO/C to procure materials and supplies for renovat- ion of teaching & research facilities amended to incl- ude all materials and RFQs prepared	January 1985	USAID/U, OSU, REDSO/ESA
RFTP for U.S. PSA sent to 84 firms	January 1985	AID/W
PIO/C prepared to procure 2-way radios	January 1985	USAID/U
Supply contract issued to procure remaining materials to complete TA housing at Serere Agric. Research Inst.	January 1985	USAID, OSU, REDSO/ESA

5

<u>Event</u>	<u>Approx. Date</u>	<u>Agent</u>
Last 5 project pick-ups received	January 1985	USAID, OSU, MOA, Makerere
Pro Ag. amended adding additional funds	February 1985	GOU, USAID/U
Chief Research Advisor arrives	February 1985	OSU, USAID/U, MOA
1st 2 TA houses at Makerere renovated	February 1985	OSU, Contractor
PIO/Ts prepared to obtain services of contractor to rehabilitate classrooms and labs on Makerere University Campus	February 1985	USAID/U, OSU, REDSO/ESA
Remainder of materials to complete TA houses at Serere received	February 1985	MOA, USAID/U, Supplier, OSU
Contract signed with U.S. PSA	February 1985	AID/Washington
Remainder of project vehicles (trucks, buses, 4 x 4 station wagons, etc.) arrive	March-April 1985	MOA, Makerere, OSU, USAID, Suppliers
Rehabilitation Assistant (Mechanic) arrives for Kabanyola Farm	March 1985	OSU, USAID/U, Makerere
1st TA house at Serere completed	March 1985	OSU, MOA
1st shipment of materials to renovate teaching & research facilities received	March 1985	Supplier, OSU, MOA, Makerere, USAID/U
Last 3 TA houses at Makerere completed	March 1985	Contractor, OSU
Rehabilitation Assistant (construction) arrives for Kabanyola farm	March 1985	OSU, Makerere, USAID/U

<u>Event</u>	<u>Approx. Date</u>	<u>Agent</u>
<b>Procurement of commodities &amp; equipment in the U.S. begins</b>	March 1985	U.S. PSA
PIO/Ps prepared for 20 participants	March 1985	OSU, MOA, Makerere
Research Advisor for Serere arrives	April 1985	OSU, MOA, USAID/U
Contract awarded to building contractor to renovate classrooms and labs at Makerere campus	April 1985	REDSO/EASA, USAID/U
Farm Manager for Kabanyola arrives	April 1985	OSU, USAID/U, Makerere
Renovation starts on classrooms & Labs, etc. at Kabanyola Farm	April 1985	OSU, Makerere
Additional materials arrive for renovation of teaching & research facilities	May 1985	Supplier, OSU, MOA Makerere, USAID/U
Renovation starts on labs and other facilities at Serere	May 1985	OSU, MOA
2nd TA House completed at Serere	May 1985	OSU, MOA
Participants (15) from Serere & MOA depart for training	June 1985	OSU, MOA
Renovation Assistant (Mechanic) for Serere arrives	June 1985	OSU, MOA, USAID/U
Participants (15) from Makerere depart for training	June 1985	OSU, Makerere
Last TA houses at Serere completed	June 1985	OSU, MOA
30 participants return	September 1985	OSU, MOA, Makerere

17

<u>Event</u>	<u>Approx. Date</u>	<u>Agent</u>
PIO/Ps prepared for 25 participants	September 1985	OSU, MOA, Makerere
1st Seminar	October 1985	OSU, MOA, Makerere
Roof on Faculty of Agriculture building completed	December 1985	OSU, Makerere
Plumbing & Electrical systems at Serere rehabilitated and some building repairs completed	December 1985	OSU, MOA
PIO/Ps prepared for 29 participants	December 1985	OSU, MOA, Makerere
12 participants from MOA & 7 from Makerere depart for training	January 1986	OSU, MOA, Makerere
Farm & lab equipment, and supplies arrive from U.S.	January 1986	Makerere, U.S. PSA, OSU, MOA
Evaluation	March 1986	USAID/U, REDSO/ESA
19 participants return	March 1986	OSU, Makerere, MOA
Second Seminar	April 1986	OSU, MOA, Makerere
Renovation of Faculty of Agri. teaching and research facilities completed on campus	April 1986	OSU, Makerere, Contractor
Renovation of research & teaching facilities at Kabanyola farm completed	May 1986	OSU, Makerere
5 participants from Makerere and 1 from MOA depart for training	June 1986	OSU, Makerere, MOA
29 participants depart for training	June 1986	OSU, Makerere, MOA
Renovation at Serere Completed	June 1986	MOA, OSU

