PD-ACB-900

TAB FY 76-77 PROGRAM SUBMISSION

OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Narrative Set

June 26, 1975

TAB FY 76-77 PROGRAM SUBMISSION

OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

Narrative Set

June 26, 1975

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BUREAU

OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM SUBMISSION

FY 76-77

	Narrative Page	Tab Page
Part I. Narrative Set		
A. Office Summary		
1. Focus and Character of Program	1	1-2
2. Manpower Considerations	4	
3. KPA and Activity Priorities	5	1
4. Other Main Office Tasks	7	
5. Current Office Workload	10	
B. Key Problem Area Summary		
1. Agricultural Management (KPA #6)	11	4
2. Selected Development Problems (KPA #24)	14	5
a. Project Management	14	17-18, 20-22
b. Institution Building and TA Methodology	17	19
C. Project Narratives		
1. Project Identification Documents		
New Projects		
a. Appraising Health Management Systems (KPA #12)	20	3
b. Training Materials in Health Management (KPA #12)	25	3
c. Project Management (KPA #24)	31	20-22
d. Commodity Action Systems (KPA #6)	38	15
e. Agricultural Implementation (KPA #6)	44	14

	Narrative Page	Tab Page
2. Summary Progress Statements		
Ongoing Projects		
a. Local Action Guidance and Implementation (KPA #6)	51	9-13
b. Agricultural Management--Commodity Systems (KPA #6)	55	6, 8
c. Agricultural Management--Ag. Sector Implementation (KPA #6)	59	6, 7
d. Multisector Project and Program Management (KPA #24)	63	17, 18
e. MUCIA 211(d) (KPA #24)	66	19
f. Agricultural Information and Related Activities	86	
D. Small Activity Requirements for TA/DA Program FY 1976, Interim Quarter and FY 1977	94	13

Part II. Tabular Set

A. Office Summary	1
B. Key Problem Area Summaries	3
C. Project Data Sheets	6

TA/DA FY 76/77 PROGRAM SUBMISSION

A. Office Summary

This submission covers the current TA/DA program and projected extension/revision of on-going activities, all of which have been approved in prior-year program submissions. It also provides for an expanded TA/DA program pursuant to recommendations of the Work Group on Management Improvement and Development Administration. The latter will consist of an expanded field support function and a central R&D effort complementary to expanded analysis, research and testing of methodology regarding sectoral management problems to be undertaken by the Regional Bureaus.

1. Focus and Character of Program

The TA/DA program seeks to foster the use of sound organization and management in major areas of development action. It does this primarily by sponsoring a small and highly selective portfolio of projects to generate and promote utilization of new knowledge about the management and local action dimensions of development. The work is presently concentrated in the food and nutrition development sector (KPA #6). Work will be expanded in the Health and Population Planning Sector (KPA #12) and in Selected Development Problem Areas (KPA #24) during FY 76-77 if office funding and staffing levels permit.

The existing and proposed program addresses the Congressional Mandate and special Agency concerns both directly and indirectly. The Local Action project activity is aimed at improving the ability of AID and AID-supported LDC agencies and institutions to design and implement projects which involve and benefit the rural poor

and women directly. The Agricultural Management, Health Management, Commodity Systems and Multisector Project Management activities address these areas less directly. They seek to increase the ability of LDC governments and private agencies to effectively manage and implement sectoral development programs and projects which stimulate agricultural production or improve the delivery of health and other services to the poor majority. Additional work undertaken pursuant to the recommendations of the management work group will have the same characteristics.

Since our total program is small we try to broaden its impact by working collaboratively with selected LDC regional (multi-national) and national research and training institutes. By selective resource inputs, we seek to strengthen and in some cases re-direct their capacities and outputs towards the above purposes. This approach permits a considerable multiplier effect and considerably increases the potential return to our human and dollar resource inputs. It also increases direct and substantive involvement of LDC institutions in the R&D program and helps get results into the hands of LDC decision-makers more quickly. However, this approach also increases and complicates the managerial task and heightens the risk that outputs will be less directly targeted on key Congressional and Agency concerns and interests.

With the exception of work in the Health Management field, all of our present program activity has been under way for some

time and is shifting from a predominantly R&D focus to a predominantly response capability/field utilization focus. The results of R&D work in the Local Action, Commodity Systems, Agriculture Plan Implementation and Multisector Project Management areas is being disseminated to the field Missions and LDC institutions in increasing quantity and is currently being tied-in to Mission and Regional Bureau funded programs as follows:

A. Tie-in Established:

Country	Mission Program/Project
Paraguay	Cooperatives
Lesotho	Rural development project
Kenya	Rural Development project
Peru	Rural community development loan
Bolivia	National Community Development Service
Costa Rica	Agricultural development
Nicaragua	" "
Guatemala	" "
Panama	" "
Ghana	Agricultural Management
Nigeria	Agr. Econ. & Marketing
Africa/CWR	Project Management Training
LA Regional	LA Agricultural Management
Africa Regional	Regional organizations development

B. Inquiries Received

Country	Mission Program/Project
Panama	Integrated Rural Development/ Rural Municipalities Loan
Peru	Industrial Bank Loan
Bolivia	National Community Development Service Loan (2nd phase)
Ghana	Small Farmer Project Design
Zaire	Regional Rural Development
Philippines	Agr. Services and Prov. Dev.
Indonesia	Area Agr. Resources Assessment
Kenya	Agr. Planning and Management

The result is an increasing office support role to regional bureaus and field missions; coupled with an increased managerial requirement. This support role currently exceeds our response capability considerably and we are greatly concerned about our ability to do the program work necessary to keep our projects moving on schedule and on target and at the same time adequately relate to field missions and evaluate R&D product utility and contractor performance.

2. Manpower Considerations

At present staffing levels, we estimate 60 percent of staff time is devoted to managing our R&D program, 25 percent to general administration, and 15 percent to regional bureau and field mission support. The latter figure refers only to support requested by Bureaus and Missions which is not directly related

to our R&D program. As noted, our R&D program is becoming increasingly directed to field applications, which can also be classified as field support. Most of our current non R&D project related field support is provided through use of consultants and RSSA staff.

We presently have available an annual total of 840 mandays of direct hire professional staff.* We estimate 1,090 mandays will be required to properly manage our existing R&D program, exclusive of other Office responsibilities. Therefore, the initiation of work in the health management field and moving back to an active work program in multisector management in FY 76, as well as the undertaking of the expanded R&D and Regional Bureau/Field Mission support role envisaged for TA/DA in the Management and Development Administration Work Group Report, is contingent on expansion of existing office staff from 7 to 10 (7 professional/3 secretarial) exclusive of the transfer of 3 existing spaces to TA/RD.

3. KPA and Activity Priorities

Our first priority is the KPA #6 work in Agricultural Management. Of the three major activities within this KPA, we exclude the Local Action Project from Office priority considerations because it is being transferred to TA/RD. Of the remaining two,

*Figured on an average of 20 workdays per month and 10 1/2 work months per year. Actual staff days worked currently exceed these figures.

we rank the commodity systems work as number one and Agricultural Plan Implementation number two. The basis for this ranking is the fact that the commodity systems work is farthest advanced and has, we believe, the greatest immediate development pay-off potential in the high priority areas of increased agricultural production and distribution. Also we know of no other comparable work in the subject area which is directly available to the AID Missions and LDCs. Among the other two KPA's, we would place greatest priority on getting started in the KPA #12 Health Management work in view of the pay-off potential for the overall AID program in a key development priority sector into which considerable AID development appropriations will be flowing. Of the two projects planned in the Health Management KPA, highest priority would go to developing diagnostic capability.

If necessary, we would probably reduce or defer additional effort on the Multisector Management project in favor of concentration on continuing to introduce work already done into current areas of sectoral concentration, starting new efforts in the health sector and following up on other Management Work Group recommendations if approved by the R&DC and the Deputy Administrator. We believe, however, that provision of adequate resources for further development, utilization and networking efforts under the new Multisector project would have high payoff. Several regional institutions are ready to move forward with modest assistance, and networking possibilities are excellent.

Thus the trade-off between fulfilling our previously programmed intention of moving into a new sector (Health) versus taking advantage of the existing opportunity to significantly increase the utilization of past work in the project management area is very real.

We are not at this time recommending any new KPA's.

4. Other Main Office Tasks .

As previously indicated, at our present personnel level we can do little more than manage our existing R&D Program, which means insuring the production and utilization of outputs in order to insure adequate return on prior year investments. Other urgent tasks are as follows in order of priority, although in some cases inter-relatedness makes prioritizing difficult. All of these tasks are closely related to the findings and recommendations of the Work Group:

a. Office and Agency staff development. TA/DA is charged with leadership in improving the quality of the Agency's work in development administration. This will require recruitment of able people and continuous sharpening of professional skills through training and interaction with field programs. We are blessed with a secretarial staff of unusual professional development potential. It is in the Agency's and their own interest that they have access to professional advancement training opportunities.

Similarly, contributions are needed to professional expertise in development administration in the Agency at large. Unless action is taken on this front, the increased attention to management aspects of development assistance called for in the Work Group recommendations will be circumscribed by the limited professional talent available and limited knowledge of needs and what to do about them in a program context by non-specialists within the Agency. Hence, TA/DA should contribute substantially to Regional Bureau and SER efforts in staff development.

b. Build-up of professional relations with outside experts and within the agency--including continued expansion of response capability in the form of "on-the-shelf" contractor and consultant expertise. This task inter-relates with a number of others including the immediately preceeding one. Much greater professional interchange within the Agency and between the Agency and the outside professional community is needed. TA/DA is the logical center for this. The contacts made by the Work Group with other donors and other sources of expertise on the management dimensions of development assistance should be followed up on and a continuing information exchange maintained.

c. Considerable staff work will be required in support of Agency implementation of Work Group recommendations, e.g., the preparation of an expanded statement on managerial considerations in project development for the project assistance handbook; building planning and management considerations into technological

research programs as requested by Mr. Parker; setting up a process for insuring that management considerations are taken into better account in the program and project development and review process, etc.

d. TA/DA should, in collaboration with the Regional Bureaus, increase its efforts to promote inter-regional R&D and operating experience interchange through staff visits to field projects and regional and national centers for administration and management and through increased participation in local and regional workshops and seminars (which will also promote internal staff development).

e. Concurrent with 5 above we need to increase USAID awareness and utilization of R&D results through increased technical assistance to USAIDs and LDC agencies in program/project design and evaluation work. This will require more frequent and longer TDYs and greater between-visit communication with USAIDs and other LDC contacts than we have been able to mount or sustain to date.

5. CURRENT OFFICE WORKLOAD

Position	Duties: Normal	Duties: Interim
1. Office Director (Vacant)	Overall office & program mgt. Agency tech. leadership & external representation in Dev. Admin. field Field support Ag. Mgt. KPA Manager	
2. Int'l Rel. Officer (French)	Local Action Project Mgr. WGRP member Field support particularly in rural dev. and agrarian reform Administrative duties	Act'g Office Director Ag. Mgt. KPA Mgr.
3. " " " (Kornher)	Multisector Project Mgr. Staff Director Work Group on TA in Mgt. MUCIA 211(d) Grant Mgr. Field Support Administrative Duties	Health Sector Projects Mgr.
4. Int'l. Coop. Spec.	Agric. Plan Implementation Project Mgr. General Program Support Administrative Duties	Commodity Action Systems Project Mgr.
5. " " " (Chapman)	Ass't. Local Action Project Mgr.. Program Dev. work on Role of Women Field Support particularly in local government admin. General Program Support; Admin. Duties	Local Action Project Mgr.

NOTE: All officers are expected to seek to keep abreast of professional activities in their field by perusing current literature, maintaining correspondence with peers, and attending seminars and workshops as workload permits. Office workload for non-TA/DA program and project analysis and review including analysis of research proposals is shared on basis of demand and particular individual competencies weighed against individual workloads at any given time.

B. Key Problem Area Summary

1. Agricultural Management KPA #6

This KPA is an amalgamation of two previously discrete KPA's. The original Agr. Mgt. KPA addressed the deficiency (problem) in LDC capacity to manage agricultural programs. The original and current goal of the activities mounted under the original KPA is to improve the capacity of LDC agricultural institutions to organize and manage agricultural development. The primary means for accomplishing this goal has been to increase the capacity of U.S. and LDC educational, training and research institutions (primarily agricultural schools and business schools with an agri-business interest) to analyze, teach, train, and consult with regard to agricultural program management.

The only major change in the KPA Program came when the previously discrete Local Action KPA (also managed by TA/DA) and the USDA information response capability RSSA (managed by TA/AGR) were incorporated into it in the aftermath of the FY 74 FAA reorganization of AID program categories. These latter two program activities are aimed generally at the same goal but take somewhat different approaches to its accomplishment. The Local Action activity is aimed at improving the use of development resources in LDCs by increasing small farmer involvement in agricultural development projects. The method for accomplishing this is improved project design and implementation. The USDA PASA is a field service mechanism for providing a variety of agricultural, information, extension and related publication services to support AID-sponsored agricultural programs.

These various activities are basically complementary to one another while employing different means to achieve essentially the same ends. They have an increasing potential (which needs to be more fully exploited) to be mutually supportive of each other and of other Agency activities as well; particularly since another effect of the KPA amalgamation has been to give it a greater focus on the small farmer and his relationship to the activities of government officials and the private sectors. An example of the mutual reinforcement possible is the current need in the Agricultural Sector Implementation (ASIP) Project for first hand field research material to supplement their heavy reliance on secondary sources for training material preparation. The local action project has just completed a comparative project analysis based on extensive field data collection and focused on small farmer development. The results of which can be fed directly into training programs of ASIP and collaborating regional and local institutions. These in turn can be directly related to AID/host country small farmer development projects through the priority given to the location and selection of attendees at training programs and the phasing of this activity with development of USAID-assisted country projects. The Local Action and Commodity Action System work also relate very heavily to efforts to exploit technological opportunities.

An important element of the KPA program is the tie-in to other institutions and to ongoing mission supported programs. Links with and support to/from Missions and Regional Bureaus have been fairly extensive, particularly in the study and data gathering

phases of the Local Action Project. The commodity systems studies have been done in collaboration with regionally based institutions and their numerous clientele organizations. The Agricultural Sector Implementation Project is now moving into its in-country phase and has received expressions of interest from several countries.

Coordination with TA/AGR has been strengthened particularly to avoid duplication of small farmer and sector analysis project activities. Outside links include collaborative and coordinative relationships with FAO, the U.N., IBRD, IDB, CABEI, LAAD, and numerous other development organizations and programs.

