

REPORT ON REVIEW OF
TITLE XII
COUNTRY PROJECTS IMPLEMENTATION

By

John R. Mossler

October 15, 1979

Board for International Food
and Agricultural Development
(BIFAD)

Contract: AID/DSAN-147-728

REPORT ON REVIEW OF TITLE XII
COUNTRY PROJECTS IMPLEMENTATION

I. PROBLEM

Progress has been made toward carrying out the provision set forth in Title XII of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975 by which Congress declared that, in order to prevent famine and establish freedom from hunger, the United States should expand and improve the participation of land-grant and other eligible universities in the U.S. Government's international efforts to apply more effective agricultural sciences to the goal of increasing world food production, distribution, and consumption. However, both the Agency for International Development (AID) staff and the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) representatives are of the view that the present system of providing qualified agricultural manpower and institutional experience available in the U.S. agricultural universities required for implementing Title XII agricultural development and related country programs should be reviewed with the ultimate objective of improving present performance with respect to this effort and thus more efficient and expeditious response to those needs identified in country programs. The contractor was requested to submit a report on his review of the Title XII country project operation and his findings and recommendations and of his exploration of the feasibility of improving performance through the use of intermediaries or other alternative means. It became readily apparent

that the most difficult task confronting BIFAD and AID is how to obtain the appropriate university institutional and personnel expertise to address the Title XII country project requirement on a timely basis. It was also apparent that neither AID or BIFAD was presently equipped with the resources to undertake this task.

The most significant proposal in this report is that of using an especially well qualified entity to serve as an "intermediary" with discrete functions to serve between AID and the universities to facilitate, expedite and make recommendations with respect to the match between project requirements and university capabilities. In order to arrive at a possible solution to this major problem, it was necessary to make certain assumptions and to review the entire project development and implementation process and the special concerns of both AID and the universities, and finally, to explore possible alternative methods of resolving the problem.

II. ASSUMPTIONS

A. It is important that programs developed pursuant to the mandate set forth in Title XII be continued and expanded as necessary to meet the needs of developing countries to solve their food and nutritional problems.

B. It is imperative, both to AID and the university community, that projects undertaken pursuant to Title XII result in tangible benefits to the countries concerned.

C. It is quite likely that present constraints on increasing direct hire U.S. personnel will continue and perhaps be intensified. It will be increasingly difficult to retain, via the direct hire method, the necessary experienced and trained rural development and agricultural personnel essential to develop and implement projects identified as important to program objectives.

D. The land grant and other eligible universities, given the opportunity, will continue to sustain their interest in Title XII programs and attempt to improve their ability to respond to identified program needs by providing appropriate institutional and personnel expertise.

E. The BIFAD, its two subordinate joint committees, the JCAD and JRC, and the various regional and technical work groups will continue generally as presently constituted as the organizational mechanisms to deal with Title XII programs and problems which arise in connection with both policy development and program implementation.

F. The present system of AID program review and project selection, development, and approval will generally remain as it is.

G. Prime responsibility for overseeing country project development and implementation will be vested in field missions and host countries will become increasingly involved and responsible for these functions.

III. GUIDELINES

This report has been guided by AID's need to accomplish the following:

(1) reduction of the time lag between AID/host government agreement on a project and the initiation of its implementation, by delivery to the country the requisite U.S. scientific and technical agricultural personnel operating under most effective and efficient funding and management arrangements;

(2) reduction, also, of AID management and other staff workload requirements at both Mission and Washington levels;

(3) creation of the best possible match of U.S. university resources to the project requirements (which might require in certain cases inputs from more than one university working under proper consortial arrangements);

(4) creation of planning, financing and working arrangements designed to achieve most harmonious relations among host government, AID mission and university personnel involved in the project, and to achieve also the quickest and best possible adaptation of U.S. scientific and technical inputs to changing project requirements, and to insure continuity of effort for the duration of the project and completion of the specific development assistance task;

(5) support of the U.S. agricultural university community as a means of enhancing its capability for participating in U.S. development assistance programs;

(6) above all, realization of the most cost-effective and expeditious possible accomplishment of the Title XII foreign assistance objectives as defined in applicable U.S. foreign assistance legislation.

IV. DISCUSSION

In order to have a better understanding of the difficulties inherent in the implementation of Title XII projects, and in "matching" country program requirements with university capabilities it is considered appropriate that some of the complexities of the AID/university community be identified. The operation is not a simple one and each of the parties involved has the responsibility for doing what it can to facilitate the partnership approach which is required.

