PN-AAN-129
ISN-29792

April 1, 1980

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

ON

# TITLE XII - FAMINE PREVENTION AND FREEDOM FROM HUNGER

OF THE

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

AS AMENDED

Submitted by the

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

## Highlights

This is the fourth Report to the Congress on Title XII.

Title XII is predominately a program carried out in developing countries. Of the FY 1980 A.I.D. requests to the Congress for Title XII activities, 80% was to carry out A.I.D. Mission funded country assistance programs. Most of the rest, including 8% for support to International Agricultural Research Centers, was to have been spent in the developing countries for their benefit.

This Report covers Title XII activities of Fiscal year, 1979. This has been an eventful year, rich in accomplishment in Title XII program implementation.

-- The number of A.I.D. Mission funded Title XII country assistance projects developed through the A.I.D./BIFAD review and selection process and being implemented has nearly doubled since last year.

-- The number of such Title XII projects which have been developed and approved and for which contractor selection processes are underway has increased more than two and one-half fold since last year, indicating even more rapid increase in the number of field programs next year.

-- The interest of developing countries in Title XII projects as reflected in Mission requests has grown continuously, increasing about 8 fold between FY 1976 and FY 1981. Among these Title XII proposals, sharply increased emphasis is being given to strengthening developing country institutional and human resource capabilities.

-- One major Collaborative Research Support Program, on Sorghum and Millet, principal food crops of the very poor, was initiated in FY 1979. Eight U.S. universities, one International Agricultural Research Center, eleven developing countries and A.I.D. are collaborating in and contributing financially to this effort.

-- The program of strengthening U.S. universities to participate more effectively in Title XII technical assistance programs was started with a total of 46 grants averaging $108,550 each. University contributions to this program were approximately double this amount.

-- Significant progress was made by A.I.D. in adopting policies and procedures initiated or participated in by the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD).

*BIFAD analyses of Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs) contributed to reshaping guidance to A.I.D. field missions. Baseline analyses and studies for Title XII assistance were incorporated into most mission CDSSs prepared in FY 1979. Increased emphasis was given to the role of women, both as participative agents and as beneficiaries of agricultural and rural development. Use of the Collaborative Assistance Method of involving U.S. universities in country assistance programs was sharply expanded.*

-- *Mutual understanding between A.I.D. and the universities continues to improve. A.I.D. is making several modifications in approach and procedure which improve university performance in carrying out A.I.D. technical assistance programs. Universities increasingly recognize that many problems are inherent in the task itself. They are taking several measures to strengthen their capabilities to deal with these problems and to do even more effective technical assistance work in the future. The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges has adopted a Statement of Principles designed to assure maximum accomplishment from the overseas work of its member universities. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) has recently announced intention to establish an Office which will give special attention to its member institutions' participation in Title XII.*

*At the beginning of FY 1980, lead responsibility for interacting with the BIFAD shifted from A.I.D. to the newly established International Development Cooperation Agency, which has policy and budget authority affecting bilateral and multilateral development assistance, and advises the President on all U.S. actions affecting development. From that time, BIFAD began working with both IDCA and A.I.D. in accordance with their respective responsibilities.*

*The Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation which was planned to take over from A.I.D. many Title XII research activities and to provide increased funding in related work was authorized but has not yet been funded for FY 1980. It has been proposed again as part of the Administration's program for FY 1981.*

*With these changes, the prospect at the end of FY 1979 was for considerable change in the organizational relationships within which Title XII is implemented.*

*This Report discusses most of the Title XII activities and issues in more than a single year perspective. This seems appropriate as Title XII marks the end of its fourth full year and as U.S. development assistance shifts to a new organizational format.*

*Future budget projections for U.S. foreign assistance are currently under intensive review in both the legislative and executive branches of government. Therefore, it is not possible to include five-year or other long-term budget projections in this Report.*

*Clearly, the four years of Title XII have validated its central premises. Hunger, both chronic and periodically recurring, remains the lot of millions of people in the developing countries. In many such countries, growth in population and food supplies move at the same pace; in some, population growth is not offset by yield increasing technology, forcing crop and animal production onto ever more unsuited, fragile lands thereby diminishing the land resource base. Fortunately, however, science and technology, properly adapted to local circumstances, have demonstrated their capabilities radically to increase agricultural productivity on the typically small, poor farms of the less developed countries. Title XII is beginning significantly to harness the institutional and human resources of the U.S. universities to this task and the related objectives of improving nutrition, incomes, productive employment and living levels of the peoples of the developing countries.*