Substantial progress has been made towards the KPA purpose, but findings are generally just becoming available and still need to be tested further and disseminated more widely. The goal of more effective use of development resources remains to be accomplished and will be contingent on USAID, other donor, private agency and host country acceptance and utilization of the knowledge and guidance developed, as well as resources and manpower available for field support follow-up. If efforts are sufficiently coordinated and concentrated, the problem can be significantly alleviated in priority countries, however, the need is too vast and widespread to be affected on a broad scale without a much larger effort than current resources permit.

2. Selected Development Problems (KPA 24)

a. Project Management

Project Management is a new KPA #24 project scheduled for initial obligations in FY 76. This project provides one significant means of addressing the Key Problem of lack of LDC managerial capacity for programmatic action in the priority development sectors. Project management was listed for continuing Agency attention as a sub-element of this key problem area in the Agency's 1971 review of key problems in development administration.

Subsequent analysis and reviews have confirmed the importance of LDC skills development in this field. In 1973 an AID/W Review Panel recommended that the predecessor project, Modernizing Management for Development, focus predominantly on project management training through regional institutions. The panel found that "the identification, implementation and evaluation of projects ranks very high among the managerial needs of LDCs that might effectively be addressed by project outputs." The Hall Work Group on Technical Assistance in Management also confirmed this judgment.

The previous project developed and tested management methodology and training materials for use by LDC training institutions. As recommended, beginning in 1974, the outputs were focused on project management skills development. The project produced six sets of training materials in project management, a directory of U.S. resources

and a review of U.S. materials appropriate for adaptation and use by LDC institutions. Contacts were established with several regional management training institutions and methodology and materials successfully field tested. The largest utilization effort was a $120,000 FY 74 grant to the Inter-American School of Public Administration (EIAP) in Rio de Janeiro. The grant is funding adaptation and utilization of project outputs in EIAP courses which serve numerous Latin countries. The grant is also funding development of methodology and a training effort focused on management of potable water projects, a current high priority need with substantial health benefits to urban peoples of Latin America.

Contacts with multilateral and LDC institutions have confirmed high demand for indigenous project preparation and management skills. It was also found that institutions working in this field would welcome expanded collaboration and professional exchange. Networking possibilities are excellent, both for a multisector training network, and for sector-specific networking, e.g., in health or agricultural project management.

Project Management is a new three-year project which will fund (1) adaptation and use of products of the predecessor project, principally by grants to regional centers; (2) development of methodology for project management in the context of programs to benefit the poor majority (drawing, for example, on the results of our Local Action research and the Latin American Bureau's sector loan experience), (3) provide services to USAIDs that have closely related projects or activities; and (4) promote professional exchange through a network of collaborating institutions.

Collaborators in activities of the previous project included the Pan African Institute for Development (PAID), the African Centre for Research and Training in Administration for Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American School of Public Administration, the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank, the Pan American Health Organization, and the East-West Center. Workshops and professional exchange will continue under the new project. Related USAID projects include rural and municipal sector loans, project management training in Nigeria and at PAID, various activities in the Philippines, and the new agricultural management project in Ghana.

FY 1976 grants are planned for the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences (in cooperation with LA/DR); the Pan African Institute for Development; (in cooperation with AFR/CWR) and the Asian Institute of Management (in cooperation with RED and USADB).

b. Institution Building and Technical Assistance Methodology

KPA 24 includes work on institution building (IB) and technical assistance (TA) methodology. The purpose of this work is to build U.S. capacity to develop and apply knowledge and techniques which improve the effectiveness and usefulness of IB and TA methodology for the benefit of developing countries.

In 1971, a $1 million, 5-year 211(d) grant was given to the Mid-Western Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA) for a Program of Advanced Study in Institution Development and Technical Assistance Methodology (PASITAM). This grant arose from prior Agency interest and research and development investment in "institution building" -- the process of developing or reconstituting organizations to plan and implement innovative economic and social change. It was also intended to build MUCIA capacity in TA methodology. Both methodologies are critical to the development process from AID's viewpoint. Grant outputs are: research and development products; MUCIA staff, course, and curricula development; training; documentation center services; MUCIA/LDC collaboration; and services to LDCs, AID, and other international assistance organizations which arise from increased capacity.

Grant activities are behind schedule. After four years, 1/3 of the funds remain uncommitted, and accomplishments lag proportionately.

Positive accomplishments and utilization are evident in some areas, and the "key problem" nature of this activity remains valid.

However, grant activities and outputs will require continuing appraisal, guidance, and interaction by AID management to assure that the sunk costs have corresponding benefits in the remaining period of the grant and afterward.

Linkages within AID have included the Manpower Development Division, TA/OST, ASIA/TECH, and PPC/PDME, as well as TA/Methodology Division. Principal external linkages included the American Institute for Free Labor Development, the Asian Centre for Development Administration, and documentary services to numerous international development organizations.

Total efforts under the grant, assuming rapid progress will make a significant impact on available U.S. capacity in institution building, and a useful, though lesser, impact on technical assistance methodology. The magnitude of the LDC institutional problem is such that the total effort cannot be expected to alleviate the overall problem significantly. Over the long run, however, dissemination and use of the institution building and methodological outputs through international organizations and country-level institutions may have a substantial effect.

Page

C. Project Narratives

1. Project Identification Documents

a. Appraising Health Management Systems (KPA #12)

b. Training Materials in Health Management (KPA #12)

c. Multisector Management (KPA #24)

d. Commodity Action Systems (KPA #6)

e. Agricultural Implementation (KPA #6)

Agency for International Development
Project Identification Document Face Sheet
Part I to be completed by originating Office

Transaction Code
Add ☐ Delete ☐ Change

1. Country/Regional Entity/Recipient
Interregional--GTS--KPA #12

2. Document #1 -- PID
Status: New ☐ Revision # _____
Proposed Next Document:
PP
Proposed Date of Submission:
September, 1975

3. Project Number

4. Bureau: TAB Code: 6

5. Project Title
A. Appraising Health Management Systems
B.

Contractor: N/A
Project Manager: TA/DA,

6. Estimated Initial/Final Obligation
FY 76 FY 77

7. Estimated Cost (Life of Project)
($000 or equivalent. $1= _____)
AID Approp. 278
Other U.S. _____
Total U.S. 278
Host Govt. _____
Other Donor(s) _____
Total 278

8. Purpose Code
Category Code _____

9. Special Concerns Codes

10. AID Appropriated Funds ($000)

Funding Source	Tech. Code	1st Year Grant	1st Year Loan	All Years Grant	All Years Loan
GTS Contract (FY 77: 131)		147		278	
Total		147		278	

11. Other U.S.

	1st Yr	All Yr
Total		

12. Project Goal

To improve the sectoral management capacity so that good health service is available to the majority of the population.

13. Project Purpose(s)

To develop a methodology capable of being adapted to various LDC conditions which will enable LDC health planners and administrators to appraise, evaluate, and improve the management of their health sector.

14. Planning Resource Requirements (Staff/Funds)
1 Direct hire
2 MM, AID consultant $6,000

15. Originating Office Clearance
Signature: _____
Title & Date: Acting Director, TA/DA

Date Received in AID/W or for AID/W Documents; date of Distribution: _____

Project Identification Document

Appraising Health Management Systems

The Problem

The health sector analyses conducted by AID are confirming that there is a critical lack of information about the effectiveness of health management systems in LDCs. There is at present no reliable tool that can be used to provide health planners and administrators knowledge on how well their management practices are working or where improvement is needed. The problem then, is how to appraise the strength and weaknesses of these management systems in a way related to the overall health sector. The problem concerns the interrelations among health organizations as well as the internal systems within each organization. A methodology is needed to do this in the context of the LDCs and the AID approach to sectoral analysis and plans.

This project fits into the overall KPA goals of improving sectoral management capacity and closing the plan-performance gap in the health sector. It also is in accordance with the findings of the Hall Work Group which has recommended significantly increased emphasis on management problems in AID projects.

Project Purpose

Development of a methodology for analysis of health management systems will improve the "actionability" of the health system by increasing the capacity of system managers to assess the situation accurately, implement plans and programs, reduce costs, and expand coverage. The purpose is to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of management systems, the "infrastructure" of the sector, so that good

health service is available to the majority of the population.

Outputs

The end product of the project will be a methodology to appraise the strengths and weaknesses of management systems in health organizations and programs in LDCs.

Technical Resources

To develop this methodology it is estimated that twenty man-months of professional work will be needed. The work will require expertise in planning, programming, policy formulation, health statistics systems, management information systems, evaluation systems, accounting, auditing, organizational structure, facility maintenance, and supply and equipment management.

The proposed duration of the project is twenty-four months with all of the funds being committed in FY 76.

Assumptions

The major assumptions on which the success of this projects rests are:

1. That there are sufficient data and techniques available to make the results significant.
2. That interested agencies, governments, and institutions will utilize the methodology produced.
3. That the resultant methodology will contribute to better health services for the poor in LDCs.

Alternatives

The first alternative considered was to observe the efforts of others in the field and attempt to derive a methodology from that. This method, however, would be too slow and would not provide complete coverage of health management systems. The second alternative was to simply conduct a literature search and distill a methodology from previous work. After a bibliographical search, however, it was determined that the literature is not adequate to support such an undertaking. The present project will include both of the above alternatives within its design, but will go beyond them to examine health management systems thoroughly and produce a methodology which is health specific.

Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of this methodology will be health planners and managers in LDCs who will use it to develop and manage health projects more effectively. The indirect beneficiaries will be the whole population which will receive improved health care as a result of the advances made possible by use of this methodology.

Spread Effects

This methodology should be applicable to all LDCs and it is hoped that it will be widely utilized. The techniques developed will be replicable.

Financial Requirements and Plans

The estimated cost of this project is about $278,000. This will be in the form of a GTS contract with a U.S. institution. The budget breakdown is as follows:

Category	FY 76 Amount ($000)	MM	FY 77 ($000)	MM
Personnel Service	60	20	55	18
Overhead	42		39	
Travel & Per Diem	8		12	
Workshops	25		10	
Case Studies			15	
Publication & Translation	12			
Total: $278,000	147	20	131	18

Development of the Project

The basic outline of this project was first proposed to TA/DA by Mr. William Worcester and Dr. Joe Davis of TA/H. Taking this suggestion and building on it, an AID consultant conducted studies to determine the feasibility of developing such a methodology for health management. Based on a literature search and interviews with experts in the field he has found that there is a great need for the proposed methodology. Dr. John Daly, HEW Sector Analysis, has reviewed the project and his comments have been incorporated into its design. These sources will continue to be drawn upon in further development of the project. Additional work must be done to produce a more detailed technical statement concerning the kind of end-product that is desired and the methods and potential resources to be used in the project. It is estimated that this will require two more months of consultant's time.

As now planned, the PP will be submitted in FY 76. This is dependent, however, on the TA/DA office receiving a direct hire specialist in this field to prepare the final version of the PP and then manage the project.

Agency for International Development
Project Identification Document Face Sheet
Part I to be completed by originating Office

Transaction Code
Add ☐ Delete ☐ Change

1. Country/Regional Entity/Recipient
Interregional-- GTS--KPA #12

2. Document #1 -- PID
Status: New ☒ Revision # _____
Proposed Next Document:
PP
Proposed Date of Submission:
September, 1975

3. Project Number

4. Bureau TAB Code 6

5. Project Title
A. Training Materials in Health Management
B.

Contractor: Getulio Vargas Foundation
Project Manager: TA/DA

6. Estimated Initial/Final Obligation
FY 76 FY 78

7. Estimated Cost (Life of Project)
($000 or equivalent. $1 = _____)
AID Approp. 273.5
Other U.S. _____
Total U.S. 273.5
Host Govt. 150.0
Other Donor(s) 423.5
Total _____

8. Purpose Code
Category Code _____

9. Special Concerns Codes

10. AID Appropriated Funds ($000)

Funding Source	Tech. Code	1st Year Grant	1st Year Loan	All Years Grant	All Years Loan
GTS Grant		84.0		273.5	
(FY 77: 100)					
Total		84.0		273.5	

11. Other U.S.

	1st Yr	All Yr
Total		

12. Project Goal

To improve the sectoral management capacity so that good health service is available to the majority of the population.

13. Project Purpose(s)

To develop a network of regional training institutions, offering courses for top-level staff in systems approaches to managing the health sector and its major management systems.

Countries involved: LA Regional; Africa; and Asia regions

14. Planning Resource Requirements (Staff/Funds)
1 Direct hire
2 MM, AID consultant $6,000

15. Originating Office Clearance
Signature: _____
Title & Date: Acting Director, TA/DA

Date Received in AID/W or for AID/W Documents; date of Distribution:

Project Identification Document

Training Materials in Health Management

The Problem

The health sector analyses conducted by AID are confirming that a shortage of trained administrators is a basic constraint to improvement in coverage, efficiency, and quality of health care in LDCs. For example, the sector policy statement of the Africa Bureau signals this deficiency as one of the top priorities for AID assistance in African countries.

Within the overall shortage of trained administrators, there is a key component: the need to train top-level executives and staff. It is more difficult to train subordinates and to effectuate system changes when the top officials are not familiar with the concepts and techniques of management, and it is difficult to train executives in the same groups as their subordinates. Moreover, the training content of advanced schools of administration in LDCs tends to teach principles of management in the abstract since there is insufficient training material and documentation on how to manage health at the sectoral level. This problem comes under the Health Planning KPA which has the objective of expanding and improving sectoral management capability. It has also been addressed by the Hall Work Group which has recommended significantly increased emphasis on developing management skills in AID projects.

Project Purpose

This project will increase the number and quality of health sector managers. The purpose is to stimulate a network of regional training institutions, offering courses for top-level staff in systems approaches to managing the health sector and its major

management systems. This project will be initiated in Latin America and involve a contract with the Getulio Vargas Foundation to develop a prototype curriculum and training materials for use by other institutions in the region—national and subnational, public and private. Based on the experience with Latin America similar regional programs may be worked out in Africa and Asia with the development institutions linked in an information exchange network to accelerate the learning process.

This project will contribute significantly to closing the plan-performance gap which is a discouraging feature of the health system in many LDCs. The sector goal of improved health service for the poor majority will be advanced by the improved management capability the project will help develop.

Output

The output of the project will be a fully developed and tested training program consisting of an up-to-date curriculum, training materials, practical exercises, and learning methodology suitable for the above purposes and judged effective for these purposes by those who have received the training and by outside evaluators.

Technical Resources

Development of the training curriculum and implementation of it in Latin America will require an estimated eight man-months of work by U.S. personnel and four man-months of work by local personnel. Expertise is needed in the areas of health management, curriculum development, and curriculum evaluation. To develop courses for Africa and Asia, similar skills and amounts of time will be needed.

The funding period will be FY 76 through FY 78.

Assumptions

The major assumptions on which the success of this project rests are:

1. That an institution in each of three regions can be found capable of collaborating on the project and willing to bear the overhead costs of the project;
2. That trainees from high levels in health ministeries will be willing and able to attend the courses;
3. That the training received will contribute to better health sector management.