A. Communications

It is of extreme importance that AID understand the special problems and concerns of those universities and their staffs which will be participating in the Title XII effort. Likewise, the universities and their representatives must recognize the constraints within which AID must operate in its relationships with the Congress and the various host countries. It appears, based on discussions with representatives of both parties of the partnership, that, when Title XII legislation was initially enacted, considerable misunderstanding existed as to what was envisaged as the appropriate role for each of the partners. The spirit of cooperation left something

to be desired. Some AID personnel feared that the universities were attempting to usurp the power and authority vested with them in the development of agricultural institution building or that the BIFAD mechanism would contribute little other than delay the project development and implementation process. On the other hand, some university personnel, failing to recognize AID's problems and concerns, had little sympathy for implementation compliance and were of the view that if the operation were just turned over to the university community the task could be more effectively accomplished.

It is obvious that the attitudinal approach to the partnership is now much improved. There is a much better understanding of both partners of the total process and the special problems and concerns of each party. In short, the mutual dependence of AID and the universities is increasingly recognized. Efforts have been made to improve communications by both AID and BIFAD. They need to be continued and strengthened.

B. Project Development and Implementation

The project development process is complex, complicated by legislative and budgetary constraints, host government and Agency concerns, lack of personnel continuity and a variety of procedural and communications difficulties. Under the best of circumstances it must be recognized that it takes both time and personnel to proceed from project idea to a project implementation document (PID),

from the PID to an approved project proposal (PP), and from the PP to the arrival of implementation personnel in the field. In some instances baseline data or other information must be developed before it can be determined what issues should be addressed in the host country. At the other end of the total process, mechanisms must be developed for adequate project progress reporting and evaluation of results.

The AID, for a variety of reasons, has limited agricultural direct hire staff expertise in the field and it appears unlikely that the situation will improve. In fact, it is expected that efforts will be made to mount an expanded program with even fewer such personnel. Thus, it becomes increasingly important that university expertise and personnel be used in this most important area of technical assistance. Such assistance and participation by universities are required at the earliest steps of project preparation and even more so in the course of project implementation.

Technical assistance to field missions for relatively short term planning and project development to date has been obtained, when necessary, primarily by means of IQC and RASA arrangements with the Department of Agriculture. This course of action has been used because it has been the most operationally expedient and convenient method available. The AID regional bureau and BIFAD staffs are of the view that these arrangements have failed to provide the desired

results and that more should be done to exploit university capabilities in this effort. Therefore the BFAD has supported a proposal, currently being studied indepth by one of the JCAD work groups, to link individual (or consortia) universities with specific AID missions to assist in identifying need for, and in preparation of country projects. This proposal should be developed soon and hopefully it will be possible that it be supported by both AID and BIFAD authorities.

It is also suggested that another approach to the short term need for university personnel be explored. The Department of Agriculture has developed a system for obtaining such expertise by entering into short and generally "boilerplate" cooperative agreements with all the Land-Grant Universities and several other institutions under which, by letter exchange, they have been able to draw upon the universities for short term technical help. At this time universities do not receive overhead or indirect cost reimbursement. However, this fact may, in the future, make it more difficult for the Department to obtain such a wide range of resources. To date, the Department has found this to be an effective tool. It would appear that this type of arrangement could also be used by AID.

Longer term technical assistance to develop host country institutions, using university experience and personnel, has a long history. Since the enactment of Title XII, efforts have been made, within AID, to reduce the complexities and time delays involved in developing a satisfactory approach to the AID/university partnership. In the past, many of the

problems have been related to the contracting process. The Collaborative Assistance Method was developed in recognition of the need for a partnership approach and flexibility during the course of implementation. It is designed to: (a) increase the joint implementation authority and responsibility of the contractor and the LDC, and (b) encourage more effective collaboration between all participating parties (AID, host country, and university) at important stages, including the design stage, of a technical assistance project.

The principal differences between the collaborative approach and the traditional university contract approach are earlier selection and involvement of the prime contractor, contracting for the complete project including design and implementation, minimizing contract amendments, and AID approvals, and providing contractors with the authority and responsibility needed to manage implementation within the approved bounds of the program. Under the collaborative approach, the contractor is selected prior to development of the implementation proposal. Among the conditions necessary for this approach to work effectively as outlined in AID's policy directive, is "the careful contractor selection, i.e., matching the contractor's technical and managerial capabilities to the anticipated requirements of the overseas activity."