*IDCA, A.I.D. and the U.S. agricultural universities have dedicated themselves, under the Title XII legislative mandate, to vigorous and creative collaborative effort toward even greater accomplishment. Perseverance in this effort is essential.*

CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| | Highlights | i |
| I. | COUNTRY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION | 1 |
| | Table 1. Projects Shaped by Title XII Review and Selection Process, April 1, 1980 | 2 |
| | Table 2. Levels of A.I.D. Requests for Section 103 (Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition) and FY 1981 ISTC Funds and Their Proposed Allocation | 4 |
| II. | POLICY AND STRATEGY FORMATION | 5 |
| 1. | A.I.D. Agricultural Development Policy | 5 |
| 2. | BIFAD Analysis of Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs) - 1979 | 6 |
| | Table 3. A.I.D. Program Levels - Agriculture and Rural Development ($ Millions) | 7 |
| 3. | Women in Development | 8 |
| 4. | Baseline Studies | 9 |
| III. | ILLUSTRATIVE COUNTRY TITLE XII PROJECTS UNDERWAY | 10 |
| 1. | Botswana | 11 |
| 2. | Malawi | 12 |
| 3. | Sierra Leone | 12 |
| 4. | Nepal | 13 |
| 5. | Sri Lanka | 13 |
| 6. | Indonesia | 13 |
| 7. | Yemen | 14 |
| 8. | Egypt | 14 |
| 9. | Ecuador | 15 |
| 10. | Peru | 15 |

CONTENTS (Continued)


| | Page |
|---|---|
| IV. PROVIDING A FULLER ROLE FOR U.S. AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITIES IN A.I.D. COUNTRY PROGRAMS | 16 |
| 1. Background | 16 |
| 2. Increased Use of Collaborative Assistance Method Under Title XII | 17 |
| Table 4. Utilization of Collaborative Assistance Method of University Contracting of Title XII Projects, in Operation or Planned, as of April 1, 1980. | 18 |
| 3. University Support to A.I.D. Missions in Analysis and Program Planning | 19 |
| 4. Modification of University Selection Process | 19 |
| 5. Increased University Assistance with Agricultural Policy Problems | 20 |
| V. RESEARCH: AN INTEGRATED APPROACH | 21 |
| 1. U.S. Support to the International Agricultural Research Centers | 21 |
| 2. U.S. University Participation in Research | 22 |
| (1) Through Country Mission Programs | 23 |
| (2) Through Centrally Funded Contract Research | 23 |
| (3) Through Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs) | 25 |
| Table 5. Collaborative Research Support Program Funding, 1977 - 1981 | 28 |
| Table 6. A.I.D. Support to Title XII Research, FY 1979 and Requested for FY 1980 and FY 1981 (in $ millions) | 30 |
| VI. U.S. UNIVERSITY STRENGTHENING PROGRAM | 30 |

CONTENTS (Continued)


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| VII. | OTHER NOTEWORTHY ACTIVITIES | 33 |
| | 1. Regional Title XII Seminars | 33 |
| | Table 7. Attendance at Regional Title XII Seminars | 34 |
| | 2. Establishment of AASCU Office | 35 |
| | 3. Statement of Principles for University Participation | 35 |
| VIII. | SEPARATE STATEMENT OF THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT | 38 |

APPENDICES

1. Projects Shaped by Title XII Review and Selection Process
   - (a) Africa Bureau
   - (b) Asia Bureau
   - (c) Latin America & Caribbean Bureau
   - (d) Near East Bureau
2. A.I.D.'s Response to Policy Recommendations Submitted by the Members of the Workshop on Women in Development to A.I.D. and the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD)
3. Estimated Schedule of Collaborative Research Support Programs Implementation, FY 1977-1981
4. Strengthening Grants

## I. COUNTRY PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Fiscal year 1979 was a year of accomplishment under Title XII: a year which saw rapid movement to actual implementation of previous years' policies and plans. It saw a rapid step-up in the process of placing eligible university, and USDA, teams in developing countries to carry out Title XII projects which had been shaped by the BIFAD/AID review and selection process. It also saw continuing increases in emphasis placed by host governments for assistance through Title XII type projects, as reflected in mission program requests.

