BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. CONTROL NUMBER	2. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION (695)
	PN-AAK-885	DC00-0000-G100

3. TITLE AND SUBTITLE (240)
The role of agriculture in the economic development of Africa with emphasis on technical manpower requirements

4. PERSONAL AUTHORS (100)
~~Motheral, J. R.; Davis Donald~~
Motheral, J. R.; Davis, Donald

5. CORPORATE AUTHORS (101)
Experience, Inc.

6. DOCUMENT DATE (110)	7. NUMBER OF PAGES (120)	8. ARC NUMBER (170)
1976	46p.	

9. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION (130)
EXPERIENCE

10. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (500)

11. ABSTRACT (950)

12. DESCRIPTORS (920)
agricultural development
agricultural planning
agricultural policy
rural development
planning
organization
feasibility
project design
project evaluation
manpower
manpower [illegible]ation

13. PROJECT NUMBER (150)	
698 013500	
14. CONTRACT NO.(140)	15. CONTRACT TYPE (140)
AID/afr-c-1130	
16. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (160)	

AID 590-7 (10-79)

The Role of Agriculture in the Economic Development of Africa With Emphasis on Technical Manpower Requirements

by
Joe R. Motheral and Donald Davis*

PREFACE

We were employed under an AID contract in the latter part of 1976 to perform a series of services which were summarized in the PIO/T as follows:

"In carrying out their duties, contractor personnel will:

(a) Review African government requests for development assistance and make recommendations on the priority and feasibility of such request;

(b) Participate in drafting project review and/or project papers (PRPs and PPs);

(c) Provide required expertise to direct-hire personnel during subsequent Bureau reviews;

(d) Assist in the design of integrated rural development, agricultural research, crop production, livestock production and associated rural development projects;

(e) Analyze and provide critiques of research or feasibility proposals;

(f) Conduct special studies of African rural development problems which may be identified during the review of project documentation, and which may serve as guidance for the Bureau in formulating program policies and strategies".

---

* Consultants, Africa Bureau, AFR/DR/ARD, under an AID contract (AID/afr-c-1130), Experience Incorporated.

The work was to be carried out under these assumptions:

"1. AID and the Africa Bureau intend to continue to focus upon agricultural and rural development in the LDCs over the next five to ten years.

2. Resources to be allocated to the development of agriculture and rural development in Africa are expected to increase over the next few years.

3. A.I.D. and the Africa Bureau require the best available staff to take the lead in planning the use of AID's resources and monitoring the implementation of program activities.

4. A.I.D. and the Africa Bureau will continue to rely upon intermediaries (U.S. universities, private contractors, USDA, etc.) to implement projects in the LDCs.

5. A.I.D. and the Africa Bureau will continue to maintain the field mission concept."

During these three months we examined and reviewed scores of project documents at all stages of their evolution. Our studies included numerous budget submissions, country program books, sector analyses, special reports, cables and correspondence, reports of international, regional and privately supported agencies, and a host of other related and contributory materials. We participated in review conferences.

As our assignment progressed, certain common patterns in the approach to African agricultural development began to appear. We were first surprised, then appalled by the mediocre quality of the program documents that came under review, and the more so by the sheer quantity of paper work required to reach the implementation stage on a project.

Particularly disappointing were the weaknesses in economic and social analysis offered in support of many projects. It almost seemed at times that project sponsors believed that repetition of poor documentation somehow would strengthen their case. The mechanics of presentation, although not a conclusive factor in project appraisal, were substandard and a distraction from the main points at issue.

Worst of all, we detected no sure sense of priorities in project selection. And in a veritable sea of program analysts, in our judgment there were no programs.

These deficiencies were a grim reminder that the United States finds itself in various stages of commitment to a multi-billion dollar development program in Africa during the next 20-25 years. As hired consultants, and no less as concerned citizens, we felt obliged to identify the shortcomings of AID's undertakings in Africa and, insofar as possible, to propose remedial measures for correcting them.

The means to be used, we felt, lay in the problems associated with AID's administration and staff, and it is toward people and their assigned responsibilities within the organization that our analysis is directed. A short background review of relevant U.S. and AID policies precedes the body of the report.

Authorization for this study is contained in item (f) of the above-quoted section of the PIO/T.

The Role of Agriculture in the Economic Development of Africa With Emphasis on Technical Manpower Requirements

Contents

Summary & Conclusions

This report is a brief review of U.S. and AID management policies as they affect agricultural economic development in 34 countries of Africa. African agricultural programs are encountering trouble, and the principal cause for it is identified with the changing composition and use of professional manpower in both AID/Washington and in AID missions overseas.

U.S. foreign aid policies, from the start, have been compounded of humanitarianism and enlightened self-interest. Their most recent manifestation of relevance to this inquiry is the inclination expressed by the Congress since 1973, which calls for first priority in American assistance abroad to be given to the most impoverished nations, and within them, to the poorest farmers.

The tragic coincidence of drought in the Sahel region in 1969-73 parallelled the issuance of Congressional views and brought U.S. and world attention to bear on the plight of Africa, with its disproportionate burden of Least Developed Countries (LDC) and rural poverty. Agriculture, in its most wretched state of development, is patently the core of the African economic problem.

Ironically, as these facts unfolded, AID was preoccupied with dismantling its technical agricultural capability. Three figures substantially tell the story: Between 1968 and 1976, the total number of US nationals employed by AID worldwide declined by 55 percent. During the same period, however, personnel in agriculture (including biology) were slashed by 78 percent. Simultaneously, the number of program analysts was increased by 356 percent. No region was excepted from these adjustments, and the Africa Bureau sustained its share of the change.

This transformation entailed more than mere numbers. A category known as "Technical Generalists" was created and specifically subordinated to the "broader Program Generalists". The "Technical Specialist" was listed number 13 in a field of 13 occupational classifications. The "Project Manager" came into being with the admonition that he was not really to manage anything at all.

The latest announcement of promotions elevates 31 executives and program management types to the higher Civil Service grades, and none in agriculture. Agriculturists are conspicuous by their omissions from the periodic honors award rosters. Technical competence in agriculture, although not wholly abjured, is no longer considered critical to the decision-making process.

It may be noted parenthetically that the general attrition of AID staff in the last nine years had a differential impact between AID/W and the field. There was a relative pile up of staff headquartered in Washington, the number rising from 42 percent of the total employed in 1968 to 65 percent in 1976. Conversely, field staff declined from 58 to 35 percent of the total during the same period. Many field missions, including those in Africa, were stripped, especially of their technical personnel.

What were the effects of the downgrading of agricultural specialists? The most obvious was an enormous proliferation of paper work, much of it ambiguous and repetitive. As recently as March 1975, an AID Circular lists 30 separate and mostly major steps from conceptualization to termination of a project, and there is no assurance that more will not be added.

The snail's pace in project approval and implementation inherent in these requirements, unfortunately, has not been matched by improvements in quality or thoroughness. On the contrary, the economic and social analyses accompanying agricultural project submissions are often weak and insubstantial. Outside of

the Sahel, there is little evidence of a sensitivity to priorities or of program content. Frequently, projects arise from the preconceptions of transient consultants, without much visible relationship among project objectives. The judgments and experience of seasoned agricultural technicians seem less and less to find their way into project documentation, and adequate Washington review is scarcely feasible in light of AID/W's technical staff limitations.