Related Activities

The Pan-American Health Organization has been active in this area. It has considerable experience in health management training and the proposed curriculum will be developed in close coordination with it.

Alternatives

One alternative for training health managers is to bring LDC personnel to the US for training. There are no courses in US universities, however, which are designed to deal with health conditions in LDCs. A second alternative is to develop a health management course for each country. This was rejected, however, because it would be too costly and there are not enough specialists and qualified training institutions to develop such an extensive program. The present method was chosen as a preferred means of developing a training program which is tailored to the needs of the LDCs and can reach a large number of countries at a reasonably low cost.

Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of the management training curriculum will be those high ranking administrators who receive the training, and the collaborating regional institutions whose overall quality will be enhanced. The indirect beneficiaries will be the population which profits by the improved management of the LDC health agencies and also those LDC institutions which adapt the curriculum to their local conditions and initiate their own training programs.

Spread Effects

At the end of the project there will be health management curricula in operation in three regional institutions. These institutions will continue to train administrators and as the courses prove successful, they will be further adapted by local institutions.

Financial Requirements and Plans

The estimated cost of this project is about $273,500 of which $84,000 will be expended in the first year for the Latin American portion of the project. It is expected that the grant will be with the Getulio Vargas Foundation. The budget breakdown is as follows:

Category	FY 76 Amount ($000)	MM	All other FY Amount ($000)	MM
Curriculum Development				
Personal Services	18	6	45	15
Travel & Per Diem	10		28	
Workshop	15		30	
Testing and Evaluation				
Personal Services	10.5	3.5	22.5	7.5
Travel & Per Diem	5.5		14	
Reproduction, Translation	10	2.0	20	4.
Utilization Workshop	15	.5	30	1
	84.0	12.0	189.5	27.5

TOTAL - $273,500

To reduce funding for the project, the cooperating institutions will be expected to find separate financing for the students and for the training program. This project will fund only the initial development costs of the training materials.

Development of the Project

This project was recommended to TA/DA by Mr. William Worcester and Dr. Joe Davis of TA/H. It was then pursued by an AID consultant who has determined through discussions with Miguel Segovia, chief of PAHO's Health Administration Unit, and by the results of AID's own health sector analyses that there is a widespread need for such a training program. Dr. John Daly, HEW Sector Analysis, reviewed the project and his comments have been incorporated into the design.

The feasibility of this approach has been partly substantiated by the fact that the Getulio Vargas Foundation in Brazil has already installed a similar course in the health field. Their experience will be reviewed to determine how much additional management training should be and/or can be incorporated into their program. It will also be useful to consult the US experts in the field (Harvard, North Carolina, and Johns Hopkins) to determine the state-of-the-art in the US and to ascertain what portion might be suitable for the LDCs. It is estimated that two additional man-months of consultant's time will be needed to conduct these analyses required for preparation of the PP. Furthermore, before the program can be extended to Asia and Africa feasibility reviews for those regions must be conducted.

As now planned, the PP will be submitted in FY 76. This is dependent, however, on the TA/DA office receiving a direct hire specialist in this field to prepare the final version of the PP and then manage the project.

Make New KPA Public Admin.

Agency for International Development
Project Identification Document Face Sheet
Part I to be completed by originating Office

Transaction Code
Add ☐ Delete ☐ Change

1. Country/Regional Entity/Recipient
Interregional GTS KPA #24

2. Document #1 -- PID
Status: New ☒ Revision #
Proposed Next Document:
PP
Proposed Date of Submission:
July 7, 1975

3. Project Number

4. Bureau TAB Code 6

5. Project Title
A. Project Management
B.
Contractor/Grantee
Inter-American Institute for Ag. Sciences
Pan African Institute for Development
Asian Institute of Management
Dept. of Commerce (RSSA) for [illegible] support)
K.L. Kornher, TA/DA

6. Estimated Initial/Final Obligation
FY 76 FY 78

7. Estimated Cost (Life of Project)
($000 or equivalent. $1=)
AID Approp. 755
Other U.S.
Total U.S.
Host Govt. 380
Other Donor(s)
Total 1,135

8. Purpose Code
Category Code

9. Special Concerns Codes

10. AID Appropriated Funds ($000)

Funding Source	Tech. Code	1st Year Grant	1st Year Loan	All Years Grant	All Years Loan
		270		755	
		(30)		(210 FY 77)	
Total		270		755	

11. Other U.S.

	1st Yr	All Yr
Total		

12. Project Goal

Enhance LDC management capacity to plan, implement and evaluate sector projects and programs.

13. Project Purpose(s)

(1) Improve the quality and quantity of outputs and services of four regional centers for project management and four national centers assisted by USAIDs.

(2) Facilitate international development and interchange of knowledge and skills in project management for the benefit of LDCs.

Regions involved: Central/West Africa; Latin America

Countries to be determined: Asia

14. Planning Resource Requirements (Staff/Funds)

4 Direct hire
1 MM Consultant

15. Originating Office Clearance
Signature:
Title & Date: Acting Director, TA/DA

Date Received in AID/W or for AID/W Documents; date of Distribution:

The Problem

Improved project management was identified as a significant management need of developing countries in the Agency's development administration Key Problem review of 1971. It was listed for continuing attention as a sub-element of the Key Problem of lack of LDC managerial capacity for programmatic action in the priority development sectors.

This need has been subsequently confirmed from many sources. The "Muth-Johnson" Report* (1972) illustrates:

> Poor project design and slow or inefficient execution are viewed almost universally in the countries of Central and West Africa as central and urgent problems. Examples of badly prepared projects abound; many more never get beyond the stage of conception.... In both Mali and Upper Volta, officials indicated that little over half the money allocated for previous development plans had been spent, largely because of bottlenecks in the process of project design and execution.*

In 1973 as AID/W review panel recommended that the predecessor project, "Modernizing Management for Development," focus predominantly on project management training through regional institutions. The panel found that "the identification, implementation and evaluation of projects ranks very high among the managerial needs of LDCs that might effectively be addressed by project outputs."

The Hall Work Group on Management Improvement and Development Administration (1975) noted the need for related work at the individual country level and called for "joint AID and developing country research and training in program and project analysis, design, management and evaluation."

*Training in the Techniques of Project Design and Project Execution

Project Purpose

The proposed project's goal is to build LDC capability to manage effective and equitable development projects. It will treat all phases of the project cycle. The purpose is to (1) improve the quality and quantity of outputs and services of four Regional Centers for project management (including one grant recipient under the predecessor project) and four national centers assisted by USAIDs, and (2) facilitate international development and interchange of knowledge and skills in project management for the benefit of LDCs. Principal outputs of the prior project and other AID projects (e.g., LA and TAB Agricultural Management projects) will be utilized and supplemented to serve project management analytic and skills needs of the developing countries.

Project design, implementation and evaluation will be emphasized along with means to link project activity into larger action systems such as agriculture or health programs to serve the poor majority. Generic approaches in project management (including those developed by AID) will be adapted to specific regional and sub-sectoral applications of high priority to the developing countries and AID. Potable water and small farm service delivery/acquisition systems are examples.

The project will serve LDC needs through a network of regional centers for project management training, consulting, action research, and technical cooperation. The project will link to individual countries via these centers and to USAID projects with similar objectives.

Technical Resources

The technical resource strategy is to build up LDC regional and country technical resources with U.S. and "network" resources in a supporting role.

The project will support the work of the Inter-American School of Public Administration which received a $120,000 grant for project management training under the predecessor project. A grant request has been received from the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which wishes to add a project management component to its work in agricultural management partially funded by the Bureau for Latin America. A preliminary grant proposal has also been received from the Project Management Centre of the Pan African Institute for Development which receives assistance from AFR/CWR and tested project management materials developed under the predecessor project. An August, 1974 reconnaissance by a Vanderbilt University consultant indicated excellent prospects for collaborative work in Asia, (probably through the Asian Institute of Management).

The network of field activities will be supported by a RSSA team (36 man-months/year for three years), consultants, a half-time IPA expert in agricultural projects, and small-scale procurement by TA/DA. Services will include field consultation; training design; implementation and evaluation assistance; talent banking; and professional materials.

The groundwork for a professional exchange and support network is already well laid. Collaborating institutions include the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank, the Training Division of the Inter-American Development Bank, the Engineering Department of the Pan American Health Organization, and the Technology and Development Institute of the East-West Center. Prospects for collaboration with the World Health Organization, the Asian Development Bank, and various U.N. bodies are also good.

The proposed duration of the project is three years of obligations and 42 months of services at a total project funding level of $755,000.

Assumptions

Major assumptions on which the success of the project rests are:

1. Project management skills can be learned in appropriately designed training programs.

2. The concepts and methodology produced under the predecessor project are sound and functional, but require regional and sectoral adaptation and application.

3. Regional centers can effectively serve LDC project management needs including links to country-level activities.

4. The values (equity, distribution of benefits to poor people, environmental protection, etc.) mandated by current AID policy will be sufficiently shared by LDC project management trainers and practitioners to be reflected in LDC project design and implementation activities affected by this project.

Alternatives

The first alternative would be to utilize the products of the predecessor project by mailings and such limited supporting services as TA/DA and consultants might provide. This alternative was rejected because the impact would be slower and much less certain. Also, adaptation of materials to specific needs will require a level of effort that LDC institutions are unlikely to be able to provide from their own resources.

The second alternative considered was to attempt to arrange further work and utilization through one or more multilateral organizations. This is a good alternative for the longer run, but would run serious risk of losing the momentum of the previous AID research and development effort. Further, the U.S. is widely accepted as a primary source of expertise in project management--expertise that might be significantly diluted with premature transfer to international auspices.

Several sectoral project management alternatives (health, agriculture, rural works) were considered, but none were found to have the same potential for broad impact represented by the proposed packaging of this project.

Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of this project will be professional LDC trainers and consultants in project management. The indirect beneficiaries will be those served by the more effective and equitable projects expected to result.

Spread Effects

Because the methodology will be incorporated in training materials and studies that can be exchanged among institutions in various countries and regions the potential spread effect is good. Also, the project has good leverage potential, in that advances in the state of the art can be used and further distributed by the various network collaborators using their own funds.

Financial Requirements and Plans

Project cost is estimated at $755,000. Grant costs of $380,000 will be (in order of importance) for personnel, travel, and other direct costs of materials development and professional exchange. RSSA life-of-project costs will be $375,000 for 117 man-months of supporting services. Consultant and IPA services will be provided from non-project funding.

Development of the Project

Extensive data and experience have been accumulated under the predecessor project and related AID activities. We plan to proceed directly to a PP in early July.

Agency for International Development
Project Identification Document Face Sheet
Part I to be completed by originating Office

Transaction Code
Add ☐ Delete ☐ Change

1. Country/Regional Entity/Recipient
Interregional - ~~Research~~ GTS - KPA 6

2. Document #1 -- PID
Status: New ☒ Revision # ____
Proposed Next Document: PP
Proposed Date of Submission: December, 1975

3. Project Number

4. Bureau Code
TAB 6

5. Project Title
A. Agricultural Commodity Systems Management
B. (Phase II)

Contractor: Harvard Business School
Project Manager: Paul Worthington

6. Estimated Initial/Final Obligation
FY 76 FY 79

7. Estimated Cost (Life of Project)
($000 or equivalent. $1= ____)
AID Approp. 1235
Other U.S. ____
Total U.S. ____
Host Govt. ____
Other Donor(s) ____
Total 1235

8. Purpose Code
Category Code ____

9. Special Concerns Codes

10. AID Appropriated Funds ($000)

Funding Source	Tech. Code	1st Year Grant	1st Year Loan	All Years Grant	All Years Loan
GTS Contract		350		1235	
Total		350		1235	

11. Other U.S.

	1st Yr	All Yr
Total		

12. Project Goal - To increase the effectiveness of donor and LDC efforts in agricultural development to improve the productivity and income of smaller farmers through strengthening the management of agricultural and rural organizations and activities in the public and private sectors.

13. Project Purpose(s)
1. Increase the capacity of the participating training and research institutions to teach, train and consult with regard to agribusiness
2. Develop an improved means of shared effort, accelerated diffusion and utilization of agribusiness management information and methods

Countries and Regional Organizations involved: INCAE & ROCAP in Central America, SEARCA in Southeast Asia, Thailand, Philippines, Indonesia, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Nigeria.

14. Planning Resource Requirements (Staff/Funds)
15 days Direct Hire
15 days MM AID Consultant

15. Originating Office Clearance
Signature: ____
Title & Date: Acting Director, TA/DA

Date Received in AID/W or for AID/W Documents; date of Distribution:

Rewrite
Request 2-yr. extension

The Problem

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the rate of progress in solving the problems of agricultural development, despite a series of expanded remedial efforts by the major donor agencies.

Additional efforts in the agricultural and rural development sectors are frustrated by inadequate managerial and institutional capability to implement programs successfully. Evidence of this is apparent in the inadequate delivery of services to the farmer, compartmentalized and uncoordinated approaches to solving agricultural and rural development problems, infrequent use of systematic analytical methodology, inadequate information and scarcity of training capacity. These problems encompass both the private and public sectors.

Project Purpose

The proposed project is based on work done by Harvard Business School under project 720-936 for:

1. development of methodology and knowledge about selected commodity systems in various geographic regions and for improved management performance by various components of the system.

2. development of training materials, courses and seminars conducted by regional intermediary institutions for appropriate public and private sector organizations.

3. progressive adaptation of the methodology to other regions and types of commodity systems.

This project will permit additional dissemination and further testing of the methodology developed by Harvard and further strengthen the agribusiness information and research network developed under the earlier project, by assisting the establishment of an agribusiness institute designed to support the network with training and case materials development, consultant and training services.

Outputs

The end product of this project will be:

1. Methods and mechanisms for accelerated diffusion and utilization of agribusiness materials, research and knowledge.

2. Improved commodity systems analysis methodology

3. Increased support capability for an agribusiness network in the form of an operating agribusiness institute

4. Agribusiness management training materials and programs.

Technical Resources

This project will require expertise in agribusiness systems analysis, training and training materials, planning and programming, management information systems, evaluation, marketing, transportation, and specialized technical, cultural, and commodity expertise related to the geographic area and commodity under study.

The proposed duration of the project is four years with funds being committed on a yearly basis.

Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries will be (1) the collaborating institutions, both LDC and U.S. which will improve the relevance, quantity, and quality of their outputs; (2) public and private LDC agricultural managers who will be trained; and (3) the LDC government and commercial organizations they represent.

The organizations and individuals who have a stake in improved effectiveness and efficiency of the operation of commodity systems will be indirect beneficiaries, as will consumers. The project will include specific attention to the participation of small farmers in commodity systems studies.