### 1. Implementation of Projects Shaped by BIFAD/A.I.D. Process

Last year's Annual Report to the Congress noted that under this process, 19 contracts had been signed with a total life-of-project cost of $71.96 millions. This year the number of projects is 36, with a total life-of-project cost of $173.38 million. Last year the number of approved projects for which the contracts had not yet been signed was 16 with a life-of-project cost of $74.66 millions. For almost all of these, contracts have now been signed and activities are underway. There is now a new group of 41 approved projects under varying stages of contractor selection and approval, with a total life-of-project value of $333.42 million. This is a much larger total than last year at this time, indicating that projects to be contracted for under Title XII will increase even more sharply next year than this, both in numbers and total value. Furthermore, another 110 projects though not yet approved are in varying stages of development and internal review, again about twice as many as were at this stage of development a year ago. This remarkable step-up in the rate of country technical assistance project implementation, in contractor selection for approved projects, and in development and review of projects for future approval and implementation is shown in Table 1. Project by project details are included as Appendix I.

### 2. Continued Emphasis on Title XII Type Projects in Mission Program Requests

The rapid increase in rate of implementation of Title XII country technical assistance projects, which as has been indicated may be expected to accelerate rapidly next year and continue in succeeding years, is in response to an early, and continuously increasing emphasis on Title XII projects by A.I.D. country missions.

A.I.D. guidance to its overseas Mission concerning Title XII began even before its enactment, and was made a part of the instructions to Missions for the preparation of their Annual Budget Submissions for FY 1978. This early guidance requested that Missions thoroughly examine their programs and appraise the opportunities for U.S. university involvement in ongoing activities and the need for new activities of the type envisioned in Title XII.

TABLE 1

PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS, APRIL 1, 1980. [a], [b]

Summary by Regional Bureaus

| Bureau | Contracts Signed Number | Contracts Signed Life-of-Project Cost Millions $ | Projects Approved Contracts Not Signed Number | Projects Approved Contracts Not Signed Life-of-Project Cost Millions $ | Projects In Advanced Planning Number | Projects In Advanced Planning Life-of-Project Cost Millions $ | Totals Number | Totals Life-of-Project Cost Millions $ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Near East [c] | 7 | 68.00 | 9 | 127.70 | 6 | 23.90 | 22 | 219.60 |
| | (4) | (17.33) | (4) | (42.40) | (5) | (83.70)[c] | (13) | (143.43) |
| Asia | 3 | 18.30 | 5 | 53.00 | 8 | 62.10 | 16 | 133.40 |
| | (3) | (23.80) | (2) | (7.40) | (2) | (25.00) | (7) | (56.20) |
| Latin America | 17 | 51.90 | 19 | 108.94 | 12 | 46.60 | 48 | 207.44 |
| | (5) | (10.65) | (6) | (11.48) | (9) | (47.50) | (20) | (69.73) |
| Africa | 9 | 35.18 | 8 | 43.78 | 7 | 82.45 | 24 | 161.41 |
| | (7) | (20.18) | (4) | (13.38) | (3) | (26.40) | (14) | (59.96) |
| Totals | 36 | 173.38 | 41 | 333.42 | 33 | 215.05 | 110 | 721.85 |
| | (19) | (71.96) | (16) | (74.66) | (19) | (182.60) | (54) | (329.32) |

a. Includes host country contracts and PASAs.

b. Numbers in parentheses are comparable figures as of April 1, 1979.

c. Activities funded by Security Supporting Assistance, but otherwise comparable to Title XII, are treated as if they were funded under Section 103 funds.

Missions responded very affirmatively to these new emphases. In the Fiscal year preceding enactment of Title XII (FY 1976), $66 million of proposed country mission programs were of a type that would classify as Title XII, under definitions later developed jointly by BIFAD and A.I.D.1/ Fiscal year 1977 program plans had already been approved and could not be appreciably adjusted to the new Title XII emphases. Proposed Title XII mission projects for that year totaled $68 millions. But for FY 1978, the first year which could reflect program planning in response to Title XII, this amount had almost doubled to $129 millions. This reflects interest on the part both of missions and of developing country governments in expanding these Title XII type assistance programs. It reflects also continuing and frequent communication of A.I.D. and BIFAD with field missions and host governments and institutions, including field trips to each geographic region by BIFAD members, members of the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development (JCAD), of the Joint Research Committee and BIFAD staff members.