Among the measures to remedy this situation, is a recommendation that agricultural sector assessments be conducted immediately in the 20-25 African countries which have not received the benefits of this basic type of survey/ accompanied by appropriate increases in field staff. Each should be carried out with the understanding and collaboration of host governments, participation by a regular AID staff member or members and designed to provide a proper base for the establishment of development priorities, to be followed by project, program and staff requirements.

Other recommendations call for strengthening the staff of AFR/RD/ARD and, in selected cases, of mission technical staffs. A great many adjustments are also needed to straighten out the present jumble of line and staff authority both in Washington and the field. These problems are addressed in general - and to the extent possible - specific terms in this report.

One final question that is certain to arise is, "Where are the qualified people?" We have faced this question and can report that they are available from several sources. The first task is to restore agriculture to the status of an honored profession, and the talent will be forthcoming.

The Role of Agriculture in the Economic Development of Africa With Emphasis on Technical Manpower Requirements

BACKGROUND

Following the successes of the Marshall Plan in Western Europe after World War II, the United States turned its attention to three continents comprising the greatest economic need. For two decades, Latin-America and Asia received the bulk of American technical and financial assistance.

The motivations for the U.S. foreign assistance program were mixed. Perhaps, the foremost was humanitarianism and a proud American tradition of sharing one's wealth with less fortunate neighbors. Second was self-interest, grounded in the belief that developing nations would be less hostile to the Free World and less susceptible to the machinations of totalitarian forces, than would countries with stagnant economic and social systems. Third, and probably in order of importance, were commercial objectives, the reasoning that nations which produce no surpluses are poor customers for American goods. Finally, there was an awakening to the reality that the United States truly was a world power attendant with the duties and responsibilities of such a global role.

Foreign aid, unmarred by warranties of reciprocation, was an untested undertaking. If the verifiable successes of the first 20 years of U.S. effort could be matched against the better known failures, the score might still be a subject of controversy. However, the severest of critics would concede that this country, by its basically selfless attack on worldwide poverty ,

gained the confidence and respect of untold millions of beneficiaries and observers alike.

For several reasons, the rationing of American aid resources slighted Africa until recent years. Colonial control over African territories survived longer than elsewhere. Independence, when it came, arrived with a rush, and ties - commercial, cultural and emotional - with the once Mother Countries survive in varying forms until this day. U.S. aid to Africa for a long while was either unjustified or greeted with apathy, or both.

The need for a revised U.S. policy toward the newer African nations was apparent for some time, but it was dramatized by the disastrous drought of 1968-73 in the Sahel States. The American response to human suffering, as usual, was prompt and generous. As the emergency neared an end, the full scope of longer range problems in that region emerged and the United States, along with the international community, began laying plans for intermediate and longer term remedies.

Disaster in the Sahel, meanwhile, drew attention to the extreme vulnerability of much of the rest of the continent - to nagging food deficits, deplorable health conditions, substandard education - the whole spectrum of ills of a neglected people . The case for an accelerated aid program for the extraordinarily disadvantaged African populations was documented in many places.

In AID's 1977 Submission to the Congress, it was noted that:

- 18 of the world's 28-least developed countries are in Africa.

- 26 of those countries designated as most severely affected by fuel and food cost increases are found there.

- Health conditions are the worst in the world.

- Food production is lagging ominously behind population growth.

- Poverty and lack of economic progress are endemic.

- World recession and declining raw material prices have exacerbated an already perilous situation.

The list goes on and on. If present U.S. policy favoring aid to the most impoverished countries is to be meaningful, it follows that Africa must be the object of the most intense concentration of effort and resources that can be applied toward economic development there.

And by any logic, agriculture must be the focus of the developmental thrust. Typically, farm population comprises up to 90 percent of the total in African countries and accounts for about 50 percent of the GNP.

In these countries agriculture is the means of survival, the dominant way of life, the source of most government revenues and, for the foreseeable future, the mainstay of capital accumulation. Much remains to be done to improve the infrastructure in African countries, especially as it relates to agricultural productivity. In most cases, industrial growth of any consequence lies far in the future. Mineral extraction is important in a few countries. but beset with the uncertainties of a capricious market. Social services are desperately needed but the means of support for them are totally inadequate. Thus, agriculture essentially embodies the problems, the needs and the only visible prospect leading to a better life for millions of Africans.

The dimensions of Africa's plight may be measured in various ways; one is by matching prospective world food supplies against population growth rates. A recent study [1/] projects a cereal shortfall of 100 million tons for

---

1/ "Meeting Food Needs in the Developing World" International Food Policy Research Institute, 1976.

1985/86 in all the food deficit countries, among which are numbered a score of African countries. Under unfavorable weather conditions, this figure, the authors conclude, could swell to 200 million tons. If these projections are even remotely realistic, there is no conceivable way for non-African production to bridge the gap in Africa.

On one count, all authorities agree that the solution basically rests within the production capabilities of the countries threatened by famine. It becomes all the more urgent, therefore, that the agricultural problem be attacked in Africa, in force, and with determined effort.

This paper will outline some of the steps required for such an attack.

CURRENT U. S. POLICIES

The broad contours of U.S. policies are implicit in the preceding comments.

In relation to agricultural programs for Africa - the subject of this paper - it is necessary to inventory a few specific policies of relatively recent vintage.

First, and of greatest importance for assistance to Africa, is the Congressional directive which enjoins AID to give priority to the most impoverished nations of the world. Second, in the identical spirit, within these needy nations the poorest farmers are to have first call on U.S. development investments. As a practical matter of implementation, these are hard choices, the wisdom of which might and sometimes has been a subject of debate. In the meantime, as the operating Agency for foreign assistance, AID is obliged to fulfill the directive to the best of its ability. And by the same token, these requirements again focus attention on Africa with its dire rural poverty and on the necessity for the highest practicable capacity in technical agricultural fields.

Among the other U.S. policies that enjoy wide acceptance in African nations is the goal, in-country, of self-sufficiency in foodstuffs. This objective is sometimes derogated as mere sloganeering, or it is confused with the alternative of import substitution. Often it is regarded more as a sympton of latent nationalism than as an attainable target. But the fact remains that meeting food needs through expanded production within these countries is infinitely superior to reliance on the shaky logistics of import deliveries. Every experience the United States has had in coping with food emergencies overseas confirms this truism. And the technology for stimulating domestic food production is at hand, awaiting the touch of imaginative planning and implementation.

A recurrent theme in numerous legislative acts and AID pronouncements is the policy of promoting maximum participation by host LDC governments and other indigenous institutions in economic development at all stages. Realistically execution of this policy, is limited by the dearth of trained administrators and technicians to be found in most aid-receiving countries.

On the presumption that the real success of foreign aid may be measured by the speed and facility by which recipients shoulder their own leadership burdens, training of host country personnel at all levels becomes an overriding consideration in any development program. More than any other region in the world, Africa suffers from the lack of this vital component.

Family planning, under terms acceptable to aid-receiving countries, is another U.S. policy goal which, while administered on a different plane, is inextricably linked with achievement of domestic food self-sufficiency. Largely because of wretched health standards, Africa is not plagued with explosive population growth rates to the same extent as Asia and Latin-America.

Generally low population density, however sordid the explanation for it, nevertheless buys time in Africa for more methodical and durable agricultural development.

Protection of the environment and greater opportunity for women are other specific U.S. policies that are now included among the standard provisions of agricultural projects in Africa and elsewhere.