Rehabilitation Assistant

<u>Event</u>	<u>Approx. Date</u>	<u>Agent</u>
Rehabilitation Assistant (Construction) Serere departs	November 1986	OSU, USAID/U
Kabanyola Rehabilitation Assistants (Construction & Mechanic) depart	March 1987	OSU, USAID/U
Fourth Seminar	April 1987	OSU, Makerere, MOA
Rehabilitation Assistant (Mechanic) - Serere departs	June 1987	OSU, USAID/U
Administrative/Supply Management Advisor departs	September 1987	OSU, USAID/U
Fifth Seminar	October 1987	OSU, MOA, Makerere
Chief Research Advisor departs	February 1988	OSU, USAID/U
Kabanyola farm Manage- ment Advisor departs	April 1988	OSU, USAID/U
Sixth Seminar	April 1988	OSU, Makerere, MOA
Research Advisor - Serere departs	April 1988	OSU, USAID
Evaluation	July-August 1988	USAID/U, REDSO/ESA
Team Leader departs	September 1988	OSU, USAID/U

0943

# TELEGRAM

INDICATE  
 COLLECT  
 CHARGE TO

<p>E.O. 11652  <del>EXEMPT</del>                  TAGS:                  SUBJECT:                  ACTION:                  ACTION:                  DIST:                  USAID                  AMB                  DCM</p>	<p>FROM                  AMEMBASSY KAMPALA</p> <p>12356: N/A</p> <p>MANPOWER FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT NO. 617-0103                  (SECTION 116 (A) - HUMAN RIGHTS REVIEW)</p> <p>SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE</p> <p>UNCLASSIFIED KAMPALA <u>0943</u></p> <p>AIDAC</p> <p>FOR PPC/PDPR, ZAK AND AFR/PD, LOFGREN</p> <p>1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND BACKGROUND: THE GOAL OF THE SUBJECT PROJECT IS TO ASSIST THE GOU IN ITS RECOVERY PROGRAM TO STIMULATE SMALL FARMER FOOD CROP PRODUCTION. IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE THIS GOAL, THIS PROJECT FOCUSES SPECIFICALLY ON ONE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS TO IMPROVED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION -- MANPOWER; THUS, THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROJECT IS TO ASSIST THE GOU IN REHABILITATING RETRAINING AND REDIRECTING ITS AGRICULTURAL MANPOWER AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPABILITIES IN FOOD CROP PRODUCTION. SPECIFICALLY, THIS MEANS IMPROVED RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CAPABILITIES TO REACH SMALL FARMER HOUSEHOLDS IN THE PROJECT AREAS WITH INFORMATION ON IMPROVED FARMING TECHNIQUES AND RESOURCES. THIS BASIC PROJECT CONCEPT</p>	<p>CLASSIFICATION                  UNCLASSIFIED</p>	<p>7</p>
---	--	---	----------

<p>DRAFTED BY:                  A/PO:EBMCPHIE:RM <i>EBM</i></p>	<p>DRAFTING DATE                  3/20/85</p>	<p>TEL. EXT.</p>	<p>CONTENTS AND CLASSIFICATION APPROVED BY:                  IRVIN D. COKER, DIRECTOR</p>
---	---	------------------	---

CLEARANCES:

PDO:WMMCPHIE *A*

ADO:WFCOOK *WFC*

AZ:PSANDS *PS*

ALREADY HAS BEEN APPROVED; THE CURRENT SUPPLEMENT DOES NOT KALTER OR AMEND THIS ORIGINAL CONCEPT IN ANY WAY BUT MERELY ADDS SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO COVER THE FULL COSTS OF THE PROJECT'S TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND COMMODITY NEEDS.

2. NEED FOR THE PROJECT: SECTION 116(A) OF THE FAA PROHIBITS ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES DEEMED TO VIOLATE HUMAN RIGHTS EXCEPT WHERE QUOTE SUCH ASSISTANCE WILL DIRECTLY BENEFIT THE NEEDY PEOPLE IN SUCH COUNTRY UNQUOTE. AID POLICY DETERMINATION 12 ON HUMAN RIGHTS DEFINES THE NEEDY ON THE BASIS OF CERTAIN SUB-STANDARD FOOD CONSUMPTION, HEALTH AND EDUCATION INDICATORS. BY ALMOST ANY STANDARDS, UGANDA'S CITIZENS, PARTICULARLY THE 93 PERCENT LIVING IN <sup>RURAL</sup> ~~URBAN~~ AREAS, ARE NEEDY. ALTHOUGH COMPLETE AND ACCURATE DATA IS VERY SCARCE, WHAT INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE INDICATES WIDESPREAD POVERTY AND LACK OF ACCESS TO EVEN THE MOST BASIC SOCIAL SERVICES; OBSERVATION CONFIRMS WHAT LIMITED DATA INDICATES. EFFORTS THAT ATTEMPT TO ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF AGRICULTURAL REHABILITATION INEVITABLY ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF MANY OF UGANDA'S POOREST AND NEEDIEST. OVER 90 PERCENT OF UGANDA'S POPULATION DERIVES ITS PRIMARY INCOME FROM AGRICULTURE; FURTHERMORE, BETWEEN THE EARLY 1970S AND THE EARLY 1980S, TOTAL AGRICULTURAL