This mission program emphasis on Title XII continues to the present. Requests for mission funded Title XII programs are $323 million for FY 1980 and $325 million for 1981 — almost five times that of the year preceding Title XII. (Table 2).

The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) has persistently expressed the need for especially greater emphasis upon programs to strengthen developing country institutions of research, teaching and extension. It is noteworthy that mission proposals strongly reflect this emphasis also, requests rising from $28 millions in 1976 to $205 millions for 1981, an increase to 730 per cent that of the pre Title XII year and nearly five-fold that of FY 1978.

It is noteworthy also that Title XII is, as was intended, very predominately an overseas program. Of the total $400 millions requested for Title XII activities for FY 1980, $323 millions are for mission funded programs. Of the Centrally funded requests, $30 million are for funding the International Agricultural Research Centers and most of the remainder is for direct support to missions or carried out in collaboration with one or more developing countries.

Requests for Title XII programs, presented in A.I.D.'s Congressional Presentation, as presented in Table 2, characterize the demand, or need, for Title XII activities. They represent the opportunities for universi-

---

1/ These different type Title XII activities are set forth in Table 2. Of these, the first two (namely, Strengthening Developing Country Institutions for Research, Teaching and Extension, and Advisory Services to Developing Countries) are mission funded. The other categories are centrally funded.

TABLE 2

LEVELS OF A.I.D. REQUESTS FOR SECTION 103 (AGRICULTURE RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND NUTRITION) AND FY 1981 ISTC FUNDS AND THEIR PROPOSED ALLOCATION1/

($ Millions)

| | FY 1976 | | FY 1977 | | FY 1978 | | FY 1979 | | FY 1980 | | FY 1981 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % |
| Total Section 103 & ISTC Request | 582 | 100 | 540 | 100 | 586 | 100 | 673 | 100 | 715 | 100 | 782 6/ | 100 |
| Title XII | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Strengthening Developing Country Institutions for Research, Teaching and Extension2/ | 28 | | 18 | | 42 | | 90 | | 173 | | 205 | |
| Advisory Services to Developing Countries3/ | 38 | | 50 | | 87 | | 95 | | 150 | | 120 | |
| Adaptation/Application of Technology | 4 | | 10 | | 23 | | 20 | | 21 | | 23 | |
| Strengthening U.S. Universities | -- | | -- | | -- | | 5 | | 9 | | 8 | |
| International Research Centers | 16 | | 21 | | 24 | | 27 | | 30 | | 37 | |
| Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSP) | -- | | 1 | | 5 | | 8 | | 8 | | 9 7/ | |
| Centrally Funded Contract Research | 14 | | 15 | | 10 | | 4 | | 7 | | 7 | |
| TOTAL Title XII Defined Activities | 100 | 17 | 118 | 22 | 195 | 33 | 249 | 37 | 402 | 56 | 410 | 53 |
| Residual5/ | 482 | | 425 | 79 | 395 | 67 | 424 | 63 | 313 | 44 | 373 | 47 |

1/ Table does not include Title XII activities under Security Supporting Assistance.
2/ Includes related capital costs.
3/ Does not include related capital costs.
4/ Funds to strengthen capacities of U.S. universities in agricultural research, education, extension, development planning, administration and related areas.
5/ Includes all non-Title XII Section 103 activities (e.g., rural road construction, fertilizer production or procurement, etc.). Includes also activities closely related to Title XII such as support to build capacity at U.S. agricultural universities under Section 211(d), capital costs of advisory services to developing countries, and activities of private and voluntary agencies.
6/ Includes $729 million Section 103 funds and $53 million from the ISTC budget request for Title XII activities transferred from A.I.D.
7/ In addition, $2 million would be allocated for CRSPs from ISTC's new funds.

ties eligible under Title XII, and other entities such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to participate in mission programs. Time is required to move these requests through those stages of final project approval, contractor selection and negotiation necessary to bring the right match of U.S. university and other technical resources to the job to be done. This involves, in the first instance, Congressional review. It then involves review and often reformulation in some respects jointly by A.I.D. and the BIFAD and its subordinate committees and support staff as a basis for recommending U.S. institutions best suited for the specific projects. For long term projects to be implemented by universities under the Collaborative Assistance Method of contracting (to be discussed later) it involves also providing arrangements under which the implementing university(ies) may work with the mission and host country on details of project design and on the development of an implementation plan. This is essential if the university is to work with optimum effectiveness and as a true partner with A.I.D. in implementing the project.