The collaborative approach was initially designed to apply to a contract, and although no formal solicitation is called for under this system, a case must be made that more than one party has been considered and the selection of a specific university contractor justified. One

obtains the distinct impression that, during the past, some of AID's operating officials have not fully understood the nature of the AID/university relationship and thus have tended to view the operation as a commercial type contract arrangement. There seems to be an increased understanding now that this approach can be applied and thus, hopefully, more use will be made of this tool thereby facilitating the AID/university effort.

Subsequent to the development of the collaborative approach to contracting the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977 was enacted. It would appear that the cooperative agreement, provided for under this Act, is particularly well suited to the AID/university partnership with its collaborative approach and should be used in most instances rather than a contract, to implement Title XII country technical assistance projects. The cooperative agreement was intended to provide assistance to a recipient in cases where substantial joint involvement is expected between the Government and the recipient during performance of the activity. It is a device which should result in a closer relationship between AID and the universities, with benefits accruing to both parties. The approach enables AID to retain more control over the direction of the institutions' activities than under a grant. On the other hand, both parties to the agreement would have more operational flexibility than with a contract. As compared with traditional contracts, the cooperative agreement shifts AID management from monitoring input details to outputs and accomplishment.

Competition is not a legal requirement in the case of cooperative agreements, a major difference, therefore, from contracts. The major concern with the agreement mechanism is how to insure that an appropriate degree of competition can be built into the selection process in order to assure quality in program performance and equity to the university community without unnecessary delays. My review leads to the conclusion that AID has failed to take advantage of this provision. There appears to be an over concern for competition in the commercial procurement sense and a lack of recognition of the partnership and matching process called for under Title XII. Hopefully, it will be possible for AID to agree to some sort of review and selection process which would assure program quality and equity without the delays which have arisen through use of contract mechanisms. As noted elsewhere in this report, the Department of Agriculture seems to be using this device efficiently to obtain short term university assistance.

It is concluded that the Agency either possesses or is able to further develop the necessary tools to expedite the joint AID/university agreement relationship. It is necessary that certain of the mechanisms be further refined and that there be a wider understanding and acceptance than presently exists as to how the tools could and should be used. Within AID the Title XII program implementation should be viewed in the light of a consonance of interest rather than a conflict of interest with the eligible universities.

Reporting and evaluation are essential ingredients of the overall project implementation process. In conducting the analysis called for in the scope of work underlying the preparation of this report, it quickly became evident that it is difficult to determine Title XII project development and implementation status. No satisfactory uniform system exists for tracking or reporting progress on such projects. Each regional bureau of AID apparently has its own reporting system, some better than others, and none appear to be sufficiently comprehensive to enable management to determine implementation status from the planning through the disbursement stages. It would appear appropriate to direct additional attention to this matter. Finally, it is suggested that, at some subsequent date, some attention be given to the evaluation of results of operations under the Title XII partnership agreement.

C. University Problems and Concerns

As in the case with AID, the universities and their staffs have their own concerns and constraints in the participation in international development efforts. Not the least of these are continuity of funding and personnel resource availability. They need to be confident that adequate funding will be provided over a sufficient time frame to enable them to finance and plan their programs and to develop necessary staff. However, it is clear, that despite these concerns, the university community is interested in participating with AID in Title XII activities. The more-than \$2 being contributed by the universities for every \$1

received under the first 42 AID formula strengthening grants, illustrates the magnitude of the commitment of these universities to involvement in Agency activities. These BIFAD-approved university strengthening grants are serving to sharpen each university's decisions on which problem areas and which geographical regions to emphasize, and to provide additional information on the magnitude and nature of strengthened expertise. Thus, the Strengthening Program plays a significant role in improving the matching of university resources to AID/LDC needs.

To fully exploit university potential, it is necessary that these programs be supported by university presidents and their boards of regents and not merely by those officials concerned with agricultural development. There must be a commitment to rural development in its broadest form, a willingness to provide staff personnel to deal with developing countries' needs to address social as well as productive problems. Although much of the required expertise will be found in schools or faculties of agriculture, participation by other elements of the university may be called for. The substantive division, rather than just the international office, must fully participate in the design and implementation of those activities undertaken.