21

PRODUCTION IS ESTIMATED TO HAVE DROPPED BY 15-20 PERCENT, WHILE THE POPULATION GROWTH RATE HAS RISEN TO 3.2 PERCENT NATIONWIDE. THUS, THERE ARE MORE UGANDANS TO FEED AND LESS TO FEED THEM WITH AS A RESULT OF EVENTS IN THE PAST DECADE.

MANY CONSTRAINTS TO A RESUMPTION OF FULL AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION HAVE BEEN OUTLINED IN VARIOUS DOCUMENTS RESULTING FROM FIELD STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN UGANDA. ONE OF THE MAJOR BOTTLENECKS IS LACK OF FARMER ACCESS TO FARM INPUTS; ~~EXTRA~~ CRITICAL AMONG THESE IS INFORMATION, TECHNIQUES AND TECHNOLOGY NECESSARY TO INCREASE PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY. FOR YEARS NOW, SMALL FARM HOUSEHOLDS IN UGANDA HAVE FARMED WITHOUT ADEQUATE ACCESS TO THE MAIN SOURCE OF SUCH INPUTS, I.E., RESEARCH RESULTS AND EXTENSION SERVICES. CROP DISEASES, FARMING INNOVATIONS, NEW TECHNOLOGIES ALL NEED TO BE INVESTIGATED AND APPROPRIATE SOLUTIONS PASSED ON TO THE SMALL FARMERS OF UGANDA IF INCREASES IN PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY ARE TO BE REALIZED.

3. PROJECT APPROACH: THE SUBJECT PROJECT IS ADDRESSING THESE VERY RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CONSTRAINTS IN THE PROJECT AREA. AS A RESULT OF REVITALIZED RESEARCH AND THE PROJECT EXPECTS TO DIRECTLY BENEFIT FARM HOUSEHOLDS IN EXTENSION WORK, /THE PROJECT AREA (WHICH REPRESENTS APPROXIMATELY 16% OF THE TOTAL POPULATION) BY INCREASING

THEIR ACCESS TO APPROPRIATE, EFFECTIVE INFORMATION THAT WILL INCREASE FARM PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY WITHIN THE PROJECT AREA DURING THE LIFE OF PROJECT. OVER TIME (I.E., BEYOND THE LIFE OF PROJECT), MANY OF THESE ANTICIPATED BENEFITS ARE EXPECTED TO HAVE AN EVEN WIDER IMPACT ON FAR MORE OF THE COUNTRY'S SMALL FARM HOUSEHOLDS, AS RESEARCH RESULTS SPREAD BEYOND PROJECT BOUNDARIES AND AS FARMERS AND EXTENSION AGENTS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE COUNTRY PERCEIVE THE ECONOMIC GROWTH POTENTIAL RESULTING FROM UGANDA'S RENEWED AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CAPABILITIES NATIONWIDE.

4. IMPACT: THE MOST IMMEDIATE PROJECT IMPACT ON SMALL FARMERS IN THE PROJECT AREAS WILL BE IMPROVED CROP PRODUCTION AND PRODUCTIVITY; HOWEVER, THESE BENEFITS WILL QUICKLY TRANSLATE INTO ADDITIONAL INCOME (FROM INCREASED SALES OF FARM PRODUCTION) AND IMPROVED NUTRITION (FROM DOMESTIC CONSUMPTION OF INCREASED YIELDS) AND BEYOND TO IMPROVED FAMILY WELL-BEING (AS INCREASED INCOME ENABLES FAMILIES TO BUY BETTER HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL SERVICES, BETTER FAMILY SHELTER, ETC.). ALTHOUGH THESE ANTICIPATED BENEFITS ARE EXTREMELY DIFFICULT TO QUANTIFY GIVEN THE LACK OF AVAILABLE DATA, ANY IMPROVEMENTS IN FARM PRODUCTION

**AND PRODUCTIVITY WILL ALMOST NECESSARILY IMPROVE  
THE LIVES OF THESE POOR FARM FAMILIES.**

**DAVIS**

*John Davis*

*24*

## AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

## ADVICE OF PROGRAM CHANGE

Country: Uganda

Project Title: Manpower for Agricultural Development

Project Number: 617-0103

FY 1985 CP Reference:

Appropriation Category: Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition

Life-of-Project Funding: \$13,091,809

Intended FY 1985 Obligation:

This is to advise that AID intends to increase the life of project funding of the subject project from U.S.\$9,500,000 originally approved in August, 1983, to U.S.\$13,091,809 an increase of U.S.\$3,591,809.