AID POLICIES AS REFLECTED IN MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Under the broad canopy of U.S. policies, AID, through administrative decision-making, exercises wide discretion in determining the course and character of the foreign assistance program. The changing patterns of manpower employed by AID is one significant barometer of the Agency's operational strategy.

The year 1968 is useful as a starting point of analyzing trends in manpower because: a) it was a peak year both for total expenditures and personnel; and b) 1968 was something of a watershed in the conceptual framework of the program worldwide. In terms of the changing composition of the AID staff, comparisons between 1968 and the present are a useful indicator of the directions toward which AID management elected to move. 2/

Between June 30, 1968, and June 30, 1976, the total number of U.S. nationals employed by AID, in all occupational categories, declined from 8,306 to 3,706, or a decrease of 55 percent. 3/

2/ It must be borne in mind that the nine years since 1968 were marked by irregular but sustained reductions in appropriations for foreign assistance. Thus, the only valid manpower comparisons are those that measure relative changes.

3/ In response to the dictates of Congress, certain new activities appeared in AID's portfolio for the first time. Examples are the environment, equal opportunities and urban planning, all of which involve small numbers. Public safety was essentially dropped as a subject of AID interest, and such areas as secretarial and messenger services sustained above-average cuts. Not being central to the main proposition of this paper, these adjustments are omitted from the analysis.

Within the core staff, these reductions were grossly disproportionate as to fields of specialization. Technical expertise was heavily downgraded. The score reads:

Engineers (all classes)	minus 79 percent
Health & Medicine	minus 74 percent
Education	minus 79 percent
Agriculture (incl. biology)	minus 78 percent 4/

In the midst of this dispersion of technicians, there was a proliferation of the program staff. Between 1968 and 1976, the number of program analysts increased from 84 to 383, or by 356 percent.

This drastic overhaul of staffing patterns carried overtones that extended far beyond the mere shuffling of occupational categories. Within the context of dwindling overall manpower resources, the traditional functions of the agricultural technician, among others, were blurred or obliterated. 5/ In their stead there emerged a mechanism stressing "management" and, above all, program documentation. Such technical inputs as may be required were to be provided largely by "intermediaries," which roughly equates with contract and PASA personnel, often on assignments of limited duration. In the main, the practice of a direct-hire agricultural technician serving, say, two 2-year tours in a given country, followed by transfer to another overseas post or rotation to AID/Washington, became something of a rarity.

4/ Table I

5/ This shift in administrative philosophy is documented in many places, but see, e.g., AIDTO Circular A-889, 8/21/73; AIDTO Circular A-154, 3/18/75; and, inter alia, AIDTO Circular A-247, 1/30/74.

A whole new lexicon gained currency in AID. The "Technical Generalist" was born. He was to have "managerial, analytical and leadership skills" and, "at the senior level should also be a person with broad knowledge of a technical field (i.e., agriculture)". He was not to be faulted for a speaking acquaintance with the concepts and terminology of that field nor with the interrelationship within and among other technical fields that he might encounter. His credentials must include acceptance by his peers and by the heavier thinkers to be known as "broader Program Generalists!" 6/ Finally, he was to know where to turn when he needed a technical expert.

The "Technical Specialist" was to occupy a third, fourth or bottom layer in the hierarchy. In a roster of proposed personnel categories, this position was number 13 in a field of 13.

"Project Manager" was another new creation. Except for the proviso that he was not, in fact, to manage a project at all (this was to be the prerogative of a host country national or intermediary), the functions of a project manager have never been clearly defined. His tasks have been determined on an ad hoc basis as the assignments arose. An attempt has been made in this paper to clarify the role of the project manager. (See Annex 1.)

6/ A term possibly adapted from the "Classical Generalist", a civil servant concept molded by Wellesley and Macaulay in the heydey of the old Indian Civil Service. Many members of the ICS and, indeed of the British Colonial Office, prided themselves on their lack of specialized technical competence and instead asserted their mastery of administrative skills. This was the elite bureaucratic class, replete with their massive files and the Maxwell System for moving paper about, that presided over the liquidation of the British Empire.

The old food and agriculture officer was no more. In his place was the "Technical Generalist", whose position is well defined in AIDTO Circular A-247 and reproduced here in Annex 2.

Step-by-step, the downgrading of technicians, as illustrated in the preceding data on staffing patterns, was accompanied by the ascendency of generalists or, more commonly, program officers. 7/

DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONNEL, AID/W AND OVERSEAS

Except for the abnormalities occasioned by US involvement in Indo-China, between 1968 and 1976 there was a steady build-up of Washington-based staff in relation to field mission staffs. The actual numbers were as follows:

	1968	1976
Overseas	4,838	1,279
AID/W	3,468	2,427
Total	8,306	3,706*

7/ What may be overlooked in a transition of these dimensions is that an individual who possesses technical skills, even highly specialized ones, often has a flair for management as well and is quite capable of vertical mobility in a large organization. Numerous examples may be cited; for instance, the management leadership of great laboratories and large business concerns, and such government agencies as the Atomic Energy Commission and NASA. The generalist, on the other hand, is grossly handicapped if he attempts to achieve command of technical or scientific disciplines, especially in his mature years. Certain recent political developments in the United States may prove to be a test of this hypothesis.

*Includes 34 special and Indo-China complement.

This shift constituted something more than a reversal of the previous headquarters/field ratio of personnel. Washington staff increased from 42 to 65 percent of the total number of Americans employed between 1968 and 1976, as field staff dropped conversely from 58 to 35 percent of the total. The number of employees with a foreign service designation but posted to Washington, approximately tripled.

Thus, as many overseas missions were stripped of personnel, a great proportion of the people experienced in dealing with foreigners in their own habitat was posted to Washington. The explanation, doubtless well founded in particular cases, was recurrent budget cuts or, alternatively, the need to maintain a low American profile overseas.

RECOGNITION: FOREIGN SERVICE PROMOTIONS

On October 1, 1976, AID announced its annual promotion list for foreign service personnel. (See Annex 4.) A few figures from this list are revealing:

1. Among 4 executives, 4 were promoted from R-3 to R-2.

2. In program management, 33 promotions were given as follows: 6 from R-5 to R-4, 16 from R-4 to R-3 and 11 from R-3 to R-2.

3. In agriculture, 11 individuals received promotion from R-5 to R-4. There were no promotions in the higher grades.

No attempt has been made in this inquiry to measure the limitations on advancement faced by agriculturists over the years, but it is well known that only a handful of persons with a background in agriculture have become mission directors or otherwise attained the higher reaches of AID management. The dispensation of awards for exceptional service has followed the same pattern.

This imbalance in the tendering of professional recognition may best be appreciated against a background embodying the official posture. Throughout all the years of AID's existence and that of its predecessor agencies, agriculture - nominally - has enjoyed the highest priority of all the sectors of development, and the toilers in the Front Lines have received the loftiest [illegible] tributes.

A few of the consequences of this administrative policy are examined in the section that follows.

SOME OF THE RESULTS

An immediate - and then prolonged - effect of these redirections was an enormous proliferation of paper work. In March, 1975, AID/W produced an Illustrative Table of steps to be taken in the initiation, development and termination of AID-supported projects. 8/ From start to finish, 30 separate steps are listed and some of these contain sub-steps. Certain of the major documents, such as the Project Review Paper and the Project Paper, frequently run to 200 pages each, or more. A sector analysis, if it precedes the rest of the flow, may add another 200 pages. And so it goes.