Spread Effects

Institutions and individuals (both LDC and U.S.) involved in the development and use of these materials will continue to train agricultural managers and planners and to develop trainers and consultants. The materials will be used by other institutions which will be added to the network of institutions collaborating in this program. Development of an exchange and sharing relationship between collaborating institutions will further spread the results of the project.

Development of the Project

This project will extend the utilization of methods and materials developed in TA/DA project 720-936, Agricultural Management, particularly the commodity action systems part of that project. This project will continue refinement and emphasize utilization of these outputs as they become available.

Expression of interest in the project have been received from African, Latin American and Asian countries. Regional Bureaus will be involved in the development of the project paper.

Financial Requirements and Plans

(To be added later)

Financial Requirements and Plan

Estimated costs of this four-year (plus the FY 76 Interim Quarter) project is $1,235,000 with projected obligation as shown below:

Tentative Budget

	FY 76 Amount ($000)	MM	All other Amount ($000)	MM
Subgrants to Regional Institutions	50		100	
Development of training materials by the Institute	100	20	200	40
a. Simulation Design	28			
b. Teaching materials	28			
Network Secretariat	40	12	90	32
Conferences for activation of Institute	24		77	
Contractor staff, travel, consultants & overhead	180	52	418	116
Totals	350	84	885	188

Overall Total: $1,235,000

Agency for International Development
Project Identification Document Face Sheet
Part I to be completed by originating Office

Transaction Code
Add ☐ Delete ☐ Change

1. Country/Regional Entity/Recipient
Interregional - Research KPA 6

2. Document #1 -- PID
Status: New ☒ Revision # ____
Proposed Next Document: PP
Proposed Date of Submission: Prior to December 1975

3. Project Number

4. Bureau Code
TAB 6

5. Project Title
A. Managing Planned Agricultural Development
B.

Contractor: To be determined
Project Manager: Paul Worthington

6. Estimated Initial/Final Obligation
FY 76 FY 79

7. Estimated Cost (Life of Project)
($000 or equivalent. $1= ____)
AID Approp. 1,125
Other U.S. ____
Total U.S. ____
Host Govt. ____
Other Donor(s) ____
Total 1,125

8. Purpose Code
Category Code ____

9. Special Concerns Codes

10. AID Appropriated Funds ($000)

Funding Source	Tech. Code	1st Year Grant	1st Year Loan	All Years Grant	All Years Loan
GTS Contract		250		1125	
Total		250		1125	

11. Other U.S.

	1st Yr	All Yr
Total		

12. Project Goal - To increase the effectiveness of donor and LDC efforts in agricultural development to improve the productivity and income of smaller farmers through strengthening the management of agricultural rural organizations and activities in the public and private sectors.

13. Project Purpose(s)

Develop a network of LDC institutions with improved research, analytic, consulting, training and information exchange capacity, using a systematic approach to the management of planned agricultural development.

Countries involved: (tentative) Ghana, Philippines, Guyana, Kenya, Costa Rica, Indonesia.

14. Planning Resource Requirements (Staff/Funds)
Direct hire - 20 man-days of TA/DA staff time and Regional Bureau inputs
AID Consultant - 5 Man-days

15. Originating Office Clearance
Signature: ____
Title & Date: Acting Director, TA/DA

Date Received in AID/W or for AID/W Documents; date of Distribution: ____

Ag. training course and Aug.
Evaluation and 1st Dec.
selection of contractor dependent on outcome of evaluation

The Problem

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the rate of progress in solving the problems of agricultural development, despite a series of expanded remedial efforts by the major donor agencies.

These expanded efforts focus on:

a. comprehensive sectoral analysis and systematic planning of rural development, supported by sector loans, and often, increased domestic allocation of resources

b. national or regional commodity campaigns

c. technological packages and service delivery

d. fair price marketing arrangements, and

e. greater concentration upon the equity considerations of assisting smaller farmers and maximizing employment opportunities

The efforts listed in number one impose an increased burden upon the managerial and institutional effectiveness of agricultural institutions; yet the managerial and institutional dimension is often neglected or treated inadequately in donor or LDC agricultural development efforts.

Evidence of managerial and institutional deficiencies and difficulties mounts:

a. Agricultural plans are often unrealistic, unrelated to implementation capabilities, resources, or constraints;

b. Services delivered to the farmer are inadequate or late, and his capacity to successfully use them is inadequately considered;

c. Organization and management of agricultural ministries and local organizations is deficient, as is their use of information from the farmers themselves.

d. Relevant, practical, sectoral oriented management training is unavailable.

Project Purpose

This project will continue an attack on the problem initiated in FY 71 under the Agricultural Management KPA. Its purpose is to improve the ability of regional and in-country training institutions to increase the management abilities of LDC Agricultural Program Managers and through them to improve agricultural development performance of ministries and other agencies and organizations. This will be accomplished by (a) synthesizing, expanding and making country specific training materials which have been developed from our previous project activities and related work by others; and (b) by assisting a network of LDC institutions in the utilization of this material through training and consulting assistance.

Outputs

The outputs of the project will include:

1. General and country-adapted methods and materials for training

2. Trained and experienced agricultural management specialists

3. Program guidance materials

4. Methods for accelerated diffusion and utilization of the foregoing.

Assumptions:

1. That managerial and institutional competence is an essential component of agricultural development

2. That LDC agricultural institutions will collaborate in agricultural management improvement efforts in all its phases of planning, diagnosis, implementation and evaluation

3. That the acceptance and demand for management assistance by LDC agricultural institutions is substantial now and will continue to increase.

Related Activities

The Agricultural Development Council has been active in this area. The Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA), working under a grant from the LA Bureau, has developed a methodology for agricultural program management. IICA is working in seven countries and have requests for their services in eight more. Close coordination will be established and maintained with these and other organizations and with AID Missions such Ghana, Kenya, Philippines, and Indonesia who have ongoing or proposed projects which are closely related to this area, so that the training work undertaken is integrated with their operational programs.

Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of this program will be the collaborating institutions whose overall quality will be enhanced; those LDC agricultural managers and planners who will receive training through these institutions, and the LDC government and private organizations and programs they represent. Farmers and

others in rural areas who are the target of government programs will benefit indirectly, by virtue of the improved institutional performance which should result.

Spread Effects

Institutions and individuals (both LDC and U.S.) involved in the development and use of these materials will continue to train agricultural managers and planners and to develop trainers and consultants. The materials will be used by other institutions which will be added to the network of institutions collaborating in this program. Development of an exchange and sharing relationship between collaborating institutions will further spread the results of the project.

Financial Requirements and Plans

Estimated costs of this four-year (including the FY 76 Interim Quarter) project is $1,125,000 with projected obligations as shown below.

Tentative Budget

	FY 76		All Other	
	Amount ($000)	MM	Amount ($000)	MM
Personnel	100	60	326	195
Fringe	24		78	
Overhead	50		163	
Consultants	16	6	52	20
Travel	35		114	
Per diem	13		43	
Workshops & Conferences			60	
Supplies	2		7	
Other Direct Costs	10		32	
Total	250	66	875	215

TOTAL (all years) 1,125

Development of the Project

This project will extend the utilization of methods and materials developed in TA/DA project 720-936, Agricultural Management, particularly the Plan Implementation part of that project. This project will continue the refinement and utilization of these outputs and will integrate new materials from other sources as they become available.

The in-country adaptation of materials and methods will be carried out in a minimum of three countries by regional or country institutions.

Expression of interest in the proposed project have been received from the LA, Asia and Africa Bureaus as well as specific Country Missions. Regional Bureaus will be involved in development of the project paper.

Page

C. Project Narratives

2. Summary Progress Statements

Ongoing Projects

a. Local Action Guidance and Implementation (KPA #6)

b. Agricultural Management--Commodity Systems (KPA #6)

c. Agricultural Management--Ag. Sector Implementation (KPA #6)

d. Multisector Project and Program Management (KPA #24)

e. MUCIA 211(d) (KPA #24)

f. Agricultural Information and Related Activities

SUMMARY PROGRESS OF ONGOING PROJECTS

Project # 720-986 KPA # 6

Project Title Local Action Guidance and Implementation

Contractor a) Development Alternatives

b) Near-East Foundation

c) Trans-Century, Corp.

d) Paraguayan Center for Sociological Studies

I. Implementation Progress

Outputs	Progress to Date & Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal
1. Studies drawn from field analysis. 2. Program guidelines and training materials. 3. Tested applications of no. 2 above. 4. Series of workshops and symposia to refine and assess findings. 5. Info and knowledge exchange network.	All field work necessary to collect data for a cross-project analysis has been completed (Output 1). As this work progressed, several important components were noted and additional research conducted on: a) the role of women in rural development, with completion and wide dissemination of a study on seven countries in Africa and Latin America and b) information systems to support rural development, with prototype on-going information systems designed for two development projects, one in Bolivia and the other in Peru. A process for improved design and implementation of rural development projects has been developed and will be translated into guidelines and training materials for test applications in FY 76 & 77 (Outputs 2 & 3). Concurrent with this work and integrated with it, individual contractors have been working to introduce and test the results of local action R & D work in Kenya

Progress to Date and Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal (cont.)

and Lesotho. These latter two activities will be converted to Mission or Host Government funding during FY 76.* Testing of findings will be commenced in 3 additional locations during FY 76 (Outputs 1, 2 & 3).

A local contract in Paraguay for field surveys and analysis of small farmer involvement in local organizations has been completed, and the results will be integrated into an information system to support local cooperatives, as part of the continuing field support element of the project. Design of two additional information systems is planned for FY 76.

Preliminary findings of the local action R & D work have been discussed at workshops and symposia at the East-West Center, Inter-American Development Bank, AID Director's Spring Review, the AID Working Group on the Rural Poor and at three Overseas Development Council workshops for private and voluntary agencies (Outputs 4 & 5). Considerable demand for the completed findings has been generated both in and out of AID, insuring an effective info and knowledge exchange network through the balance of the life of the project, and beyond (Output 5).

Substantial progress has been made towards the project purpose but findings still need to be translated into general program guidance. The goal of more effective use of development resources remains to be accomplished and will be contingent on USAID, private agency and host country acceptance and utilization of the knowledge and guidance developed. Based on response to date we believe this will occur.

* Conversion of the Lesotho activity is subject to negotiation with AID/Africa and the Host Government Project Authority.

II. Project on Schedule: Life-of-Project Budget Accurate?

Overall the Project is essentially on schedule though we are slightly behind where we would like to be in dissemination and testing of findings. This will be the major focus of project effort in FY 76 and 77. It is now apparent that the FY 77 Project termination date will not provide sufficient time to fully test the findings in application to new field projects. We estimate an additional three years will be needed to accomplish this but a project extension will not be required. We believe any additional funds needed will be available from other sources.

FY 76 is the final funding year of the project. Because additional monies were added in prior FY's for additional work not provided for in the original Budget and to cover costs greater than originally budgeted, the $279,000 requested for FY 76 will exceed the presently approved total of $740,000 by $187,500.

III. Significant Changes in Project Proposed?

Revision of the Project Budget upward to cover the above is the only change proposed. The Project will be evaluated in July/August by an intra-agency committee. While this may result in recommendations for significant Project changes we do not consider this likely.

IV. Role of TA Technical Office; Mandays Required

A concerted TA and management effort will be required of TAB (TA/DA, TA/RD and TA/AGR) in the production of program guidelines and their application in design and implementation of at least 3 AID supported rural development projects and in the design of information systems to support the projects. Intensive contract management will also be necessary along with participation in a series of workshops and symposia to refine and assess findings. Approximately 300 mandays will be allocated to manage/monitor this project and ancillary activities.

SUMMARY PROGRESS OF
ONGOING PROJECTS

See page 38

Project # 720-936 KPA #6

Project Title Agricultural Management (Commodity Action Systems)

Contractor a) Harvard Graduate School of Business School

I. Implementation Progress

Outputs	Progress to Date & Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal
1. Multi-country analyses of management problems and feasibility of solutions for selected agribusiness projects 2. Multi-country surveys of management and training requirements, operational solutions and institutional/enterprise linkages 3. Agr. management concepts/approaches for better collaborating institution/private enterprise management capabilities. 4. Agribusiness management curricula and training, evaluation workshops, bibliographies.	Fruits and vegetables commodity systems analysis conducted in four Central American countries. Four study related international workshops held. Methodology developed in the Central American study has been adapted by HBS and the Southeast Asian Regional Center for Graduate Study and Research in Agriculture (SEARCA) corn commodity systems in Southeast Asia. Country studies in the Philippines, Thailand, and Indonesia and a regional study were reviewed at a recent SEARCA sponsored regional workshop. Additional country workshops and

a broader based second regional workshop are scheduled thru this summer and fall. Industry notes, case studies, (18 for S.E. Asia corn studies), curricula, bibliographies and other training materials have been developed for use by INCAE, SEARCA, and numerous client organizations.

Five collaborating institutions (HBS, INCAE, SEARCA, Kasetsart, and LAAD) are using these concepts, methodologies and approaches in Central America, S.E. Asia, and the U.S. They are additionally consulting and exchanging agribusiness knowledge and experience. A network and secretariat are planned for linking institutions around the world who are involved in commodity systems studies. HBS is designing an agribusiness institute to backstop the network and secretariat. A third major commodity analysis activity is planned for Africa.

The progress outputs identified above have contributed significantly to the capacity of the participating training and research institutions to teach, train and consult with regard to agricultural program management (project purpose). It is perhaps too early to judge what significance they have had towards the broader goal of improving the capacity of agricultural institutions to organize and manage agricultural development.

II. Project on Schedule: Life of Project Budget Accurate?

A number of activities (relating to secretariat establishment, institute design and network build-up) were deliberately slowed during FY 75 because of the need to avoid getting out of phase with work of the intra-agency management planning group (Hall group) and because office personnel limitations made it impossible to proceed as rapidly as contemplated in last year's program submission. Thus the project is somewhat behind the original schedule but no irreparable harm has been done. In fact, we believe the purpose of effective project management will be served by establishment of a new project in FY 76 as discussed below. The current budget, while not completely accurate, will be adequate to carry the activity over into a new project life-cycle.

III. Significant Change in Project Proposed

The present PROP expires with FY 1975 funds. A new PROP will be submitted prior to December, 1975, with a four year lifespan, emphasizing the utilization/dissemination of methodologies, concepts and materials developed in the present project.

This will be accomplished through the establishment of a mini-network of collaborating institutions served and supported through a secretariat which will act as an information, knowledge and materials exchange mechanism. The secretariat will also provide a means of linking with other dimensions of the agricultural sector. Additional support for research, training materials and consultant capability will be provided by an institute funded partially by AID.

IV. Role of TA Technical Office; Mandays Required

The TA/DA management effort in relation to the activities of this project has increased as the number of regions and collaborating institutions has increased. Outputs and their utilization has increased over the life of the contract and this will continue. We expect during the coming fiscal year to more directly link the new project into AID mission field programs and this too will increase the need for coordination and management. We estimate this project will require at least 200 direct hire mandays during FY 76.