This increase in total project funding is required for several reasons: (1) the technical assistance contract signed on October 22, 1984 with Ohio State University is for U.S.\$6.891 million whereas only U.S.\$2.417 million plus an add-on of U.S.\$500,000 and U.S.\$1.048 million for participant training were budgeted in the original project design, a difference of U.S.\$2.717 million; (2) recent price inflation in Uganda has caused increases in project commodity and other costs over those budgeted in the original design; (3) inadequate engineering estimates in the original design have been found in initial implementation, requiring increases in certain commodity categories; and (4) 25 percent danger pay was approved effective December 9, 1984 for employees serving in Uganda, requiring an additional U.S.\$266,477 be added to the Ohio State contract to cover the provision of danger pay over the life of the project.

The nature, purpose and goal of the project all remain unchanged and valuable to Ugandan agricultural development. In addition, the life of project funding period and the project completion date remain the same.

Purpose: To assist the Government of Uganda to rehabilitate, retrain and redirect its agricultural manpower and institutional capability in food crops production.

Background and Progress to Date: The original project was authorized in August, 1983. Throughout FY 1984, the initiation of implementation was slower than expected due to several factors, primarily concerning initial procurement actions for both commodities and technical assistance. Despite these initial problems, by early FY 1985, implementation progress began to increase, and the project is now moving forward on a revised schedule according to plan.

Project Description: The intent of this project is to restore the agricultural research capability of Uganda for food crops. This will be achieved through a combination of (1) physical renovation of agricultural research facilities (at the Serere Research Station in eastern Uganda and at Makerere University's Kabanyolo Farm north of Kampala), (2) technical assistance in the form of four expatriate agricultural experts to initiate agricultural research activities, (3) training of Ugandans to eventually take over and carry on with the research work of the technical assistance team and (4) reequipping of research facilities. These inputs will result in retrained staff, rehabilitated and reequipped research, teaching and office facilities, and a joint research coordination system which establishes research priorities and is linked to extension. At the present stage of implementation, renovation and procurement have begun, the technical assistance team has begun to arrive and take action and trainees are being selected and processed.

Relationship of Project to AID country Strategy: The AID strategy in Uganda is to provide incremental financial resources to the available human and natural resources which will yield steady, long-term growth. This project, in assisting to restore the capabilities of a number of Ugandan agricultural institutions to develop and improve agricultural skills and methodology, will contribute to the achievement of the overall AID strategy by helping to rebuild the country's agricultural sector, the backbone and engine of growth of the national economy.

Beneficiaries: The most immediate beneficiaries of this project will be the agricultural research community who will be involved with the training, technical assistance, renovation and reequipping activities. However, the ultimate and major beneficiaries are the small farmers who will have access to new information and improved technologies on more productive agricultural methods and resources as a result of project research, consequently will be better able to improve their farm production, therefore incomes and standards of living. In the longer run, the larger Ugandan population will also benefit from increased availability of agricultural products.

25

Host Country and Other Donors: The Government of Uganda considers agricultural rehabilitation to be essential to its overall economic recovery and growth. In June 1983, the Government, in its Recovery Program, emphasized the need for agricultural research in an effort to revitalize the agricultural sector. In support of this, the GOU will contribute the equivalent of over \$3 million to this project. Other donors have not as yet become involved in rehabilitation of agricultural research; however, the World Bank, in collaboration with IFAD and IDA, is assisting the GOU with general agricultural rehabilitation (e.g., provision of basic farm implements) in a similar project area to the Manpower project, thus complementing and supporting the efforts of this project.

Major Outputs:

Magnitude:

Nature of Output Retrained staff	87
Research stations rehabilitated and reequipped	2
Research priorities established	1 system
Joint research coordina- tion system	1 system
Research linked with extension	5 cross trained extensionists
Faculty of Agriculture reequipped	2 locations
Ministry of Agriculture reequipped	1 location

AID Financed Inputs:

Technical Expertise  
Training  
Equipment  
Operating Costs  
Research Grants

26

DRAFT AUTHORIZATION AMENDMENT

Country: Uganda  
Name of Project: Manpower for Agricultural Development  
Project Number: 617-0103  
Amendment Number: 2

1. Pursuant to Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, the Manpower for Agricultural Development Project for Uganda was authorized on August 26, 1983. That authorization was initially amended on February 21, 1984, and is hereby further amended now to increase the life of project funding by \$3,600,000. Accordingly, paragraph 1 of Amendment No. 1 to the authorization is amended by changing in the first sentence thereof the amount "\$9,500,000" to "\$13,100,000".

2. The authorization cited above remains in full force except as hereby amended.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of  
authorizing Officer

Date: \_\_\_\_\_