It is necessary for the universities to draw upon their most qualified and able personnel, individuals who are willing to take on assignments away from campus in Washington and in countries

abroad. They should not be merely providers of bodies to take on tasks not considered to be an essential element in the strengthening of their own domestic education and research efforts. Qualified teaching and research staff may need to be encouraged to take on the necessary off-campus assignments and assured that they will not be discriminated against in terms of future promotion and tenure. Rather, it may be necessary to offer certain incentives to engage in international activities. Faculty administrators must be convinced that it is their longer term interest to sacrifice short term loss of teaching or research staff in order to improve their longer term objective of broadening the quality of their teaching and research elements. Staff may also have to be convinced of the merits of the program in so far as their own career aspirations are concerned.

There must be a recognition that the participation in the international development effort may require changes in the way they have historically operated and that it is not a simple operation to adjust to special problems of working with both the U.S. government and a developing country, each with its own ideas, concerns, rules and regulations. Inasmuch as host countries will be taking an increasingly active role in project development and implementation, it is important that the universities become increasingly familiar with the desires and interests of these developing nations.

For the purpose of this report, based upon discussions and observations, it is assumed that eligible universities do recognize the special efforts which must be made in order to contribute fully to the objectives set forth in Title XII and will take the steps necessary to fulfill their end of the partnership arrangement.

V. POSSIBLE USE OF INTERMEDIARY INSTITUTIONS

As noted earlier, failure to resolve the problem of obtaining appropriate university response to identified AID project requirements is of major concern to BIFAD. Unless performance in this area is improved, the potential envisaged as a result of Title XII will not be realized and poor performance in terms of efficient and expeditious action could have adverse effects for both AID and the university community.

The BIFAD, its staff, JCAD, and various work groups are aware of the problem and have taken a number of measures designed to improve the situation. Work is being done to expand and improve a Registry of Institutional Resources, information on institutional training capabilities is being gathered, and attempts to strengthen communications in a variety of ways, including country field visits by university and BIFAD personnel and trips to university campuses by AID and host country officials have been undertaken and encouraged. Such efforts, although helpful, have been inadequate. The basic difficulties continue to exist and are unlikely to be resolved unless some additional action is undertaken and unless additional resources are directed to this "matching" effort.

Because of the problems discussed above, the contractor for this report was requested to "determine the merit and feasibility of the selection or creation, and use of an intermediary organization to serve between the universities and the AID Missions to facilitate more effective and efficient provision to AID Missions of university personnel and university experience, and to facilitate more effective program implementation." The use of intermediary organizations as a means of enabling AID to carry out its programs with reduced personnel has been given serious consideration within AID recently.

The merit and feasibility of an "intermediary" depends upon what is envisaged as the role for the intermediary. If it were designed to be the only entity to be involved in the program development process in the type role provided by the planning groups established to develop the Title XII supported Collaborative Research Support Projects (CRSP), a number of concerns arise. The intermediary should not, in any way, duplicate or substitute for existing AID Mission/Washington/BIFAD review process. All field projects, regardless of their nature (Title XII or non Title XII) should be developed, reviewed, and approved in the same general manner. The intermediary should not take over all responsibilities of BIFAD staff with respect to country projects. AID and BIFAD should be more concerned with program quality than with a mechanism established primarily to enable it to operate with fewer direct hire personnel.

It should be noted that AID has departed from two of the assumptions used in this report with respect to a portion of the population program, specifically that (1) prime responsibility for overseeing country project development and implementation will be vested in field missions and (2) that the present system of AID country program review and project selection, development and approval will generally remain as it is. An intermediary is being used to implement a significant portion of the population program. A grant agreement exists between AID and the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF). A program is developed in Washington, without benefit of field participation, and a centrally funded agreement reached by which IPPF makes funds available to various local chapters to carry out activities agreed upon at the Washington level. A similar arrangement exists with the Pathfinder Fund.

Although it would appear that this approach might be considered as a device for implementing Title XII country projects, a large number of problems would have to be overcome. It would have to be agreed, within AID, that agricultural and rural development projects should be developed outside the country context and AID field staff would have little or no role. It would be contrary to the presently established concept that country projects should be reviewed within a country program context. The population program grants are made to organizations whose funds are obtained in large part from other AID sources. Funds are comingled and used for various activities in

the family planning area, some of which AID might have difficulty supporting as specific AID projects. It would appear that the agricultural country projects are of such a nature that they do not lend themselves to the use of an "intermediary" as has been done with certain of the AID supported population programs.