SUMMARY PROGRESS OF ONGOING PROJECTS

PROJECT # 720-936 KPA #6

PROJECT TITLE Agricultural Management (Implementation)

CONTRACTOR Governmental Affairs Institute

I. Implementation Progress

Outputs	Progress to Date & Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal
1. Comprehensive reference manual "Managing Planned Agricultural Development" based on comparative study of theory and practice. 2. Training methodologies, training materials, course designs and bibliographies. 3. Established training capabilities in selected regional/national institutes 4. Consultant Services 5. Mini-network for Agricultural Planning & Implementation Management	Over 1000 documents have been analyzed and used to compile the basic reference. A seminar attended by senior LDC Agricultural Managers and AID Mission representatives was held in October 1974 to validate the approach and content of the manual against practical experience of operating personnel. Recommendations were incorporated into the current draft which has recently been submitted to selected experts for evaluation. The manual, one of the major outputs of the contract, serves as the basis for developing general and country specific training materials (Output 1).

Progress to Date & Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal (cont.)

Training materials and course design are under development. A six-week pilot training course for 24 LDC middle level Agricultural Managers will start July 21, 1975. A task oriented training methodology is being developed that combines both substantive and process concerns and relates them to the job requirements of each trainee. These methodologies, concepts, and approaches will assist the participants to make maximum use of their own experience as well as that represented by the reference manual. (Output 2).

Selection of the first collaborating country-institute is scheduled for September, 1975, with subsequent development of country specific training materials and adaptation of the basic manual and training course. The First in-country course will be conducted during March, 1976 (Output 3).

This activity was initiated as a part of project 720-936, but will be re-constituted in FY 76 as a new project.

The goal is to improve the capacity of the LDC to implement agricultural and rural development plans. The purpose is to develop and foster the use of improved methods to appraise implementation feasibility, plan and manage implementation and systematically relate the two.

This is being accomplished by: 1) developing knowledge through analysis of LDC and other experience; 2) assuring its relevance and usefulness thru testing in LDC situations; 3) developing problem oriented learning materials and training programs; 4) developing consultant capability; 5) promoting of national and international linkages for exchange of knowledge and skills. Progress has been only minimally satisfactory in 1, 2 and 3 and much remains to be done on 4 and 5.

II. Project on Schedule; Life-of-Project Budget Accurate?

The project activity is designed to be accomplished in five overlapping phases. Phase one has been completed, however the extensive research and writing required for completion of a working draft of the basic manual put the phase one activity considerably behind schedule and delayed the pilot training course and subsequent parts of phase 2 a few months. An acceptable version of the manual still has not been produced. / Work has proceeded concurrently on additional training materials needed for phase 3 (in-country work). Training material development and course design are proceeding satisfactorily.

The portion of the current project budget for this activity is adequate. However, as noted this activity will become a new project in FY 76, with a separate budget.

III. Significant Changes in Project Proposed:

To allow better workload distribution within TA/DA and more flexibility in management, the Agricultural Plan Implementation activity of the Agricultural Management Project will be incorporated in a new PROP which will be submitted prior to December 15, 1975.

The present project expires with FY 75 funds. The new project will have a four-year life span and will concentrate on the "pay-off" to LDCs by assisting them to adapt the reference manual and training materials to their specific situations, training LDC personnel in its use, and helping develop local institutional capability to conduct training programs. Thus the R & D focus in the existing project will be shifted to a field utilization focus in the new project.

IV. Role of TAB Technical Office; Mandays Required

The amount and kinds of interface and coordination within TAB and with Regional Bureaus and USAIDs is increasing as this project activity moves into the field utilization stage. The time required to evaluate outputs and guide their adaptation and utilization is also increasing greatly. We estimate that 175 direct hire mandays per year within TA/DA will be required.

Attachment: PAR dated 2/4/74

SUMMARY PROGRESS OF ONGOING PROJECTS

Project # 720-937 KPA #24

Project Title: Modernizing Management for Development (terminating)

Contractor: a) Vanderbilt University Graduate School of Management
b) Vargas Foundation, Inter-American School of Public Administration (FY 74 grant)

Part I. Implementation Progress

Outputs	Progress to Date & Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal
1. Training materials in project management	Six sets completed.
2. New project management doctrine/methodology	Documented in several papers; non-funded research continuing by Vanderbilt faculty; professional interchange begun with several international assistance institutions.
3. Tests of training materials by collaborating institutions	Pan African Institute for Development and University of Sao Paulo (project management) CAFRAD (executive devel. training) U. of Bahia (organizational devel.)

Part II. Project on Schedule; Life-of-Project Budget Accurate?

Work under this project from 1972-75 produced six sets of project management training materials; a seventh will be delivered in November. In addition, a broad search and evaluation of U.S. project management materials appropriate for LDC adaptation was completed under the Vanderbilt contract and a subsequent purchase order. A directory of U.S. resources for project management is being published. Overseas tests of project management training materials were completed successfully in West Africa and Brazil, in addition to tests of other materials and approaches via CAFRAD and the Federal University of Bahia.

A two-year grant of $120,000 to the Vargas Foundation Inter-American School of Public Administration (EIAP) on June 28, 1974 is funding adaptation of training materials to the needs of EIAP's generic project management training programs in Spanish and Portuguese. A second element of the grant provides for development of training for management of potable water projects. Grant implementation was delayed for several months due to problems with bank arrangements and a change of personnel at EIAP. The effort is now underway with sound leadership.

The FY 75 program under the prior project was sharply curtailed due to TA/DA staff reductions and the prolonged absence of the project manager on detail to the Hall Wrok Group. However, groundwork has been laid for very rapid initiation of network and field support activities under a new project.

Part III. Significant Changes in Project Proposed?

Not applicable.

Part IV. Role of TA Technical Office; Mandays Required

Completion of this project will require 10 direct-hire mandays.

Project # KPA #24

Project Title: Institution Building and Technical Assistance Methodology

Contractor: Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc. (MUCIA) 211(d) grant #AID/csd-2958

Part I. Implementation Progress

A one-million dollar 211(d) grant was awarded to MUCIA for the period 28 May 1971 to 27 May 1976. The grant funds a Program of Advanced Studies in Institution Building and Technical Assistance Methodology (PASITAM). It is intended to build MUCIA capacity in these fields for work benefitting developing countries.

Outputs	Progress to Date
1. Research and development products	1. Two studies of design for international agricultural activities; others in process.
2. MUCIA staff, course, and curriculum development	2. Impact on 3 courses/seminars in MUCIA schools; 1 U. Minn. professor developed to high degree of competence.
3. Training and consultative capability	3. MSU workshop in rural development design; rural development training materials.
4. Documentation center services.	4. Extensive materials distribution to multilateral organizations; design studies and notes in preparation; abstracts prepared.
5. MUCIA/LDC collaborative work in IB and TA methodology	5. Collaboration with Asian Center for Development Admin.; work planned with Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Sciences
6. Capacity for services to LDCs, AID, and international organizations	6. Services provided to AID in Development Studies Course and evaluation; American Institute for Free Labor Development; Nicaragua (health).

Part II. Project on Schedule; Life-of-Project Budget Accurate?

Progress is behind schedule; after four years, 1/3 of funds remain unexpended. If warranted, project could be extended through a sixth year with no additional funding.

Part III. Significant Changes in Project Proposed

A PAR of April 1975 rates the overall status of the project unsatisfactory. (See attached PAR and demurrer by the Director of PASITAM.) MUCIA is proceeding with its own evaluation via the PASITAM advisory committee. The PAR recommends a full-scale AID evaluation in the fall of 1975 unless a decision is reached sooner to terminate the activity.

Part IV. Role of TA Technical Office; Mandays Required

The grant was assigned to TA/DA in April, 1975 with instructions from the Deputy Assistant Administrator that it should draw no more than three hours per week on the time of TA/DA until the current situation of serious understaffing can be remedied. However, it is very clear that a great deal of time and interaction with MUCIA/PASITAM people will be necessary to seek to assure that the sunk costs and future costs of this activity have appropriate payoff. External consultants can be of some use, but close attention by direct hire staff is indispensible. For example, item-by-item assessment of outputs should be treated in a thorough evaluation. We estimate that a minimum of 40 mandays of TA/DA staff time will be required during FY 1976, assuming reliance on outside assistance for the AID fall evaluation.

Attachment: PAR dated 4/18/75

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD:	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
	May 1971 TO March 1975	TAB	

5. PROJECT TITLE

Institution-Building and Technical Assistance Methodology - AID/csd 2958

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY ~~1971~~ Ends FY ~~1976~~	7. DATE LATEST PROP	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
	n/a	n/a	-

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $ 1,000,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $ -0-	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $ 1,000,000

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (*Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency*)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
MUCIA	AID/csd 2958

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X) USAID	AID/W	HOST	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
	X		1. Project monitor to be designated, vice Abraham M. Hirsch.	April 25, 1975
	X		2. If the Grant activity continues, a comprehensive evaluation should take place following PASITAM's self-evaluation. Such a review to be conducted by outsiders complemented by AID officials.	Fall 1975
	X		3. Future activities should be dependent on the outcome of the above evaluations.	Fall 1975 and thereafter.

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES REVISED OR NEW: ☐ PROP ☐ PIP ☐ PRO AG ☐ PIO/T ☐ PIO/C ☐ PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE	MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
Abraham M. Hirsch AMH April 18, 1975	Carl Fritz April 21, 1975

for Period: 3/1971 to 3/1975

VI. ACTION AGENT - A.I.D./W

A. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON A.I.D./W

Monitoring the Grant activity, liaison, and technical support

B. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE				
Unsatisfactory		Satisfactory			Outstanding		Low	Medium			High
1	2	(3)	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	(5)

D. PERFORMANCE FACTOR RATING FACTORS	Not Applicable	Actual Impact			Check if Important
		Negative	As Planned	Superior	
1. Provision of Personnel			X		X
2. Provision of Commodities					
3. Provision of Adequate A.I.D./W Technical Backstopping			X		X
4. Contract Negotiation					

E. ACTION REQUIRED: What Mission action(s) should be taken to stimulate improved A.I.D./W performance?

See recommendations on page one of the narrative.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS

1. U.S. ACTION AGENT – Contractor, Participating Agency, or Voluntary Agency

Evaluation for Period: 5/1971 to 3/1975

Agent: MUCIA/PASITAM

A. FUNDING

1. Cumulative Obligations Through Prior Fiscal Year	2. Estimated Budget, Current Fiscal Year	3. Estimated Additional Budget to Completion, After Current Fiscal Year
$ 1,000,000	$	$

B. IMPORTANT OUTPUTS DEPENDENT SUBSTANTIALLY ON THE ACTION AGENT:

See quote on page two of the narrative.

C. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE DURING THE PERIOD AS COMPARED TO PLANS (N.B.: It is PASITAM's headquarters and operations conducted by it, not MUCIA, that is rated below)

1. EVALUATION FACTORS	CHECK IF SIGNIFICANT	PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN (✓) NA	NEG.	AS PLANNED	SUPERIOR
a. Understanding project purpose	X		X		
b. Planning to achieve purpose	X		X		
. Staff of proper size	X			X	
d. Timely arrival of personnel					
e. Technical qualifications of personnel	X			X	
f. Responsiveness to A.I.D. Directions	X		X		
g. Adherence to scope of work	X		X		
h. Adherence to work schedule					
i. Contractor's home office support	X		X		
j. Relations with cooperating country nationals					
k. Local staff training and utilization					
l. Effective administration of participants					
m. Management of commodities					
n. Timely submission of required reports					
o. Content and usefulness of required reports	X		X		
p. Other (specify) creative development of subject matter and expertise therein.			X		

2. OVERALL EVALUATION (✓) Check one →	UNSATISFACTORY 1	2	SATISFACTORY 3	4	5	OUTSTANDING 6	7
		X					

D. ACTION REQUIRED: What action(s) should be taken and by whom to improve performance?

See recommendations on page one of the narrative.

(If additional space is needed, use the reverse side of the worksheet)

(Revised 12-72)

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT ON THE 211(d) GRANT TO MUCIA ON INSTITUTION-BUILDING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE METHODOLOGY (Grant AID/csd 2958, May 1971)

NARRATIVE

Introduction

This PAR and Evaluation were performed by Ms. Mary E. Mozynski and Mr. Abraham M. Hirsch in April 1975. The level of this PAR exercise corresponds to the lowest level of evaluation provided for by applicable regulations. It is based on files, on documents prepared by MUCIA and the Grant activity directorate (PASITAM), as well as on a visit to the PASITAM office on April 8-9, 1975, and a session with the advisory committee to PASITAM which met in Chicago without quorum on April 10, 1975.

Recommendations

This PAR is not the only evaluation of this Grant now being performed. The PASITAM advisory committee itself has begun an evaluation of its own. In addition, this Grant is slated for a full-fledged evaluation in the Fall of 1975.

The PASITAM advisory committee has designed an ambitious frame of reference in its evaluative effort; a copy is attached. In addition to the three alternatives stated on the Mikol draft, a fourth one was voiced by Dr.Axinn: to close the activity down at the end of this grant year, and return the balance of the funds to AID. It is too early to gauge which way the committee will tilt, since the meeting at which the evaluation was discussed did not even bring together a quorum of the committee members.

We recommend:

1. That in the event that the advisory committee recommends early foreclosure, that this recommendation be accepted and allowed by AID.

2. That in the event that the committee chooses option "1"--allowing the activity to run its five-year course and ending it then--AID accept this course of action, but consider, together with MUCIA, whether for the last year the objectives should not be revised and focussed on a narrower set of tasks. This may focus more narrowly on "training", and work in support of AID manpower development, within the "IB" and technical assistance methodology area.

3. That in the event that the committee prefers option "2"--and requests AID to allow a sixth year but without additional financing, this course of action be considered sympathetically, but with the narrowing of purpose suggested under 2. above.

4. That if either option "1" or "2" of the committee's options is accepted by AID, the Documentation Center effort be terminated as of the end of the current "grant year".

5. That this Grant not be considered for an add-on grant or utilization grant.

6. That a project monitor be designated, vice Abraham M. Hirsch, who is being transferred to Tunisia. If the narrowing of focus suggested as part of recommendation #2 is accepted, and the Grant document revised accordingly, the most appropriate project manager might well be a staff member of SER/PM/MD.

7. That, unless the Grant activity is foreclosed at the end of May 1975, a full evaluation be made in the Fall of 1975, following the completion of PASITAM's self-evaluation. Such an evaluation should be conducted by outsiders, or by outsiders complemented by AID officers. Among outsiders, we suggest illustratively Dr. Milton Esman, Dr. Norman Uphoff (both are at Cornell University), Dr. Robert West (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy), and Dr. Don Kimmel, of the FAO Liaison Office in Washington, D.C.