Yet the gross weight of paper is but the tip of the iceberg. A few pages of data may represent thousands of man hours in preparation and multiple thousands of dollars in staff time, transportation and manifold costs. Inevitably, there is duplication and excess verbiage. Even the authors of the program documentation system have been heard to complain about the redundancy of their own handiwork.

8/ Ibid. AIDTO Circular A-247.

Prudence demands, it will be said, that the utmost caution be exercised before committing US funds to development investments abroad. There is no contesting such a principle. The question is, does it have to be accomplished in a Parkinsonian miasma? Or is there a shorter, more direct route to establishing the viability of development projects?

It appears certain that economies in project preparation and implementation will never be accomplished in a technical near-vacuum. The real criticism of current project submissions lies not in their paper heft, but rather in their uneven quality. All too frequently the knowledge, judgments and experience of agricultural technicians are conspicuous by their absence. When and if these proposals finally fall into the hands of persons qualified to evaluate their worth, it is often too late to remedy the deficiencies. The generalist simply is not equipped to separate the potentials from the pitfalls, and the specialist is missing in action.

It would be thought that economic analysis would be the forte of the agricultural neophyte. But such is not the case. It is all too common at the project review stage to encounter weak and poorly organized statements of economic justification. And despite a recent revival of interest in the human aspects of development, social analysis - if it appears at all - more often than not is merely a blend of description and conjective. Imaginative project planning seems mostly confined to the compilation of data of doubtful validity, arrayed in deadly parallel columns.

Has the massing of program analysts in regimental proportions resulted in the creation of programs? In Africa, with one notable exception, it has not. 9/ Generally, the projects proposed or under implementation in Africa bear only a casual relation, one to the other, and more nearly resemble the random output from transient visitations by consultants and Washington emissaries, each with his intellectural predisposition. If there is a sensitivity to priorities, or to interrelationships, it has not manifested itself.

What are the relative advantages, as one example, of program emphasis on dryland agriculture versus irrigation in specified areas? Of livestock and crops? The infrastructure? Training? Administration? Marketing? Research, extension, credit and the other supporting services? Public policy in its constituent parts, or in the aggregate. If these sobering questions have been resolved - or even raised in a systematic manner - it is not evident on the record.

Outside the Sahel, only a handful of African countries have received the benefits of an agricultural sector assessment. 10/ This is a comparatively

---

9/ The Sahel region is the exception. Spurred by the devastating effects of the 1968-74 drought in the Sahel countries, by the spotlight of world concern and the stimulus of international and other donor agencies, AID planners have made a start toward constructing a long-term package program for that region. (See, for example, "Special Report to the Congress..etc.", June 1975). Even so, many of the critical details are still lacking.

10/ The word "assessment" is used advisedly in this context. "Analysis" connotes far more sophistication than the general dearth of reliable data will accommodate. In the hands of competent analysts, however, valuable impressions may be reached without a solid body of data. See "Mali Agriculture - Sector Assessment," by Center for Research on Economic Development, University of Michigan, August 6, 19776 (preliminary draft).

low-cost exercise which, in one form or another, must precede a methodical determination of priorities, which in turn sets the stage for coherent program formulation. It also happens to be an area, under the administrative "reform" instituted by AID in the 1970s, which lends itself to treatment by personnel with limited technical orientation.

It may be concluded, therefore, that AID should press forward at the earliest practicable date with an operation to complete agricultural sector studies wherever in Africa these have been omitted or slighted. Fewer than 30 countries would be involved, and some of these are sufficiently small and homogeneous as to permit of a suitable survey in regional blocs.

THE DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM: STAFF

In further pursuit of the premise that people create programs and implement projects, we come back to the original purpose of this paper. It is to evaluate agricultural development in Africa in terms of existing manpower capabilities and future technical needs. The organization with which to do the job is an essential concomitant of this first consideration.

A few selected facts will help to describe the present situation. Although the matter of definitions is troublesome, for working purposes, 34 African countries may be listed as recipients or likely recipients of foreign aid. 11/ To emphasize once more the overwhelming significance of agriculture in these countries, one may look at the percentage of the labor force engaged in agriculture. In Ghana, this figure is lowest at 55 percent. In all others,

---

11/ The northernmost tier of African countries is the primary concern of NESA and thus is not included in this study; for different reasons neither are South Africa and a few others.

the range is from 74 to 91 percent.

In the 34 countries, AID is involved in 139 approved, ongoing agricultural projects. The budget requested for these projects for FY 77 is $134.9 million out of a total budget request for Africa of $200.0 million, or 67 percent devoted to agriculture. The comparable approved totals for FY 76 were $119.4 and $215.3 million, respectively, or 55 percent. Expressed in dolars, therefore, the most recent trend in support of agriculture has been upward.

Presently, 5 direct-hire positions are manned in AFR/ARD out of an approved staff ceiling of 9 (including 1 IDI positon), plus 2 secretarial positions.[12/] To the extent possible, this Washington group provides technical backstopping for a field staff consisting of 71 direct-hire positons, of which 60 are on board or in process. In the field, the authorized staff in agriculture represents only 19 percent of a total direct-hire complement of 379.

Among contract and PASA personnel, the ratio of agricultural staff to the total is somewhat more realistic but still low. Altogether, 219 of 480 positions programmed for this category in FY 77 are in agriculture. It comes to 45 percent. Part of these are backstopped or supervised by direct-hire personnel in the field. This still leaves responsibility for program review and approval of the whole lot to the minuscule AFR/ARD staff.

Line and staff authority in the field and field relations with AID/W comprise an administrative mix that defies generalization. In the 18 locations having agricultural technicians, there are only 3 agricultural development officers who have line officer status and are responsible for coordinating the

---

12/ This and other references to present positions and titles are drawn from AID-A/PM D03, Bureau for Africa, July 31, 1976.

agricultural program. In another 15 locations, agricultural technicians either report directly and separately to the "front office" [13/] or through a non-agricultural functionary heading up a technical services office. In some cases, the program office is interposed as a line function, further retarding action decisions.

In other situations, contract personnel and team leaders report through project managers, where there is one, or directly to the front office.

In brief, there is no clear-cut policy or guidelines governing the status or operational authority of the agricultural sector. This naturally leads to fragmented programs unrelated in many instances to overall development needs and uncorrelated with other donor projects.

CORRECTIVE MEASURES: STAFF STRENGTH

Apart from the urgent need to straighten out lines of authority and responsibility in the African agricultural development program, there is a paramount requirement for additional technical personnel both in Washington and in the field.

Washington

Less than 4 years ago, the Africa Bureau had an on-board staff of 17 agriculturists Since then, the authorized number has been halved and only 5 positions, including 1 IDI; are currently filled. This attrition occurred in the face of a rapidly expanding workload and larger monetary inputs.

13/ "Front office" is an euphemism mea...., variously, mission director or regional development officer. The regional offices interlarded as they are among the stereotyped activities of country missions, remain an anomaly that cannot be properly treated in a paper of less than book length. Lacking consistent terms of reference, these offices appear to be more a function of personalities than of defined duties.