A variation of this approach would be to continue to develop projects at the country level under AID mission guidance but with an "intermediary" to serve between the AID missions and AID top policy officials. This entity would provide the special high level expertise and technical policy guidance in the agricultural sector currently being provided by AID's direct hire staff in Washington's central and regional offices. Although this arrangement would presumably enable AID to reduce personnel, it is difficult to envisage any entity which could gather a body of personnel in Washington which would equal or improve upon present in-house capabilities. Furthermore, it would appear that it would be difficult to defend, from a legal view, that such a function was of the nature that it could be provided by other than AID employees. Finally, it is anticipated that such a proposal would raise the ire of the existing organization. It could be argued that if AID is unable to attract sufficient quality personnel to direct and guide an important sector of technical assistance such as agriculture, the very existence of the AID organization itself is suspect.

It is concluded that the role of an intermediary, if it is to be a practicable approach to the special problem of BIFAD, must be used to perform discrete tasks of a non-policy nature within the context of

AID's present programming policies and procedures, thus allowing the limited BIFAD staff to concentrate its efforts on policy issues and other functional concerns.

VI. RELATING INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES TO AID'S PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

The primary reason for inadequate performance in matching capacities with requirements has been the lack of appropriate staff resources available to BIFAD. BIFAD, in order to successfully carry out its legislative mandate, has a wide range of functions to perform, not only with respect to country programs, but also with regard to overall program policy as it applies to BIFAD's legislative role, research programs, human resource development, university strengthening grants, etc. To this date, using the present approach of relying on either direct hire or Intergovernmental Personnel Agreement (IPA) personnel to perform staff responsibilities, BIFAD's legitimate staff functions are being inadequately performed, especially with respect to country programs.

A review of staff memoranda and legal opinions which were prepared after the BIFAD was established concluded that AID should provide BIFAD with staff support, and that it should be provided by means of direct hire and IPA personnel. Although this contractor is of the view that there are ways and means of supplementing the existing BIFAD resources, it is also concluded that the earlier decision that the basic BIFAD staff function is policy in nature and should be an AID responsibility and provided with direct hire and IPA personnel is appropriate. A change in the nature of the role of BIFAD and its staff is not envisaged.

Presently approved BIFAD staff positions consist of eleven direct hires (to be filled by either direct hire or IPA appointment methods). Five (5) of these are professional positions, the remaining six are administrative or clerical. Four of these professional positions are currently encumbered. BIFAD also has three direct hire temporary employees, none of a professional nature. In addition, there are authorized seven positions to be filled by IPA on a reimbursable detail basis. None of these positions are presently filled. Thus, BIFAD professional staff, including the Director of the Office, consists of only four persons. Fortunately they have been able to borrow the services of one additional direct hire professional person. It would be extremely helpful if a senior AID employee, one knowledgeable of both Washington and field operations, could be placed in a responsible position on the BIFAD staff. It should be emphasized that during the past, BIFAD staff has been assisted in its efforts by the Development Support Bureau's Title XII office which has 11 budgeted positions in FY 1979, 6 of which are experienced professionals. This office is scheduled for elimination shortly. The responsibilities are those which could logically be picked up by BIFAD staff or partially be located elsewhere within AID. Unfortunately, it does not appear that provision has been made to transfer the positions with the functions or to perform the functions elsewhere. Clearly something must be done to remedy the situation. An appropriate staff, experienced both in AID and university operations, is required.

What are the options and how realistic are they as a means of resolving the need for adequate staff resources?

A. More Direct Hire Personnel

Budget ceilings on operating expense funds and direct hire personnel ceilings have precluded staff expansion via this route. To date BIFAD has not been able to obtain transfer of those positions in the Development Support Bureau which deal with Title XII matters. There appears to be no relief in sight and thus this method is ruled out as a practical means to obtain all the resources needed to carry out the necessary BIFAD staff functions and responsibilities. However, it would be of great help if perhaps two of the non-professional positions be converted to professional positions. Consideration should also be given to transferring some of the DSB positions to BIFAD.

B. Obtain IPA Personnel By Means Of Reimbursable Detail

Increased ceilings for reimbursable detail positions are easier to obtain than direct hire ceilings. However, limits on Washington operating expenses would continue to be a constraint. Furthermore, it has not been possible, to date, to find qualified personnel from the universities to fill authorized positions. Apparently, the primary difficulty has been the reluctance of university personnel to accept positions in the high cost Washington area at the equivalent salary they receive from university and consulting assignments in the generally lower cost academic communities and the lack of a satisfactory solution to providing some sort of financial incentive to encourage the move. For example, it has been necessary for AID to limit its reimbursement of the salary and benefits paid to an individual by the university, unless special approval is received

from the Civil Service authorities--a process that effectively precludes such action. Universities are reluctant to increase salaries for staff during their tenure in Washington.