This entire process is complex and, unfortunately, time consuming. But as shown in Table 1, it is moving into a rapidly accelerating stage of implementation.

## II. POLICY AND STRATEGY FORMATION

As stipulated in Title XII, the BIFAD has participated actively with A.I.D. in allocation of resources and in shaping basic A.I.D. policies and strategies affecting agricultural, nutrition and rural sector development. This participation has very significantly affected the policy and strategy framework within which individual country programs and the implementing projects are carried out. As has been mentioned current emphases on strengthening developing country research, educational and extension institutions is due in large measure to these joint deliberations. Four other examples are BIFAD participation in development and implementation of the A.I.D. Agricultural Development Policy paper, in review and analysis of the Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSS), in activities to expand the role of Women in Development, and in Baseline Studies.

### 1. A.I.D. Agricultural Development Policy

The BIFAD, the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development (JCAD) and the BIFAD Support Staff were intimately involved in reviewing, discussing and approving the Agency's "Agricultural Development Policy Paper" which serves as a guide to A.I.D. agricultural assistance policy for developing countries. The policy paper provides general and specific guidance for implementing an agricultural policy which is responsive to the Congressional mandate of reaching the poor rural majority in developing countries.

The policy is built on five functional areas of action which are: Asset Distribution and Access; Planning and Policy Analysis; Development and Diffusion of New Technology; Rural Infrastructure; Marketing, Storage, Input Supply, Rural Industry and Credit. The Agency has analyzed its agriculture and rural development programs of the past six years to determine the emphasis in terms of funding that has been given to each of these major areas and fifteen other sub-functional areas. Table 3 provides information for the period FY 1975 through FY 1979. (Please note that the funding levels include the Sahel Development Program from FY 1978 forward. A line has also been added for discrete nutrition activities from FY 1978 onward.)

Analysis of country mission programs and project proposals by the JCAD and other BIFAD instrumentalities took into account questions of conformance to these policy guidelines. It is interesting to note the pronounced increases in Planning and Policy Analysis and on Development and Diffusion of New Technology, although the absolute amount allocated to the first of these remains relatively small. These two categories of assistance are, of course, at the heart of Title XII. Programs for development of rural infrastructure, marketing, storage, input supply and credit facilities are diminishing in relative emphasis.

2. BIFAD Analysis of Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSS) - 1979

A very important activity in 1979 was BIFAD's review of FY 1981 CDSSs from 49 A.I.D. field missions. The CDSS is an A.I.D. planning and strategy document that seeks to analyze a country's major development problems and to elucidate a long-term U.S. strategy toward meeting and solving those problems in which the United States has a comparative advantage. The CDSS includes the country mission's five-year budget projections for programs designed to fulfill the strategy. The BIFAD review focused on agricultural and rural development aspects of the CDSSs.

Eight senior agricultural specialists from the university community were engaged to conduct the review under the guidance of an experienced member of the BIFAD staff. Forty-nine CDSSs were read, discussed, and written summary assessments of each were forwarded to the appropriate regional bureau and senior A.I.D. officials for use in the A.I.D. formal CDSS reviews.

The review team also prepared an overview document on the CDSS initiative itself, and commended A.I.D. on this analytical, focused approach to country programming. It also attempted a comprehensive analysis of the CDSSs in regard to their relationships with the stated A.I.D. policy in agriculture. The final review document was used by A.I.D. as a major background document in preparing for the FY 1982 CDSS process, and was sent to all field missions for their guidance. It is known that this BIFAD input to field guidance is significantly influencing