The Washington staff in agriculture has technical review responsibilities for new projects and evaluation responsibilities for ongoing projects. In principle, it also serves as a technical backstopping and problem-solving mechanism for the agricultural field staff. In practice, the few people remaining on board are performing minor miracles in keeping abreast of the tide of paper crossing their desks, responding to telephone calls and coping with a demanding schedule of conferences. For lack of numbers, their professional skills are largely being dissipated in chore work of doubtful productivity.

Perhaps the most damaging consequence of this erosion, however, has been the practical destruction of the once highly useful technical teamwork between headquarters and field. It is no longer humanly possible for the Washington staff to furnish the supportive services to project planning and implementation that once was the hallmark of AID's successes in agriculture. The substitute tactic adopted under stress has been the use of itinerant consultants and the fielding of contract teams for field project review and documentation. While a useful tool, and one that should continue to be employed selectively, the consultant/contract approach alone is of limited value without a strong line team in place to furnish guidance. Continuity and an intimate knowledge of project details can only be achieved by personnel who are on tap the following day, or year, after a project decision. Parenthetically, the periodic appearance and disappearance of American experts on the project scene, are perplexing phenomena in the minds of host country colleagues.

Agricultural sector assessments as previously proposed also need participation, generally in a leadership role, by a regular staff member or members

It is only in this way that uniformity of analytical standards may be imposed and the findings of these inquiries placed on a comparable basis.

These staff deficiencies are critical. Remedial measures need not entail greater expenditures, but rather a far better application of funds already or prospectively under obligation.

We are proposing an overall increase in the AFR/DR/ARD staff from the present 11 to 21 positions as outlined in Annex 5.

Six of these positions, two of which are now authorized but vacant, would be filled by specialists comprising the key elements of an augmented staff. The areas of specialization would conform closely to subject matter most commonly required in the African agricultural program: 1) development planning, 2) sociology, 3) livestock, 4) agronomy, 5) engineering and 6) research.

We recommend further that in the interest of wieldiness the three regional divisions be maintained as follows: 1) Eastern/Southern Africa, 2) Central Anglophone W.A. and 3) Sahel-Francophone W.A. The heads of each of the regional offices should be classified as agricultural development officers, and attached to each such office there should be an assistant agricultural development officer and an agricultural economist.

Finally, as recognition of his enlarged responsibilities and the preeminent status of agriculture in the total matrix of development, the title of the chief officer of AFR/DR/ARD should be upgraded to that of Associate Director RD. This action would be helpful in establishing the Africa Bureau as a pace setter in acknowledging concretely the appropriate role of agriculture in development programs, a distinction that has so long been honored in the breach.

This staffing represents the minimum feasible pattern for the effective discharge of AFR's four principal duties: 1) To take initiatives in agricultural program formulation, policy interpretation and project and program development, including full participation in the processes of project identification and design; 2) to meet the expanding responsibility for technical review and approval of project submissions; 3) to collaborate with and support the increasing PASA and contract staff who are acting as intermediaries for the carrying forward of field projects; and 4) to spend more time in the field renewing the once fruitful practice of close understanding and cooperation between Washington and the field.

It is recognized that some inconvenience will be incurred in officing and securing secretarial help for an augmented staff This, however, is regarded as trivial by comparison with main objective of achieving an agricultural program that yields results.

With an adequate staff in place, much will remain to be done to systematize and improve the standards of technical reporting to and from the field. AFR/DR/AR would be responsible for designing the reporting system and assuring its optimum utilization.

Field

A variegated staffing situation prevails in the field. In the countries of Eastern Africa where there are relatively long-term programs, the structure of organization is generally acceptable, although there are undesirable instances in which project managers must clear their actions through offices having little or no agricultural capability.

The OSARAC organization comes closer to a working model, although we find only two professional officers working with the development and operation of 15 projects.

In the Sahel-Francophone W.A., there is a fair balance between projects and project managers but a serious lack of agricultural development officers to lead in the coordination of projects and the development of overall agricultural programs.

Projects proposed or under approval in agriculture in Africa are increasing at a rate of about 20 per year, a rate that likely will be maintained for at least 3-5 years. The proposed staffing as shown in Annex 6 would provide an average of one professional for each two projects, although this ratio would vary in individual cases depending on the importance and complexity of specific projects.

This is believed to be a workable basis of operations for the present. Flexibility in staffing should be maintained, however, to cope with unforeseeable circumstances. (The rest of the recommended staffing is displayed in Annexes 7-9.)

A standardization of titles and duties, as indicated elsewhere in this paper, is overdue. The primary point is that the education and experience of a field officer should match as nearly as possible the subject matter of projects to which he is assigned.

The future of regional officers would depend to a large extent upon resolution of the problems of AID/W - field mission functions as discussed above. Cogent arguments may be advanced both for and against regionalization in Africa, but the test of sound administration will remain the same: Does it work? An administrative review of the workability of existing regional offices and their further extension or curtailment should accompany consideration of our recommendations for adjustment in other areas.

Availability of Personnel:

Any proposal to enlarge the staff in agriculture is certain to

evoke the question, "Where are the qualified people?" This is a fair question and one that we have attempted to anticipate.

As part of this analysis, we have made an informal inventory of trained American agricultural personnel and can report that the bodies are there. Admittedly, it will take some effort to screen, select and place the right technicians in the right assignments, but this is not an insuperable obstacle.

The precise source of qualified staff, while by no means a matter of indifference, is not the decisive consideration. By and large, the terms under which agricultural competence is employed and utilized will govern its availability. Whether agricultural technicians are mobilized from direct-hire, PASAs, private contractors or university sources only matters if the conditions of their employment are less than suitable. We have attempted to construct a framework that will attract the talent.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY COMPARISON OF U.S. NATIONAL FTEPP EMPLOYMENT
BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS
June 1968 and June 1976

	June 1968	June 1976	Net Gain/ Loss	Pct. Gain/ Loss
Urban Planning	11	21	+ 10	+ 90.91
Sec. Admin. & Public Safety	439	20	-419	- 95.44
Social Sciences	71	54	- 18	- 25.00
Economists	202	166	- 36	- 17.82
Int'l Rel. & Coop Off; Rel & Rehab Adviser; EEO Office	280	244	- 36	- 12.86
Personnel Services	372	151	-221	- 59.41
General Admin. & Clerical	1367	249	-1118	- 81.78
Mail & File; Messenger	98	56	- 42	- 42.86
Clerk/Stenographer	189	75	-114	- 60.32
Secretary	914	479	-435	- 47.59
Clerk/Typist	105	38	- 67	- 63.81
Computer Systems	50	79	+ 29	- 58.00
Program Management	641	187	-454	- 70.83
Administrative Office	354	105	-249	- 70.34
Office Serv. Management & Supv.	132	55	- 77	- 58.33
Mngt. Analysis & Technology	169	86	- 83	- 49.11
Program Analysis	84	383	+299	+355.95
Miscellaneous Clerical & Admin.	29	1	- 28	- 96.55
Agriculture & Biology	379	82	-297	- 78.36
Accounting & Budget	534	359	-175	- 32.77
Health & Medicine	283	75	-208	- 73.50
Veterinary Medicine	9	2	- 7	- 78.78
Engineering	327	106	-221	- 67.58
Legal	57	55	- 2	- 03.51
Information & Communications	86	28	- 58	- 67.44
Business & Industry	346	300	- 46	- 13.29
General Phy. Science	2	8	+ 6	+300.00
Library & Technical Information	2	11	+ 9	+450.00
Mathematics & Statistics	36	23	- 13	- 36.11
Equipment Specialist	72	19	- 53	- 73.61
Education	246	52	-194	- 78.86
Investment & Inspection	61	27	- 34	- 55.74
Supply	244	51	-193	- 79.10
Transportation	88	39	- 49	- 55.68

cont'd

	June 1968	June 1976	Net Gain Loss	Pct. Gain/ Loss
Wage Board	26	20	- 6	- 23.0%
TOTAL	8306	3706	-4600	-55.38%

SOURCE: Office of Personnel and Manpower, Policy Development and Evaluation Division, Manpower Analysis Branch, September 1976. (Other data on personnel originate from the same source.)