The Civil Service Reform Act, which was recently enacted has provided limited relief by enabling AID to obtain IPA personnel to fill positions on a general schedule equivalency basis, in other words, pay the IPA employee the classified GS grade for the position involved. Although the salary would normally be at least comparable to that which the university representative would receive from teaching, research and/or consultancy and the government would pay family travel and moving expenses including temporary lodging, the high Washington cost of living problem together with the other problems of stepping out of a known assignment into one which may or may not have relevancy to the individual's career, and the universities' reluctance to increase salaries during the employee's assignment in Washington have limited the effectiveness of this means of support. Discussions with the Department of Agriculture reveal that it has had exactly the same difficulties as has AID in effectively using the IPA device as a means of obtaining longer term assistance from the universities. Their use of this arrangement has therefore been limited in application. It is suggested that at least four of these IPA temporary detail positions be eliminated because of an inability to obtain the personnel required. Although further effort should be directed toward obtaining assistance for the remaining positions under reimbursable detail IPA arrangements, the use of this approach appears to have definite limitations.

C. Special Approach to BIFAD Need For Staff Resources

Review and analysis of the problem of matching project requirements to university capabilities inevitably lead to the conclusion, that the options above, for one reason or another, do not provide the resolution. It must be recognized that it requires expert knowledge and time consuming effort to mobilize the appropriate university or universities and personnel for the tasks identified in country institutional development projects within a specified time frame. BIFAD has been so short of staff that it has been unable to provide participation in many of the forums dealing with country requirements. They have been able to direct even less attention to the supply part of the "matching" equation. Therefore it is urged that the following course of action be pursued.

BIFAD should be authorized to enter into an agreement with an entity which is especially well equipped to provide precisely the services needed--the wherewithal to provide the institutional support and manpower necessary to assist BIFAD to matching AID requirements to university capabilities. It is recommended that an agreement be reached with an entity representing all the universities eligible under the Title XII legislation, namely a combination of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). These organizations, with headquarters staffs in Washington, represent the Presidents of all universities and colleges currently or anticipated to be eligible to participate with AID in the Title XII efforts.

The agreement would call for a specified number of person-years service in support of the AID/BIFAD staff in the time consuming and detailed task of finding the appropriate institutions and personnel to meet the project needs identified by means of AID's project reviews. Personnel performing the service would be required to work with BIFAD staff, the regional work groups, and JCAD in order to be familiar with requirements. It is suggested that at least one person be assigned to work directly with each of the four regional bureaus. The contractor and its employees would be knowledgeable of the capabilities of the university community. The contractor and its staff would not be participating in policy issues which are reserved to AID or BIFAD. The staff would not be performing services or meeting needs comparable to those performed elsewhere within AID by Civil Service or Foreign Service Personnel. Government direction or supervision of individual contract employees would not be required to adequately protect the Government's interest. A scope of work would need to be prepared with the person-years requirement being dependent, in part, upon progress made in supplementing BIFAD's existing direct hire and IPA staff.

A number of advantages would accrue to BIFAD from an agreement with NASULGC and AASCU. They are long established non-profit entities which are, in fact, more closely related to the entire community of eligible Title XII universities than even BIFAD itself, with its high level but still somewhat limited, in terms of Board membership, participation from the university community. They

have experienced and knowledgeable staff personnel in Washington presently involved in international activities and direct and immediate access to the top officials of all those institutions working in the Title XII area. They have experience performing services for other Government bodies, including the Department of Defense, Office of Education and the NIH, and under these agreements have government approved indirect cost rates. Because of their special high level academic ties they should be able to obtain the staff necessary to perform the matching functions more readily than it has been possible for BIFAD and AID to do under the IPA arrangement, which has depended for the most part upon the more limited knowledge by BIFAD staff of individual availabilities and upon the time constraints of the small BIFAD professional staff.