Background

In May 1971, AID made a 211(d) Grant to Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., headquartered at the Michigan State University in East Lansing, Michigan, in the amount of one million dollars, and for a five year period. The grant was intended

> "to strengthen the expertise of the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., in institution building and technical assistance methodology. This [was to] be achieved through (a) a coordinated program of research and training concerning overseas institution building and technical assistance methodology among the five major public universities which compose MUCIA; and, (b) creation of a document repository of the literature relevant to these areas which will make its information readily available to scholars and practitioners in concise and useable form."

The objectives were further defined by reference to facilitating the synthesis of previous research and the further advancement of theory and practical application of "IB" and technical assistance methodology. The document speaks of "long-term active and vigorous, innovative, and coherent leadership" to an academic core program of research, integration, research operations, training and a document depository, and of a simultaneous extension of the core program in the LDCs.

There were several unique features to the Grant. It was the first ever made to a consortium. More important, it was a grant not in a readily definable and conventionally understood area such a pisciculture or nutrition, but in an experimental and innovative area of research, training, and operations the very parameters of which were not widely understood within AID, let alone within the academic community. Another novel arrangement was implicit rather

than explicit: the scope of IB and technical assistance methodology encompassed the entire range of the Technical Assistance Methodology Division (TA/PM/M), the sponsoring organization. Though, of course, all 211(d) grantees are concerned with subjects addressed by AID professionals in-house as well, this arrangement uniquely bestowed on the Grantee a comprehensive responsibility, the parameters of which mirrored the responsibilities of the monitoring organization. This was not a coincidence. The Methodology Division had been created in September 1969, when one officer was assigned to it. He was not joined by a colleague until the summer of 1970, and even then the Division was staffed at only half its projected level. The Division, in any event, was intended to remain small. The grant was seen as a device to permit a much greater level of effort to be brought to bear on the substance of the Division's responsibilities.

The Grant had been neogotiated with initiative by Dr. George H. Axinn, President and Executive Director of MUCIA. He is an experienced practitioner, manager, designer and evaluator of diverse technical assistance efforts all over the LDC world, and a creative conceptualizer to boot. It readily became apparent to those involved in the Grant negotiations (mainly Mr. Kenneth Levick, then Associate Assistant Administrator for Program and Methodology, Dr. James W.Green, then Chief of the Methodology Division, and Dr. Abraham M. Hirsch, then Social Science Research Adviser and the other half of the division) that they and Dr. Axinn spoke the same language and applied the same thoughts to the parameters and tasks of the grant. The professional and conceptual rapport between the AID officers and Dr. Axinn was heartening at the time, and remains an important asset in the management of the Grant activity. At the same time, this rapport may have obscured from the beginning the dangers that others involved with the Grant might not apply the same understandings, or seek the same objectives with the same strategies.

The first director of the grant activity--it acquired the name Program of Advanced Studies in Institution-Building and Technical Assistance Methodology and was acronymed PASITAM--was Dr. Davis Bobrow, then of the University of Minnesota. A man who had performed excellently both in government and in academe, Dr. Bobrow lacked an understanding both of the LDC environment and of the aims of the Grant. His resignation was requested in the Fall of 1972.

He was succeeded as program director by Dr. William Siffin within a few months, and in some ways the history of PASITAM starts all over again late in 1972, when Dr. Siffin assumed both the post of program director of PASITAM and of director of the Indiana University's International Development Research Center (IDRC) at Bloomington, Indiana. Dr. Siffin had been, for some three years, Director of the Office of Development Administration in the Bureau of Technical Assistance. He was strongly identified with public administration and its developmental twin, development administration. He had experience in academe, in research, in teaching; more to the point, he had experience both as a development bureaucrat and as a practitioner overseas. He also, while in TAB, had become involved with the Grant as a formal and informal "kibitzer" during the period of the Grant's negotiation and during the stormy months when Bobrow's handling of the project was being challenged and his departure sought.

Though on one level this PAR is written toward the end of the fourth-year of the Grant, in another sense less than three years have elapsed since the project had its second birth under the management of Dr. Siffin.

Through March 1974, principal liaison with the Grant on AID's side was entrusted to Dr. Green, who as chief of the Methodology Division and project monitor could promote a synergistic relationship between PASITAM and his Division. When Dr. Green retired rather suddenly at the end of that month, project monitorship was assumed by Dr. Abraham M. Hirsch, who himself will be reassigned early in May 1975. In large measure, project management at AID's end has been low-key since the directorship was assumed by Siffin. The monitoring office responds of course to inquiries and requests by the project director. Personal interface is limited to attendance at PASITAM advisory committee sessions which occur some six to eight times a year for a few hours, at annual meetings, and during the more frequent visits by Dr. Siffin to AID/W, visits usually not initiated by the Division but resulting from Dr. Siffin's appropriate liaison with diverse AID units. In addition, a few of PASITAM's projects have involved meetings of one form or another by Methodology Division staff with PASITAM managers or PASITAM-funded researchers.

Grant Activities

For purposes of this PAR, the activities conducted under the Grant are discussed under five headings:

1. Strengthening Expertize
2. Research
3. Training
4. Documentation Center
5. Linkage Building

Item 4. corresponds to the specific objective quoted above from the Grant document. The other items are aspects of the other quoted objective of the project.

1. Strengthening Expertize

The grant document is rather explicit in illustrating expectations of enhanced expertize. This effort is described, at least illustratively, in several passages, including pages 13, 14 and thereafter, in terms fairly distinct from training activities. The expertize referred to is that in areas of relating to the generic technical assistance process, and the general methodology of technical assistance including institution-building.

The program so far has not strengthened expertize significantly. Though experienced former practitioners participate in the advisory committee, or have received research grants, or been involved in PASITAM management, there is no evidence that the general expertize of the five campusses, or the individual expertize of academics or graduate students, has been enhanced by the Grant except in relation to specific participation in efforts listed below, mainly in research. In short, at the end of the fourth year of the grant period by formal reckoning, the expertize of the MUCIA campusses remains high, but not higher than it would have been without the Grant.

2. Research

The research program has not been properly coordinated, or appropriately focussed on the concerns listed on pages 3,4, and elsewhere in the Grant document. That is not to say that nothing has been done in furtherance of these listed subjects. It is to say that much of the research program has been engaged with issues which, though interesting and meritorious by themselves, do not clearly lie in the bull's eye of the Grant's targets.

Research has been based largely on projects initiated by would-be researchers who submitted proposals for consideration by the Program Director, who then referred them to the Advisory Committee for consideration and approval. These proposals reflected the personal professional interests of proposers more than the purposes of the Grant: The Grant was tapped by many individual researchers for funds wherewith to do their thing, in return for some modicum of adjustment of the research proposal to give superficial legitimization to the use of 211(d) Grant funds. Two or three reasons appear to underlie this malfunction: (a) Poor Grant management (see below) failed to sufficiently create an awareness of the Grant and its purposes to bring forth the most appropriate research endeavors; (b) the Program Director and the Advisory Committee appear to have felt under pressure to approve proposals in order to appear to implement the Grant; and (c) the relative vagueness of the Grant's underlying rationale--"institution-building and technical assistance methodology"--permitted the exercise of flexibility unmatched by discretion.

Not all research activity has been irrelevant to the Grant. Underway is a project on the application of the experimental method to technical assistance, by Hoole and Job. There the question is not one of pertinence, but rather one of the qualifications of the researchers, both of whom lacked in-depth understanding of the LDC environment when they began their work. Extremely useful has been the Dr. M. Blase's Institution-Building: A Source Book, financed in part from the 211(d) Grant, in part under contract with MUCIA. At the other end of the scale, the study of political institutions by Ostrom and Hennesey may be singled out as a "bootlegged" item, basically of no interest to the Grant, focussed as it is on political theory and political economics in the European context, by two authors not familiar with or sensitive to the LDC environment.

Since most of the research endeavors were approved late in the life of the Grant and have not yet yielded final products, the judgements made here might prove to have been overly harsh; but they are the best judgement which can be made at this time.

The Program Director now is changing the mode of research implementation from reliance on proposals for support of the work of individual academics, to a "sub-contracting" approach under which he and his staff identify subjects that should be researched, locate and contract with an appropriate individual, and manage and process the product in-house out of the PASITAM office. Two problems arise out of this switch. The first is that it weakens the linkages between the PASITAM directorate and the academic community by reducing the latter's interest in the principal benefit they sought from PASITAM--financial support for their research endeavors. The second is that it places further managerial burdens on the PASITAM office; as we shall see below, management hitherto has been poor, and there is no evidence that the PASITAM office can handle a greater burden.

3. Training

Lumped into this grouping are two different types of skill development, both of which were illustratively or specifically written into the Grant document: (a) Academic offerings - courses, seminars, etc. - for the development of greater expertize in the Grant's subject matters by graduate students and faculty; and (b) training courses offered under the PASITAM umbrella to persons not in an academic setting--practitioners about to assume technical assistance positions, team leaders, project designers, etc.

(a) We have not been made aware of a single course or seminar which was established on one of the campusses as a result of the Grant. True, there are a few courses known to the PASITAM directorate and to the advisory committee which deal with facets of institution-building and technical assistance methodology, and no doubt additional courses and seminars tackle aspects of these subjects. However, the Grant has not added new educational opportunities in this subject matter. The courses now offered preceded the Grant in some cases, or developed independently of it. Chances are that when the Grant ends they will continue, but the PASITAM effort will not have contributed to their enhancement or survival.

(b) Only one real training course has been held so far - dealing with institution-building in agriculture. Planned as a two-week course in August 1974, it lasted about a week. Insufficient preparation for the course, inadequate interest on the part of the clientele, and other factors appear to have combined to make the course a limited success. There was considerable turnover of attendees, the total number of which was smaller than anticipated; moreover, guest lecturers did not attend the entire course as had been hoped (to permit protracted interaction among them and between them and the trainees), instead coming to the Michigan State University campus for a much briefer spell. There now are plans for another training course late this summer. Interest is being solicited mainly among private voluntary organizations.

4. Documentation Center

Located within the suite that houses the IDRC on the Indiana University campus, the Documentation Center consists of one small room which holds two desks and several bookcases and filing cabinets. Its current staff, on board since February 1975, consists one one full-time and one half-time junior professional, neither of whom is trained either in information storage and retrieval (or library science) or familiar with development, technical assistance, and the like. Nor do they have a grasp--they freely concede this--of what the Grant is all about, or what purposes the Documentation Center is to serve on a level beyond the merely routine.

The DocCen staff estimates its holdings at somewhere between 500 and 700 individual items (we suspect their guesstimate is high). The collection consists of disparate odds-and-ends about development, technical assistance, development administration, specific country programs, donor organizations, etc. In no one facet of this sweep of subjects is the DocCen authoritatively stocked. It relies on others to send it materials; at least in the last report-year, no money was expended on acquisitions. The material is not yet fully catalogued. That is, several starts have been made over time--one such is in progress--to install a catalogue system of one ambitious sort or

another, but each DocCen leader appears to have dismissed what the previous started and begun anew. Ms. Jan Miracle, with the DocCen until a few months ago, did not complete the cataloguing according to "her" system. The two staff persons now on board have begun a new effort, guided by instructions from senior PASITAM staff. To speed the cataloguing system along, I suggested a much simpler approach, commensurate with the size of present holdings multiplied several times over: a system of "key words" or "mono-terms", and a semi-mechanized system of duplicating cards. Upon departure from Bloomington, I had the impression that Mr. Trout and Mr. Magnuson, who works with him, had accepted the proposal. In short, the DocCen is in a state of shambles. Moreover, it also doubles as "warehouse" for certain publications of the IDRC and PASITAM. Considerable space in that room is taken up with stock of the Blase sourcebook, etc.

This still leaves the greater question of what the DocCen has become, or has not become, at the end of the fourth year of the Grant period. It really seems to serve no adequate purpose. Inquiries to the DocCen are few, if one dismisses requests for copies of IDRC or PASITAM publications. There is no capacity for analysis in the present staffing. A suggestion to Dr. Axinn that the DocCen be absorbed by his MUCIA office in East Lansing brought forth the reply, quite justified we believe, that the collection of materials he already has at MUCIA headquarters exceeds that of the DocCen quantitatively and qualitatively.

DocCen staff also double in another role: that of editors of research products of PASITAM. It is not clear what qualifications its two staff members have as editors, but this is beyond the scope of the appraisal report.

5. Linkage Building

PASITAM has not succeeded in building linkages between its office and the participating universities. There is no evidence that the existence of the program is known to a significant potential clientele of staff and students on each of the campusses. Two anecdotal illustrations may help. At the first meeting of the advisory committee that I attended, in April 1974, a draft was discussed of a pamphlet descriptive of Grant and what it could offer. I was amazed to find this on the agenda at the end of the third year of the Grant period. I was even more amazed to find that the draft failed to mention explicitely and fully the purposes of the Grant, and its AID origin. (I discovered, too, that the deputy program director at that time had never read either the Grant document or the Foreign Assistance Act section 211(d).) The second illustration is the fact that even during this last year I have received a number of phone calls from academicians from one or another MUCIA campus, asking whether our Division might support their research; these persons in each case were unfamiliar with PASITAM, or that it offered a possibility for funding relevant projects.

Universities, of course, are complex bureaucracies, and in this case none of five has a structure similar to that of any of the others. The task of establishing liaison, of maintaining contact, is a difficult one. Yet, of all the roles of the PASITAM program director, that one surely is the most vital, if the basic purpose of the Grant, enhancing expertize on the five campusses, is to be met.

PASITAM scores higher in its ability to liaison with various units of AID. Here the personality of its program director, and his wide contacts throughout AID, are of great help. Because his personal professional assistance is sought quite frequently by various bureaus and offices, he is able to dialogue with them both as an individual professional and in his PASITAM role. This has been a very positive feature of the present director's incumbency. It has not, however, compensated for other programmatic and managerial shortcomings.

Like the PASITAM program director, members of the advisory committee have not been effective, on the whole, in serving as links between PASITAM and their respective campusses. For one thing, that was not envisaged as their function, since liaison of this type was thought to be a function of the directorship. Though able to a degree to speak on behalf of their respective university at advisory committee meetings, their ability to carry back information to all parts of their large campusses, and to represent PASITAM within their own institutions, is limited.

There have been some contacts between PASITAM and donor agencies other than AID, especially parts of the UN system. They too have been more of the nature of sporadic contacts than institutionalized linkages. I was struck, for instance, that Professor Hoole, who consulted with me in 1974 before departure for Geneva, Switzerland, to work there on his PASITAM project on the experimental approach, has not established contact with the U.N. Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) located in that city; he did not even know of it (he is an authority on the experimental method, but quite new to the development field).