ANNEX /

GUIDELINES FOR PROJECT MANAGERS - AGRICULTURE

GENERAL

The manager of agricultural projects represents an important link in the administrative chain which, in collaboration with host country personnel, identifies, plans, implements and follows through on the critical aspects of agricultural project development. His terms of reference must be defined carefully and fully. It is not possible to design a single job description to fit each and every project; specific details must be adapted to fit individual projects, taking into account relevant conditions in the country concerned, its government, environmental features, project objectives, scope of work, size and cost of the project and relationships with other undertakings that together comprise a program.

It is possible, and necessary, to lay out guidelines having general Agency applicability. A project manager's qualifications and responsibilities must be clearly delineated for his own benefit and that of his superior, the Mission, the technical backstopping facility and his associates in the host country. The key points relating to the project manager's role constitute a list of essentials. Those which vary in substance or emphasis from current AID management policy are starred for easy identification. 1/

1/ The FSR grade or its equivalent will be determined by the nature and complexity of the project(s).

THE PROJECT MANAGER:

QUALIFICATIONS

*1. Must have a professional background in one or more technical fields of agriculture. The precise areas of his competence will neither govern nor limit his selection, but rather will be based on the depth and breadth of his training and experience, as outlined below.

*2. He must have had substantial and progressive experience in agriculture or agriculture-related fields, in a scientific, educational or management capacity, or all three.

3. The paramount requirement of the position is for analytical, planning, coordinating negotiating and problem-solving skills. He must exhibit a keen sense of priorities.

* 4. He must hold as a minimum a bachelor's degree in agriculture or a closely related field. An advanced degree is preferred, but this requirement will be waived if the quality and extent of his experience clearly indicate justification for such waiver.

5. He must have a demonstrated capacity for establishing and maintaining effective rapport with counterpart staff in the host government or entity and with representatives of third-country, regional or international agencies operating in his prescribed field of activities.

6. He must have a full awareness of all U.S. and MIssion policies affecting his area of work and be prepared to perform within the framework of such policies.

7. He must have a thorough grasp of AID procedures, including the ability to draft or to assist in the drafting of such program documents as PIDs, PROPs, PIO/Ts, PIO/Cs, ProAgs, PRPs, PPs, and Log Frames.

REPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

8. He will perform his services under the general supervision of the senior agricultural officer in his Mission or region, as appropriate.

9. His primary reporting responsibilities will be to his immediate supervisor and will be discharged on a continuing and comprehensive basis.

DUTIES

10. In addition to his functions as an administrative subordinate of the principal agricultural officer, he will share his technical problems and experiences, on a regularly scheduled basis, both with his supervisor and with the appropriate technical backstopping staff in the field and in AID/Washington. As specific technical problems arise, he will seek, through proper channels, supportive counsel and guidance from available backstopping services in the field and in AID/Washington.

11. Under the general direction of his supervisor, he will be expected to participate in, and contribute to, decisions to revise or terminate ongoing projects falling within range of his competence, identification of new project possibilities, relevant project and program formulation, monitoring and evaluation.

*12. He will be encouraged to articulate in a proper manner his recommendations for improving existing AID practices and procedures that impinge on his performance as a project manager.

13. He will strive to keep abreast of new technical and scientific developments that relate to the effectiveness of his assignment.

14. As required, he will evaluate the findings of audit reports and recommend and participate in corrective actions.

15. He may be called upon for management and monitoring services covering more than single projects, depending on the needs of the Mission, the size and type of projects involved and his own suitability for a multi-project role.

16. He will perform such other duties as his supervisor may direct.

STANDARDS FOR TECHNICAL GENERALISTS

Position Title: Agricultural Development Officer
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer

(AID Circ. A-247 of 1/30/74)

The Agricultural Development Officer has primary responsibility for U.S. assistance to the agriculture sector. He stimulates, and works with, the agricultural and other such institutions of the host government, as may be necessary, in sector analyses and studies, problem identification and the development of plans and assistance projects to attack identified problems. He works with and through intermediaries and the host government and monitors AID-approved assistance projects, and coordinates with and observes the assistance activities of other donors.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF WORK

The Agricultural Development Officer's functions will vary according to the conditions in the host country, particularly the degree to which the host government itself can analyze development problems and manage development projects, the magnitude of contributions by other donors, and the extent of participation of intermediaries. The incumbent, serves as focal point on the U.S. side for activities pertaining to the agriculture and if specifically assigned the overall rural development sector, whether grant or loan funded. He normally participates in all aspects of such activities from policy formulation, sector analysis and studies to program/project design to monitoring program or project implementation and the evaluation of current and completed assistance activities. He works with senior officials in the ministries and other institutions concerned with his sector. He is not a specialized advisor to these officials, but he is a general advisor and assists them in the identification of specific development objectives, resource requirements, advisory assistance needs and sources of advice, and where appropriate, helps in securing the technical assistance required. Similarly, where intermediaries are involved, he is not responsible for the day-to-day operations but is responsible for advising the host government and the A.I.D. mission on progress and probabilities of achieving project purpose with planned constraints.

The Agricultural Development Officer normally reports to the senior A.I.D. officer of the mission. He draws from among other mission elements, regional offices, and A.I.D./Washington for technical and administrative support and assistance.

The paramount requirement of the position is for analytic, planning, coordinating, negotiating, and problem-solving skills. He should also possess broad technical knowledge and experience in the agricultural sector.

The Assistant Agricultural Development Officer performs any or all of the duties of the Agricultural Development Officer, as assigned, and may act for the latter in his absence.

REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES

1. Works with officials in the various institutions responsible for host country agriculture to identify needs and priorities for both self help and external assistance. Based on host country plans and priorities and identified needs and problems, collaborates with appropriate officials on detailed analysis of the agricultural sector, on policy formulation, and on the design of specific projects.

2. Knows and relates the priorities and capabilities of other development donors to assistance requirements in the sector. Stimulates contacts and collaborative arrangements between the host country and the donor organization best suited to assist with a particular development need. Keeps abreast of agricultural research being conducted within the country of assignment and with similar research in the United States and elsewhere, e.g., international research networks. Stimulates reciprocal arrangements between such organizations, particularly relating to an exchange of research methods and results.

3. Following consultation with host government officials, recommends required amounts, types, and timing of input of men, money, and material resources into projects. Prepares project proposals (PROP), obligating documents for technical personnel services (PIO/T), participant training (PIO/P), and project commodities (PIO/C), and project agreements (ProAg) with the host government. Participates in preparing agriculture loan papers. Prepares project status reports and budget projections on projects within the sector. Provides additional pertinent background and interpretative information on the project for use in negotiating contractors and preparing the participant training and commodity portions of projects. Participates in PL-480 programs as required. He will also be expected to utilize fully the A.I.D./W support system, i.e., SER, TAB, etc., to assist in documentation, etc.