Although the contractor will have some of the same problems previously set forth above in connection with attracting personnel to Washington by means of IPA arrangements, it is anticipated that more institutional push can be placed on possible candidates for the assignments in Washington through an agreement with the contractor, than is presently being exercised through existing arrangements. It is necessary for the top university officials to encourage faculty and staff to take on Washington assignments. It is suspected that salaries in Washington may necessarily exceed those earned by individuals in less high cost areas. However, there should be sufficient flexibility under the agreement device to meet this problem, whereas it has been an impediment to successful use of the IPA arrangement.

Because of the program nature of the service it would appear appropriate that the agreement be funded from program funds rather than from the more restricted operating expense account, thus making it a more attractive proposition to the Agency. The agreement could take, it would appear, one of three possible forms--a grant, a cooperative agreement, or a service contract arrangement. It would appear that the service contract would serve as the best means of setting forth and obtaining the services required, but the device used is not the primary issue--the need for the service is.

The service contract was questioned as to being a proper device for establishing a BIFAD support staff at the time the BIFAD was initially established. However, the legal view at that time set forth certain assumptions concerning the nature of the services to be performed. The services proposed here would not be of the nature which would be ruled out under the assumptions made in the earlier legal memorandum. Precedent has been established for obtaining similar or related services via the agreement route by other elements of AID.

For example, in the case of AID's Private Voluntary Agency programs, management support grants are being provided in two instances to organizations to enable them to strengthen the management functions of various voluntary agencies. In the case of the grant to the New Trans-Century Foundation a significant portion of the grant is justified for the purpose of the Foundation assisting the voluntary agencies in their personnel recruitment efforts.

It is anticipated that, after this entity had identified the most appropriate source of outside expertise to meet specific project requirements it would be possible for AID to use one of the tools available to it, as discussed above, to enter into an agreement without resort to a time consuming process of meeting traditional competitive procurements requirements. Hopefully AID, based upon recommendations from the NASULGC-AASCU entity, which would have taken into account expressions of interest from qualified sources, could proceed with the final selection process. The entity, of course, would be required to justify its recommendation(s) and indicate why other institutions were not considered as the number one choice.

The above possible arrangement has been discussed with the most senior staff officers of NASULGC and AASCU and they are of the view that they could perform the job in a manner which would reflect favorably on both AID and the university community. I urge that the above proposal be adopted as a means of assisting in the resolution of BIFAD and AID's most serious problem in effectively implementing the Title XII mandate with respect to country projects. At some subsequent date, it would be possible, if considered advisable, to use this device for additional external services such as project evaluation for which BIFAD or AID lacks internal resources.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Conclusion

There is insufficient understanding of joint AID-university problems related to Title XII project operations.

Recommendation

Continue efforts to strengthen communications within AID, within the universities and between both parties.

II. Conclusion

University participation in the international development effort is affected by internal concerns and constraints.

Recommendation

Increased attention should be directed to overcoming problems caused by these concerns.

III. Conclusion

Inadequate mechanisms exist for obtaining university personnel for short term assignments to assist missions on program and project development.

Recommendation

1. Support proposal to link universities with specific AID missions.

2. Explore possible use of simple cooperative agreement-arrangements as is currently being done by the Department of Agriculture.

IV. Conclusion

The process for finalizing longer term AID-university agreements appears to present more difficulties than necessary thus resulting in program implementation delay.

Recommendation

Increased use should be made of the collaborative approach and the cooperative agreement and a simpler system developed to insure program quality and equity in treatment of potential contractors.

V. Conclusion

There is no uniform method for obtaining progress reports on Title XII projects.

Recommendation

Develop a uniform reporting system which will enable management to be aware of project assistance from planning through implementation stage.

VI. Conclusion

The use of an "intermediary" if defined as an arrangement with an entity to relieve AID of high level policy responsibilities relating to technical assistance in the agricultural sector presents a number of formidable problems.

Recommendation

The role of an intermediary should be limited to discrete functions of a non-policy nature.

VII. Conclusion

The core staff of BIFAD requires strengthening and efforts should be made to obtain services of AID employees familiar with both Washington and field operations.

Recommendation

Increase on-board professional strength of BIFAD staff by eliminating some clerical positions and possible transfer of positions from DSB. Staff should be primarily direct hire or IPA appointment. Four IPA detail positions should be eliminated since it has not been possible to fill them.

VIII. Conclusion

The primary reason for inadequate performance in matching AID project requirements with university capabilities has been the lack of personnel resources and institutional input available to BIFAD.

Recommendation

BIFAD should be authorized to enter into an agreement with an entity which is especially well equipped to provide the services needed.