Prompted by a suggestion by the project manager, PASITAM currently is actively canvassing the world of U.S. private voluntary organizations active in LDCs. There is hope that they may contribute trainees to the training course later this year. So far, their collaborative posture with respect to PASITAM cannot yet be assessed.

Grant Management

What has been described above boils down to inadequate management, and this portion of the PAR dwells on management with all the benefits of hindsight. If PARs are to be used not only in connection with the activity with which they deal but as moralities for the enhancement of AID's operations, it is in this section that the most important lessons may be evident.

Headquarters Operations

The decision to have PASITAM headquartered not alongside MUCIA in East Lansing but at a site of its own--at the University of Minnesota during Dr. Bobrow's incumbency; at the Indiana University during the directorship of Dr. Siffin--was unfortunate. Sharing office space with MUCIA, or at least being on the same campus as the MUCIA office, would have kept PASITAM in direct contact with the leadership of the organization to which the Grant was made. Locating it elsewhere--to accomodate the institutional connection of the

program director--resulted in an additional increment of communications difficulty. More important, it contributed to PASITAM's reduced effectiveness in its attempt to "linkage"--to draw together the member universities.

In neither case was the program director fully engaged with PASITAM; both Dr. Siffin and Dr. Bobrow continued to carry other responsibilities. Both employed an assistant director to complement their own work. Not enough is known about the on-the-job collaboration between Drs. Bobrow and Benjamin (his assistant) to permit analysis. Our impression of the relationship between Dr. Siffin and Mr. Trout is that, though there are no personality problems, there is a lack of communication. Mr. Trout often must await "the word" from the program director, and is stymied in his attempts to deal with operational matters. Dr. Siffin appears to be pivotal to the headquarters operations, and in part because of his frequent absences on business, in part for other reasons, the managerial tempo of the PASITAM operation suffers from over-reliance on his direction, thus reducing the effectiveness of the assistant director. A different combination of personalities might collaborate more effectively.

At least since Dr. Siffin's assumption of the directorship, PASITAM has not been located within the academic structure of the university, for the IDRC is a reseach unit organizationally removed from, say, the college of arts and sciences. This in and of itself weakens the effectiveness of PASITAM in catalyzing new departures within the course-and-seminar structure of Indiana University. Sited thus away from the academic mainstream of the home university on the one hand, and away from MUCIA headquarters on the other, the locational factors are a maximization of the worst alternatives.

It is appropriate that Dr. Siffin assume the prime role of forger of external linkages--linkages between PASITAM and AID and other clienteles. This, however, assume that his colleague is adept at internal linkage building, between PASITAM and the constituent universities. Yet neither Dr. Siffin's style nor Mr. Trout's appear to have enabled the latter to perform this role aptly.

There is evidence too that the headquarters operation suffers of a lack of what in institution-building is termed doctrine. Not even the professional staff at headquarters appears to have a full appreciation of what the Grant is all about. Certainly Dr. Bobrow gave evidence of this, and attempted to take PASITAM on a quite different route than that envisaged by the Grant. There is no doubt that Dr. Siffin understands the doctrine, but he appears to have failed to convey it to his colleagues at the PASITAM office.

The lack of doctrine also is reflected in the inadequacies of the research program. A strong, purpose-oriented leadership would have found ways of restricting the support of research to proposals which met the criteria strictly. Given appropriate linkages, we believe that such proposals may have been forthcoming. In any event, if they did not, it would have been more in keeping with the purpose of the Grant to hold off funding of research than to spend Grant funds on projects only loosely connected to the Grant's purposes.

The president and executive director of MUCIA, Dr. Axinn, has consistently displayed a keen interest in PASITAM. There is persuasive evidence that the understanding that he brought to the negotiations for the Grant continue to motivate his concern for the activity. His own heavy schedule has precluded his more persistent attention to PASITAM. Perhaps too, one may conjecture, there were political reasons for his hesitance to intervene in PASITAM affairs following the dismissal of Dr. Bobrow and during the incumbency of the present director, whose own professional links to AID were more intimate than are those of Dr. Axinn.

Not all managerial blame--if blame there is--can be piled at PASITAM's door. At least two issues must be mentionned as reflections on AID's management of this activity.

The first has to do with resources. One million dollars is a lot of money, and of a magnitude equal to most 211(d) Grants. But if this large amount is disaggregated among five universities for five years, one arrives at a total of $40,000 per year per university. And this, given the Herculean task that was set for this activity, is not all that much. Perhaps the aggregate amount was not adequate to provide a "critical mass" for such a complex effort.

The second has to do with management inputs on AID's part. A grant of this type (given the diffuse and innovative character of the Grant purpose) should have warranted the assignment of one officer to work just about full-time with this activity. (At $35,000 over a five year period, this would have represented an additional resource allocation of $175,000--or only a 17.5% addition to the effort.) Instead, because of their load, the two successive project managers had to cater to the needs of an array of activities of which this was only one. Some 211(d) Grants, given for well-defined and widely-understood purposes, may not need that much management on AID's part. This one did.

Indiana University
1005 East Tenth Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc.

81

May 7, 1975

Mr. Kenneth Kornher
TA/DA
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

William J. Siffin
Director
(812) 337-1341

Grafton D. Trout
Assistant Director
(812) 337-5186

Dear Ken:

Ah, 'tis a sad thing to be in such trouble! I have read the recent PAR. According to that document, you have just become the monitor of a project whose management fails to understand the project purpose; to plan properly in support of that purpose; to follow AID directives; to adhere to the scope of work; to provide adequate management; to provide useful reports; and to develop the subject-matter and expertise therein." As the donkey said when they brought out the piano, "That's a heavy load."

Let me neither plead nor argue much about the PAR. It does contain a most constructive recommendation: that there be a full evaluation in the fall of 1975. It will, of course, perceive some problems and surface some differences of judgment. If "institution-building" and "technical assistance methodology" were well developed matters of concept and practice, I doubt there would have been a 211(d) grant on the subjects.

I want to offer you my own views of our situation, along with some illustrative information. Naturally, I prefer that your initial official view of this grant-project not be simply shaped by the recent PAR. Otherwise we shall be damaged beyond our just desserts. I think that your problems as monitor or mine as project manager are neither as grim or grand as Hirsch has asserted. A dispassionate examination of the PAR (not easy!) indicates that it is concerned with (a) basic purpose, (b) organization, management, and implementation strategy, and (c) results. It finds us grossly remiss on all counts. The document astonished me in its variance from impressions received during more than a year's participation by the monitor in Advisory Committee meetings, and quite a few other discussions of our work. Clearly, I really did not judge correctly an important feature of our own task environment.

It is puzzling and painful to be told that, after two and a half years of involvement, I do not understand the purpose of the grant. I have read the grant proposal many times. I have written two annual reports about

our assumptions and activities. There have been many meetings. I have assumed that the purpose of this venture is to build capacity within MUCIA to contribute to AID's ability to help foster appropriate institutions and institutional change, and to strengthen the methodology of technical assistance.

Orally and in writing I have said that this aim will not much be served by more generalities about such things as "leadership," "doctrine" and "linkages," etc. Practitioners have found such generalizations useful sensitizers and sources of clues. But, with regard to institution-building, the need is for something tangible and effective in responses to such ideas that "linkages are important." This is not to knock the old IB formulation; what matters is to get beyond it. We have been trying to do so.

The effort requires a constructive linkage of its own--between academic expertise and those who plan, decide, operate, and evaluate. Our task is to build demonstrably useful capacity. The capacity must consist of practical, reliable knowledge that can be used to improve technical assistance efforts, particularly those with institution-building and institution-changing objectives. This task cannot be done "in general." Milt Esman used to say that "institution-building is a generic process." But institution-building efforts always occur in some specific place, within some sector or program context, in some particular time-frame. A model or perspective made of general labels and particular illustrations is not a very potent tool. Our purpose is to do better--not more of the same. "Better" means concrete and relevant knowledge about how certain kinds of things work, and about the implications of this knowledge for institution-building, institutional change, and technical assistance more generally.

It remains true that "the instrument cannot properly determine the owner's aim." AID is the owner. Insofar as the PAR speaks formally and officially for the Agency, it finds us out of tune with what is desired and expected. As project monitor you will have to make your own judgment of this charge. I will do all I can to describe, explain and argue my view; but I don't expect to supplant your own. I don't want to. Naturally, I would prefer agreement and rapport; but it will have to be AID's judgment that we are or are not acting in accord with project purposes.

The PAR faults us on all possible counts in the area of operations, management, and strategy (except for the conclusion that "our staff is of the proper size and is technically qualified." The latter point is, however, at least partly refuted in the text.) We have not complied with Agency directives; are not linked into the MUCIA schools, have a Documentation and Analysis Center that is "a shambles," and more. (Or less.) If all of this is true, and if the project monitor had been meeting his responsibilities, why was I not asked to resign long before now? I am dismayed at the tone of cavalier uninformed hostility on the part of someone who was supposed to serve as our chief official link with AID. I welcome--and

need--positive criticism. Sweeping indictments that ignore available facts are another matter. If we have not followed all the AID directives (i.e., the approved statements in the grant proposal) it is partly a matter of having failed to yet fulfil all of the key specifications of a proposal that was drafted with a $4,000,000 budget. The budget was somewhat changed. I do not recall that the substance of the project document was.

We have not concentrated upon "team leader selection," and "advisor-counterpart relations," and some other detailed items in the grant proposal. We have gotten involved in the orientation of key technical assistance contract personnel, and hope to do more in this area. We have not become much involved in training per se, an activity which is not directly a 211(d) type of activity anyway. We have been building a training capacity within MUCIA, and will do more in the coming months. Part of that capacity lies in the materials that we are producing. In addition, one of our grant "products" is currently very much in use in training within AID, as I shall note below. We have so far involved eighteen academics from four of the MUCIA schools in ten different projects or "subgrants." Almost an equal number of individuals has been or is otherwise engaged in some constructive relationship with us. At least three courses or seminars have been created or much shaped through our efforts. It is false to assert that we are not substantially linked into the MUCIA schools.

We do have some earnest problems of management. I fired the head of our Documentation and Analysis Center after a wasted year. The person has been replaced, but some DAC problems are yet to be overcome. They are not the problems of building another self-contained reference center in a world that has enough of those. Nor do they much involve the adoption of some particular kind of classification system. DAC is something of a mess and more of a promise at this point. Only in the eyes of someone looking for an elaborate special library is the place "a shambles."

It is useful access to salient information that counts--not shelves and files of material. We deliberately changed the label of "Documentation" mentioned in the grant proposal to "Documentation and Analysis," to avoid going into the library business. Given our budget that was an imperative, although there are more important reasons. Our aim is dissemination of useful information to prospective users. We are building a process, not a collection. The work is well behind our original projections, but it is intelligently conceived.

The ultimate test of our merit must be results. These will demonstrate the extent to which we comprehend what this grant is all about, and will also show if our operations, management, and strategy are any good. In principle, we are supposed to have a certain level of capability in place by the time the grant period has ended. Much of that will be visible within the near future. But there are already some concrete results--direct products of efforts under this grant during the period in which I have directed it. For example:

(1) Richard Blue, of Minnesota, undertook an analysis for us of factors involved in the design of AID rural development projects (along with three colleagues at Minnesota and Michigan State). His report, scheduled to be published this summer, will reflect the creation of the sort of capability I assume to be envisioned in a 211(d) grant. The course he developed at Minnesota, which continues to be offered in his temporary absence, was much shaped and influenced by his PASITAM-funded work. Dan Creedon, head of the Manpower Development Division of AID, was sufficiently impressed with Blue's appreciation of AID's technical assistance concerns to hire Blue for two years to help design and implement AID's development officer training program. I think of this as (1) a case of the development of the intended sort of capacity, (2) the achievement of palpable products from the effort to be used by others within MUCIA and outside it, and (3) the movement beyond the 211(d) mode of action into the use of the capacity by AID. Grant that this is but one case. But grant too that the case tends to challenge several of the assertions of the PAR.

(2) Brian Job of Minnesota and some colleagues in other MUCIA schools are addressing concerns regarding project design and evaluation that are central features of the "methodology of technical assistance." Capacity is being built. Linkages with and among MUCIA schools are involved. And some of the capacity is soon to be "tested" through applications to actual AID concerns.

(3) One important current line of technical assistance effort seeks to build international intermediaries for the transfer of various kinds of technology in the service of agricultural development. The design of these intermediaries is an important matter, involving both technical assistance methodology and institutional development. One of our projects, based at Wisconsin and moving to Illinois, has been analyzing this subject. Results have already been displayed to some of the operationally interested persons. People in AID, in fact, have been exploring the possibility of a TDY assignment for the individual, to help AID determine its approach to possible support for INTSOY, the international soybean organization headquartered at Illinois. Within the next three months two reports will be published out of this work. They should be useful in the design of certain technical assistance activity.

I can cite other examples of effort which reflect and serve the aims of the grant as I understand them. I look forward to the opportunity to do so. (I will also report some that have not succeeded. But, even these refute a bald assertion in the PAR--of limited, ineffectual linkages between headquarters and the MUCIA schools.)

The PAR is by no means all wrong. We have some important management problems, and steps are being taken to deal with them. But the basic question at this point is simply: Does this venture possess a promise sufficiently substantial to justify it? If an informed evaluation fails to produce an affirmative answer, the program should be terminated. If the answer is not negative, then thought should be given to the time-frame in which we are operating. A year and a half elapsed before this grant began to be set upon its present course. In the past two and a half years (which involved only two full academic years) a strategy has been shaped and

strengthened. A sizeable amount of capacity-building has gotten underway, and some of it is well advanced. During the year ahead, quite a few of our efforts and investments will be coming to fruition. In an additional year, within existing funding, it will be possible to display and disseminate results, and to determine whether AID wishes to utilize some of them--or not, as the case may be.

Given my notion that we are doing proper and worthwhile things, that we do indeed comprehend the project purpose and ways to implement it, this timing question is programmatically important. If an evaluation rejects that notion, it ceases to be.

Sincerely,

Bill

William J. Siffin
Director

/ah

cc: Kenneth Levick
Mary Mozynski
George Axinn
Ed Mikol

Attachment B

SUMMARY PROGRESS STATEMENT
ONGOING PROJECTS

Project # 004

Project Title Agricultural Information and Related Activities

Contractor a) U.S. Department of Agriculture

b) _____

I. Implementation Progress

Outputs	Progress to Date & Relationship to Project Purpose and Goal
Responding to inquiries received from developing countries, in particular USAID Missions, LDC institutions and international centers. Developing and printing publications as field needs indicate and revising and reprinting those in high demand. Maintaining a constant flow of technical information to the field.	Over 2100 inquiries were processed in FY 75. About 20 publications were written, revised or reprinted; a slide set produced; and a textbook ready for publication. LDC and U.S. Agriculturalists are receiving prompt, complete and accurate service in the area of agricultural information.