4. Monitors the implementation of A.I.D. sponsored projects by personnel from the host country and intermediaries. Incumbent keeps himself

informed of the progress or lack of progress, primarily at the output level, of the total project and recommends action to resolve problems impeding progress or to rescue or terminate failing projects. Participates with host government officials in replanning or modifications of projects.

5. Confers with host government officials and other donors as appropriate to obtain compliance with commitments and resolve problems.

6. Preferably in conjunction with host government officials, participates in on-going evaluation of projects, including the performance of intermediary contractors or PASA project implementation personnel, and prepares the project appraisal and the contractor performance reports. Evaluates audit report findings, recommends and participates in corrective action.

QUALIFICATIONS

A high degree of demonstrated managerial, analytic and leadership skills, particularly in problem identification, project design, and evaluation. While a minimum of a backelors degree, or the equivalent experience, in the field of agriculture is required, it is highly desirable that he will have done advanced specialized study or research in the professional field. He should have demonstrated professional ability and be well regarded by the appropriate American professional community outside of A. I. D. In addition he would have had progressively responsible assignments leading to a broad understanding of the agricultural sector. Understanding of the inter-relationships of specialized areas within the sector, including nutrition, and is recognized as being an expert in the sector. Demonstrated planning, coordinating, negotiating, and problem-solving skills. Thorough knowledge of the A.I.D. programming process and documentation. Working knowledge of A.I.D. contracting procedures and financial management principles. A general knowledge of other donor procedures is highly desirable.

The Assistant Agricultural Development Officer must meet the degree requirement or the equivalent in experience and have demonstrated a broad knowledge of the agricultural sector and a capacity for eventually assuming full sector management.

Standards for Technical Specialists (Agriculture)

Position Title: Agricultural Technical Specialist

The agricultural technical specialist's primary responsibility is in conceptualization of viable projects which meet field requirements in his subject matter or related fields. He has review responsibility for all documentation steps in the development and implementation of AID-assisted projects in his and related subject matter fields.

He is the primary backstop for technical matter substance and problem solution to the agricultural development officers, both in Washington and in the field. He further is available to project implementers for technical review, consultation and project layout.

He works primarily as a technical staff officer with the Africa Bureau and reports directly to the Associate Director, AFR/DR/ARD.

His relations with host country or intermediaries is through AID's country or regional offices, agricultural development officer or project advisor.

Nature & Scope of Work

The agricultural technical specialist's functions are primarily those of staff backstopping to the agricultural development officers on the Washington level. As such, he is responsible for the technical quality and validity of project documentation within his professional field.

Another primary function is that of keeping constantly abreast of new research and research findings in his professional area of competence. In addition, he analyzes these new findings in relation to their adaptability to the various ecological eco-types found in Africa. From this analysis, he proposes adaptive research on the findings or outreach programs to field offices for inclusion in or documentation for new projects in countries or regions where the new findings are considered to represent technological advances which could result in increased production.

Representative Duties

1. He works with host country technicians and field agricultural development officers and project technicians, as required, on research and outreach and control problems in his area of competence.

2. He performs review functions for PID, PRP, and PP documents that fall within his professional field.

3. Keeps abreast of new developments in his field by visiting research centers, international agencies, universities and field stations. Analyzes findings for adaptability to cooperating countries and in summary form makes this material available to host country and AID technicians.

4. As directed by his superior officer, participates in project design team work as a member of the team. He also participates in project review work, both in the documentation stage and in project progress review.

5. Prepares professional staff papers on matters pertaining to his professional field and relates them to AID program and project development and implementation policies.

Qualifcations

A high degree of professional skill in his field combined with the analytical ability to match knowledge and new developments to applied technology that relate to field conditions and needs.

He needs communications skills so that he can work effectively with field and host country technicians. Further, he must be able to present to his superior officers and other staff within AID, often not knowledgeable in his professional field, the application of his knowledge to field developmental projects in such a manner that he is understood and his views respected.

A background in developmental programs in the AID assisted countries is highly desirable. Progressive experience in AID program documentation, especially since 1973, is a high value factor as are advanced scholastic degrees in his professional field. While not mandatory, language capability in one or more major foreign languages such as French is desirable.

ANNEX 4

Promotion List
AID Foreign Service Personnel
October 1, 1976

Backstop and Title		From R-3 to R-2	From R-4 to R-3	From R-5 to R-4	Total
	FSR				
01	Executive	4	-	-	4
02	Program & Economic Officers	-	11	26	37
03	Administrative Management	-	-	10	10
04	Controllers	-	8	12	20
06	General Services	-	-	3	3
08	Audit and Inspection	7	2	8	17
09	Program Management	11	16	6	33
10	Agriculture	-	-	11	11
15	Food for Peace	-	3	1	4
20	Business and Industry	-	3	-	3
25	Engineering	-	2	-	2
27	Equipment Operations & Maintenance	-	-	-	-
50	Health and Sanitation	-	-	1	1
55	Population	-	-	4	4
60	Education	-	-	-	-
70	Public Administration	-	-	-	-
71	Narcotics Control	1	-	-	1
80	Community & Social Organizations	-	-	-	-
85	Legal	-	1	-	1
91	Participant Training	-	-	3	3
93	Procurement and Supply	-	-	-	-
94	Capital Project/Development Loan	2	13	29	44
	Totals	25	59	114	198

	FSS	From S-6 to S-5	From S-7 to S-6	Total
05	Secretaries	-	9	9
05	Administrative - Sub-Professional	5	4	9
	Totals	5	13	18

ANNEX 5

Proposed Staffing

AFR/DR/ARD - (Washington)

Associate Directer - Woodrow W. Leake

Agricultural Development Planning Specialist, Vacant
Rural Sociologist, Vacant
Livestock Specialist, Vacant 1/
Agronomy Specialist, Vacant*
Agricultural Engineer Specialist, Vacant*
Agricultural Research Specialist, Vacant*

Secretary - Millan
Secretary - Harrington
*Secretary - Vacant
*Secretary - Vacant
I. D. I. - Warren

Eastern South Africa	Central Anglophone W. A.	Sahel Francophone W. A.
Ethiopia, Somali, Kenya, Tanzania Malawi, Zambia, Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland, Sudan, Regional Development Office/East Africa, Regional Economic Development Services Office/East Africa, Office of Southern African Regional Activities Coordination	Nigeria, Liberia, Sierre Leone, Ghana, Zaire, Central Africa Republic, Cameroon, Rwanda, Agricultural Development Office/ Yaounde, East Africa Republic	Senegal, Mauritania, Niger, Upper Volta Mali, Chad, Togo, Regional Economic Development Services Office/West Africa, Agricultural Development Office/Dakar, Agricultural Development Officer/Niamey Guinea
Agricultural Development, Harold Kugler	Agricultural Development Officer, Vacant	Agricultural Development Officer, Lloyd Clyburn
*Assistant Agricultural Development Office, Vacant	*Assistant Agricultural Development Office; Vacant	*Assistant Agricultural Development Office, Vacant
*Agricultural Economist, Vacant	Agricultural Economist, Vacant	Agricultural Economist, Norman L. Ulsaker

*Requires new position

1/ Authorized since July 31, 1976.

Summary

Annex 5, cont'd

	Proposed Positions	Present Positions
Agricultural Development Officer	4	3
Agricultural Economist	3	2
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	3	-
International Development Interns	1	1
Secretarial	4	2
Technical Specialist	6	3
Total	21	11

Field

1. Ethiopia - 10 Projects

Agricultural Development Officer - Sherper, Keith
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Yeaman, Donald
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Doughty, Harvey
Project Manager, Agriculture - Cobb, Richard
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Shick, Peter
*International Development Interns

2. Kenya - 8 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer - Vacant
Agricultural Economist - Vacant
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Jones, Harold M.
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Hoffarth, Leroy
Project Manager, Agriculture - Abercrombie, Frank D.
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Vacant
*International Development Interns

3. Sudan - 1 Project

No agricultural staff

4. Tanzania - 11 Projects

Agricultural Development Officer - Cornelius, John
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Cobb, R.
Agricultural Economist - Worrick, Thomas
Agronomy Advisor - Pitts, Stanley
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Williams, Edward
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Herron, John
Project Manager, Agriculture - Abel, Lawrence
*International Development Interns

5. Regional Economic Development Services Office/East Africa - 1 Project

Agricultural Advisor Resource - Broadnax, Madison
Agricultural Engineering Advisor - Swanson, Lewis
Agricultural Economist - Billings, Martin
Agricultural Economist - Winter, Marcus
*International Development Interns

6. Regional Development Office/East Africa - 1 Project

Project Manager, Agriculture - Ramsey, George

---

*Requires new position

7. Office of Southern African Regional Activities Coordination - 15 Projects

Agricultural Development Officer - Johnson, William
Agricultural Economist - Clark, Ralph
*Project Manager, Agriculture - 5

Summary

	Proposed Positions	Present Positions	Projects
Agricultural Development Officer	6	5	-
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	9	9	-
Project Manager, Agriculture	19	4	-
Technical Specialist	2	2	-
International Development Interns	4	-	-
Agricultural Economist	5	5	-
Total	35	25	47

*Requires new position

Central Anglophone West Africa

Field

1. Cameroon - 5 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer - Vacant
Project Manager, Agriculture - Hampston, J. D.
Project Manager, Agriculture - Huxtable, John H.
Agronomy Advisor - Ford, Marion H.
Agronomy Advisor - Lane, Willson
Extension Advisor - Frendine, Fred
International Development Interns (Agricultural Economics) - Witt, Eric H.

2. Ghana - 8 Projects

Agricultural Development Officer - Hess, Oleen
Agricultural Economist - Fuchs, Larsch Michael
Project Manager, Agriculture - Bartlett, Robert H.
*International Development Interns

3. Liberia - 9 Projects

Food & Agricultural Officer - Allen Charles B.
International Development Interns/Agricultural Economist - Goldman, Richard
*Project Manager, Agriculture

4. Africa-Wide Regional Plus Portugese-Speaking Africa - 6 Projects

Agricultural Development Officer - Sanders, Charles (AID/W-based)

5. Nigeria -(Projects Listed Under Liberia)

Food & Agricultural Officer - Vacant
Project Manager, Agriculture - Fuglia, Winton L.

6. Zaire - 7 Projects

Food & Agricultural Officer - Hederhott, James
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer - Voth, Leland
International Development Interns (Agricultural Economics) - Sands, Fanton B.

7. Central Anglophone West Africa - 8 Projects

No field staff - projects handled by Embassy

Requires new position

ANNEX S

Proposed & Present Staffing
Sahel - Francophone West Africa (Field)
Offices

1. Chad - 4 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer, Vacant
Project Manager, Agriculture - Krasnerski, Stefan H.
Project Manager, Agriculture - Morris, Jack R.
Project Manager, Agriculture - Henderson, Van B. S.
International Development Interns, Agriculture/Rural Development - Egan, Wm. M

2. Mauritania - 2 Projects

Project Manager, Agriculture - ?

3. Area Development Office/Niamey - 3 Projects

Project Manager, Agriculture - Daley, Paul
Project Manager, Agriculture - Livingston, James H.
Project Manager, Agriculture - Garner, Norman
Agricultural Economist - Vacant
International Development Interns (Agricultural Economics) - Baker, Murl R.

4. Area Development Office/Dakar - 5 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer - Vacant
Project Manager, Agriculture - Hartman, August
Project Manager, Agriculture - Lateef, Victor
Project Manager, Agriculture - McDill, Robert
Project Manager, Agriculture - Wilder Clyde P.
Project Manager, Agriculture - Fredrickson, Channing
Project Manager, Agriculture - Vacant
*International Development Interns - Vacant

5. Upper Volta - 6 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer - Vacant
Project Manager, Agriculture - Meyer, Richard C.
Project Manager, Agriculture - Hogan, Archie
Agricultural Marketing Procurement Advisor - Jadwin, Billy
Agricultural Advisor - Vacant
* International Development Interns

---

*Requires new position.

6. Country Development Office/Mali - 6 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer, Vacant
Project Manager, Agriculture - Smith, Myron
Project Manager,Agriculture - Benbow, Quincy
Livestock Advisor - Robinson, James
Veterinary Advisor, Diseases Control - Carver Hubert
*International Development Interns

7. Regional Economic Development Services Office/West Africa - 16 Projects

*Agricultural Development Officer - Vacant
Agricultural Economist - Vacant
Agricultural Economist - Hackie. Anita
Agricultural Engineering Advisor - Morgan, Moses J.
Agricultural Engineering Advisor - Vacant
*International Development Interns
* Project Manager, Agriculture - 5

8. Guinea - 1 Project

9. Regional - Mano River Union - 2 Projects

Summary

	Proposed Positions	Present Positions	Projects
Agricultural Development Officer	5	0	-
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	0	0	-
Project Manager, Agriculture	22	17	-
Agricultural Economist	3	3	-
Technical Specialist	6	6	-
International Development Interns	6	2	-
Total	42	28	

Requires new position.

ANNEX 9

Personnel Requirement Summary

Africa

Washington Office - AFR/DR/AGR

Position	Proposed	Present
Agricultural Development Officer	4	3
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	3	-
Agricultural Economist	3	2
Technical Specialist	6	2
International Development Interns	1	1
Secretarial	4	8
	21	11

Position	Proposed	Present	Projects
Eastern-South Africa			
Agricultural Development Officer	6	5	-
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	9	9	-
Project Manager Agriculture	9	4	-
Technical Specialist	2	2	-
Agricultural Economist	5	5	-
International Development Interns	4	-	-
Total	35	25	47
Sahel-Francophone West Africa			
Agricultural Development Officer	5	-	-
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	-	-	-
Project Manager Agriculture	22	17	-
Technical Specialist	6	6	-
Agricultural Economist	3	3	
International Development Interns	6	2	-
Total	42	28	44

Position	Proposed	Present	Projects
Central Anglophone West Africa			
Agricultural Development Officer	7	6	-
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	1	1	-
Project Manager Agriculture	5	4	-
Technical Specialist	3	3	-
Agricultural Economist	1	1	-
International Development Interns	4	3	-
Total	21	18	43

Summary

	Proposed Positions	Present Positions	Projects
Agricultural Development Officer	7	6	-
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer	1	1	-
Project Manager Agriculture	5	4	-
Agricultural Economist	1	1	-
Technical Specialist	3	3	-
International Development Interns	4	3	-
Total	21	18	43