II. Project on Schedule: Life-of-Project Budget Accurate?

YES

III. Significant Change(s) in Project Proposed?

It is planned to expand USDA activities, specifically to assume certain responsibilities of the Technical Information Specialist, who has been transferred to TA/PPU.

IV. Role of TA Technical Office: Mandays required

AID:	Professional	300 man-days
	Non-Professional:	200 man-days
	Total	500 man-days
USDA:	Professional:	1553 man-days
	Non-Professional:	962 man-days
	Total	2515 man-days

Attachment: PAR dated 6/21/75

AID 1020/25 (10-70)

REPORT U-440

87

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
064	7/1/74 TO 6/30/75	Worldwide	

5. PROJECT TITLE

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 72 Ends FY Cont.	7. DATE LATEST PROP	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
	--------	--------	---------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $379,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $ 296,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
U.S. Department of Agriculture	RSSA 3-74

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X) AA	AID/W	Other	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
X	X		1. Continue regular dispatch of agricultural information materials to USAID's and simultaneously conduct a review on relevance of material to changing AID priorities.	Nov. 1975
	X		2. Develop strategies for reaching more LDC users, i.e. expand mailing lists to include Ministries of Agriculture, Extension Directors and others.	Oct. 1975
X	X		3. Plan for one or more newsletters; identify audiences and determine scope, format and frequency.	Aug. 1975
X			4. Devise ways of both advertising informational services available to developing countries (through newsletters in #3 above?) and developing a broader base of LDC users.	Oct. 1975
X	X		5. Increase capability for response to writing and editorial needs of AID.	Aug. 1975
X	X		6. Consider broadening Sabbatical/Study Leave Program and explore alternate funding of expenses.	Oct. 1975
X	X		7. Finally, set up an inter-agency committee with AID and USDA representatives to make an in-depth survey of the RSSA services, in particular the points cited above.	Aug. 1975

REVISED OR NEW: ☐ PROP ☐ PIP ☐ PROG AG ☐ PROJ ☐ PROG ☐ PROP

PROJECT MANAGER (Typed name, signature, office symbol, and date) | DEPUTY DIRECTOR (Typed name, signature, office symbol, and date)

Ruth W. Lancelotti 7/1/75 | Leon Weiser/Robert Myron 7/3/75

AID 1020-28 (1-72)

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: From FY 73 to FY Continuing
Total U.S. Funding 3[illegible]5,000
Date Prepared: May [illegible], 1975

Project Title & Number: "Agricultural Information and Related Services," RSSA No. 3-74

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: Increase agricultural productivity and improve living standards in the LDC's.	Measures of Goal Achievement: Improved methodology is adopted by farm families.	There is a measurable increase in agricultural productivity, as observed by government and AID technicians, resulting in improved diets and higher incomes.	Assumptions for achieving goal targets: Government policies are conducive to the targets and delivery systems directed to rural families are in place.
Project Purpose: Provide agriculturalists in the LDC's with information necessary in (1) performing their assignments and (2) keeping abreast of developments in agriculture and in their areas of specialization. Also keep the American public aware of AID's aims and activities.	Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status. As long as the U.S. has a technical assistance program in the developing countries, there will be need for these technical information services.	USAID, LDC officials and others receive information, training aids and publications expeditiously. These materials are well-suited to the planned purpose. New manuscripts are developed in response to field needs and given widespread distribution.	Assumptions for achieving purpose: Channels remain open to facilitate information transfer from and to developed and developing countries and within the developing countries themselves.
Outputs: Backstopping USAID's, PASA and contract teams, LDC officials and technicians in the area of technical information including replies to technical inquiries. Responding to U.S. inquiries concerning the AID program. Writing, editing and publishing original manuscripts and newsletters for LDC training, education and information programs.	Magnitude of Outputs: Prompt, complete and accurate responses to AID technical inquiries and U.S. requests. Compilation of bi-weekly packets to the USAID's and PASA teams. Issuance of reports and updating of AID/USDA report listings. Maintenance and development of AID/USDA Reference Center.	These services are in continual demand. Periodic packets of agricultural materials are sent to USAID's. Requests for information and publications are running at an average of 2100 per year. About 20 publications have been written, revised, or reprinted, and a slide set produced.	Assumptions for achieving outputs: An adequate staff is in place carrying forward the multi-faceted aspects of the technical information program and taking on special assignments.
Inputs: Adequate professional and clerical staff and editorial and printing facilities exist.	Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) Present staff consists of approximately 5 professionals and 3 secretaries. In view of increasing demand on these ongoing services, it is planned to enlarge staff.	The services are acclaimed by users worldwide both in written testimonials and in briefing and de-briefing sessions. Often expressed is the idea that these services constitute the one constant link with AID/Washington.	Assumptions for providing inputs: Liaison has been established with USDA and AID program offices, the National Agricultural Library, land-grant universities, FAO and other U.S. institutions; and a working knowledge enabling utilization of multi-faceted computerized information systems has been developed.

STANDARD KEY QUESTIONS

A. Project Inputs

1. YES. Key inputs are being supplied according to plan by the USDA.

2. NO. The supply of inputs is no longer adequate. AID foresees deeper involvement by USDA in AID's technical information planning, production and distribution activities. Hence, more staff should be available.

3. The performance of the action agent against the plan was outstanding. USDA has displayed a high degree of cooperation with AID in maintaining a flow of appropriate technical information and responding to USAID, AID/W and LDC requests promptly and effectively.

B. Transformation of Inputs Into Outputs

4. YES. The management hypothesis that the totality of the resources applied to the project will be sufficient to produce the predetermined outputs by the specified target dates is still valid, on the assumption that USDA increases staff availability to meet increased demands on the services.

5. YES. The project design and methodology are still the most appropriate, provided there is a built-in flexibility to accommodate shifting AID priorities. Thus, some changes may be made but the overall thrust will remain the same.

C. Project Outputs

6. See attached matrix for output indicators, their planned targets, and the actual performance achieved for each during the period under review.

   a. YES. USDA performance was directly on planned target.

   b. YES. The attached matrix reflects the changes that are necessary to meet the demand for increased services.

   c. YES. USDA's reports provide all data necessary for close monitoring and analysis on a continuing basis.

D. Project Purpose

7. The statement of purpose remains the same as in the attached matrix.

   a. YES. The purpose has remained the same over the many years these services have been available.

   b. YES. The statement of purpose remains consistent with the RSSA.

8. Conditions for achieving the purpose are the same as those shown in the attached matrix.

9. YES. Critical assumptions for achieving purpose are still valid.

10. YES. The development hypothesis for achievement of project purpose is still valid.

    YES. The RSSA rationale remains sound.

E. Program Goal

11. YES. The programming goal and the key problem area remain constant to that shown in the matrix and original PROP.

12. YES. The achievement of project purpose continues to have high priority in contributing to the program goal. It is of the utmost importance that current and accurate agricultural information be provided to USAID and LDC users and others interested in the AID program in a prompt and expeditious manner.

13. YES. The assumptions for achieving goal and measures of goal achievement are still valid.

    YES. The assumptions for achieving goal and measures of goal achievement are reflected in the attached matrix.

14. The area of agricultural information is of great importance to all AID projects and related projects of other governmental and international agencies.

RESULTS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This RSSA with USDA has two scopes of work -- one for the Economic Research Service (ERS) and the other for the Extension Service (ES). Together these offices represent a technical information source and response capability for the USAIDs, LDC institutions, cooperators in international development and the general public.

The result is a flow of agricultural information required by technicians overseas to increase their on-job effectiveness and to keep them abreast with the latest developments in their professional fields. Target audiences are Ministries of Agriculture, Libraries, Experiment and Extension Stations, Universities, other Institutions, Voluntary Agencies, Peace Corps Volunteers, Missionaries and private individuals in the developing countries, the U.S., and other developed countries.

Inquirers in the U.S. and other developed countries generally are those working in international agriculture or individuals desiring information on AID's agriculture program.

In this Fiscal Year, ERS has answered more than 1,200 requests for technical information and AID-developed or AID-related materials; and ES handled over 900 for a combined total of 2,100 inquiries serviced under the RSSA. These requests came from about 70 countries. In responding staffers performed literature searches at USDA program offices and reference centers and utilized the information systems of the National Agricultural Library, the Cooperative State Research Service, State Extension Services and Universities, as warranted.

In the area of information development, ERS completed a slide set on AID's centrally funded agricultural program, with an accompanying narrative brochure; revised the "Summary of Ongoing Research and Technical Assistance Projects in Agriculture"; published "USDA and the Low-Income Nations, 1974"; and reprinted "The Marketing Challenge" and "Improving Marketing Systems in Developing Nations." Dr. Paul Miller has completed the manuscript for the "Multilingual Compendium of Plant Diseases" and it is to be published by the American Phytopathological Society under an agreement that will insure maximum utilization of this highly important work. ES has ten original manuscripts in process and expects to complete six this Fiscal Year. Revised publications include the Methods Series -- "Educational Campaigns," "Educational Tours," "Farm and Home Visits," "Seeing is Believing," "Showing How," and "Helping Hands." Among the five publications reprinted are "Agricultural Extension Training" and "Visuals for Villagers." Demand for all these publications has been exceptionally high.

Significant publications and periodicals have been sent periodically to the USAIDs and AID/W Bureaus. ES dispatched these in bi-weekly packets which included a covering memorandum describing each of the five or six publications and suggesting possible uses. Two issues of the Extension International Exchange were dispatched with a third issue projected for this Fiscal Year and one issue of Home Economics Extension went out. These newsletters were sent to 550 agricultural leaders in the developing countries.

The collection of the AID/USDA Reference Center maintained by ERS was publicized at a briefing given at a TA/AGR staff meeting and an ERS memorandum summarizing the presentation circulated to other AID/W Offices and Bureaus.

ES initiated the Sabbatical Study Leave Project through which university professors serve in LDCs on a non-salaried basis. So far over 60 well-qualified individuals have responded and their resumes have been sent to USAIDs, FAO and Peace Corps Representatives. One seminar on Reaching the Rural Poor was sponsored by ES with Dr. Joseph Di Franco of FAO presiding.

Responding to an AID request, ERS placed under contract in January two highly qualified librarians who are assisting in the development of AID's Bibliographic Control and Document Delivery System.

ISSUES RAISED AT APRIL 24th REVIEW

A Type "B" Review was held for the RSSA on April 24 and it elicited expressions of general satisfaction on performance under present terms of reference. In attendence were representatives from AA/TA, other TA Offices, Regional Bureaus and the PASA Office, and from the Department of Agriculture, representatives from ERS and ES.

The more significant issues raised concerned desirability of expanding and increasing services to conform to shifting priorities of AID. Moreover, the question arose whether all target audiences were aware of services already existing under the RSSA. In view of staff limitations overseas, there were requests that the USAID's be assisted in their efforts to achieve maximum impact in the dissemination of technical information. The group also wanted to know about the Sabbtical/Study Leave Program and how it might meet present-day needs. Concern was expressed on origins of requests -- domestic and developed countries vis-a-vis USAID and developing countries. It was pointed out, however, that the former type would have to be answered by AID, if not handled under the RSSA. In fact, many such requests are received initially by AID's Office of Public Affairs and referred to the Technical Information Specialist.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT APRIL 24th REVIEW

M. Belcher	AA/TA
Leon Kesser	TA/AGR
Michael Galli	TA/AGR
Ryland Holmes	TA/PPU
Charles Molfetto	TA/PPU
W. T. Harris	NESA/TECH
Lloyd Clyburn	AFR/CWR
Everett Headrick	AFR/ESA
D. T. Myren	TA/PPU
Kurt Anschel	TA/AGR
Edwin Rawson	CM/PAS
Helen Schroeder	CM/PAS
Al Chable	LA/DR/RD
John Gunning	TA/PM
Ruth Lancetti	TA/PPU
Helen Strow	ES/USDA
Lawrence McGary	ES/USDA
Patricia Wetmore	ERS/USDA
O. A. Lauman	ERS/USDA
Woodrow Leake	AFR/RA

SMALL ACTIVITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TA/DA PROGRAM FY 1976, INTERIM QUARTER AND FY 1977.

The following summarizes that TA/DA office needs in categories coming under this section within KPA 24 (other Worldwide Technical Assistance). A brief statement follows the summary for those items requiring explanation.

		FY 76	I.Q.	FY 77
a. Small Research Projects				
1st Priority: Project Management for Rural Equality		$25,000		
2nd Priority: L.D.C. Perspective in Project Management			$25,000	
TOTAL	TOTAL	$25,000	$25,000	
b. Evaluation & Utilization - none		-0-	-0-	-0-
c. Special Projects				
1) Project Design - none				
2) Conferences Management in Technical Assistance		$10,000		
3) Field Service/Support: Purchase Orders, Task Orders, etc.		$15,000	$ 4,000	$15,000
4) Books, Publications, Subscriptions		$ 6,500	$ 1,000	$ 6,500
TOTAL	TOTAL	$31,500	$30,000	$21,500
GRAND TOTAL		$56,500	$30,000	$21,500

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BUREAU

OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

PROGRAM SUBMISSION

FY 76-77

	Narrative Page	Tab Page
Part I. Narrative Sa		
A. Office Summary		
1. Focus and Character of Program	1	1-2
2. Manpower Considerations	4	
3. KPA and Activity Priorities	5	1
4. Other Main Office Tasks	7	
5. Current Office Workload	10	
B. Key Problem Area Summary		
1. Agricultural Management (KPA #6)	11	4
2. Selected Development Problems (KPA #24)	14	5
a. Project Management	14	17-18, 20-22
b. Institution Building and TA Methodology	17	19
C. Project Narratives		
1. Project Identification Documents		
New Projects		
a. Appraising Health Management Systems (KPA #12)	20	3
b. Training Materials in Health Management (KPA #12)	25	3
c. Project Management (KPA #24)	31	20-22
d. Commodity Action Systems (KPA #6)	38	15
e. Agricultural Implementation (KPA #6)	44	14

	Narrative Page	T Pa
2. Summary Progress Statements		
Ongoing Projects		
a. Local Action Guidance and Implementation (KPA #6)	51	9-1
b. Agricultural Management--Commodity Systems (KPA #6)	55	6,
c. Agricultural Management--Ag. Sector Implementation (KPA #6)	59	6, 1
d. Multisector Project and Program Management (KPA #24)	63	17, 1
e. MUCIA 211(a) (KPA #24)	66	19
f. Agricultural Information and Related Activities	86	
D. Small Activity Requirements for TA/DA Program FY 1976, Interim Quarter and FY 1977	94	13

Part II. Tabular Set

A. Office Summary	1
B. Key Problem Area Summaries	3
C. Project Data Sheets	6