## TABLE 3. A.I.D. PROGRAM LEVELS - AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT ($ MILLIONS)

| | FY 1975 | | FY 1976[a/] | | FY 1977 | | FY 1978[b/] | | FY 1979[b/] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % | $ | % |
| 1. ASSET DISTRIBUTION AND ACCESS | 6.9 | 1.1 | 16.3 | 2.4 | 22.2 | 4.3 | 35.0 | 5.8 | 27.2 | 4.0 |
| a. Land Tenure | (0.4) | (0.1) | (2.6) | (0.4) | (2.6) | (0.5) | (5.8) | (1.0) | (0.4) | (0.1) |
| b. Local Participatory Institutions | (6.5) | (1.0) | (13.7) | (2.0) | (19.6) | (3.8) | (29.2) | (4.8) | (26.8) | (3.9) |
| 2. PLANNING & POLICY ANALYSIS | 9.8 | 1.6 | 15.1 | 2.2 | 17.1 | 3.3 | 32.4 | 5.4 | 51.2 | 7.5 |
| 3. DEVELOPMENT & DIFFUSION OF NEW TECHNOLOGY | 53.2 | 8.7 | 89.0 | 13.0 | 77.1 | 15.1 | 131.5 | 21.8 | 239.2 | 35.2 |
| a. Centrally Funded Research | (3.5) | (0.6) | (6.0) | (0.9) | (9.5) | (1.9) | (17.5) | (2.9) | (46.2) | (6.8) |
| b. International Centers | (10.5) | (1.7) | (15.7) | (2.3) | (20.6) | (4.0) | (24.0) | (4.0) | (26.4) | (3.9) |
| c. Bilaterally Funded Research | (15.4) | (2.5) | (18.0) | (2.6) | (22.0) | (4.3) | (48.6) | (8.0) | (60.8) | (8.9) |
| d. Education and Extension | (23.8) | (3.9) | (49.3) | (7.2) | (25.0) | (4.9) | (41.5) | (6.9) | (105.8) | (15.6) |
| 4. RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE | 238.8 | 39.0 | 205.0 | 30.0 | 233.4 | 45.7 | 246.0 | 40.7 | 184.5 | 27.1 |
| a. Land & Water Development & Conservation | (137.0) | (22.4) | (146.3) | (21.4) | (135.9) | (26.4) | (115.3) | (19.1) | (74.1) | (10.9) |
| b. Energy, incl. Rural Electrification | (25.6) | (4.2) | (0.3) | (0.0) | (36.1) | (7.1) | (57.3) | (9.5) | (86.6) | (12.7) |
| c. Rural Roads | (76.2) | (12.4) | (58.4) | (8.6) | (62.4) | (12.2) | (73.4) | (12.1) | (23.8) | (3.5) |
| 5. MARKETING & STORAGE, INPUT SUPPLY, RURAL INDUSTRY, & CREDIT | 303.4 | 49.6 | 357.0 | 52.3 | 161.9 | 31.6 | 144.7 | 23.9 | 153.8 | 22.6 |
| a. Marketing & Storage | (32.9) | (5.4) | (38.4) | (5.6) | (40.3) | (7.9) | (20.2) | (3.3) | (10.8) | (1.6) |
| b. Input Supply | (200.0) | (32.7) | (234.5) | (34.4) | (86.6) | (16.9) | (71.3) | (11.8) | (95.3) | (14.0) |
| c. Rural Industry | (23.2) | (3.8) | (12.5) | (1.8) | (25.7) | (5.0) | (15.0) | (2.5) | (37.7) | (5.5) |
| d. Credit | (47.3) | (7.7) | (71.6) | (10.5) | (9.3) | (1.8) | (38.2) | (6.3) | (10.0) | (1.5) |
| 6. NUTRITION[c/] | | | | | | | 9.5 | 1.6 | 11.8 | 1.8 |
| 7. OTHER UNCODED | | | | | | | 4.9 | 0.8 | 12.2 | 1.8 |
| TOTAL | 612.1 | 100.0 | 682.4 | 100.0 | 511.7 | 100.0 | 604.0 | 100.0 | 680.0 | 100.0 |

SOURCE: Figures based on Development assistance appropriation, Food and Nutrition account, excluding Sterling development funds; a/ FY 1976 figures include transitional quarter; b/ Figures from FY 1978 forward include Sahel programs; c/ FY 1975 - 77 exclude nutrition, FY 1978 forward include nutrition. Columns may not add due to rounding.

the FY 1982 CDSSs, but the nature and degree of this influence is yet to be analyzed as a major FY 1980 BIFAD activity. The CDSS review represented the first opportunity for BIFAD to review and comment upon mission country program plans before the Project Identification Document (PID) review stage. The impressive effort by BIFAD in 1979 to participate fully in the CDSS reviews and to improve the CDSS process as a major A.I.D. initiative is one good indication of the potential value of future close collaboration between A.I.D. and BIFAD. Cross country, and cross regional bureau comparisons of the various strengths and weaknesses of the CDSSs were highly useful for purposes of improving these important planning documents. Possible means of improving the CDSS process, such as involving universities especially experienced in the specific country in their preparation or review, are currently being examined.

3. Women in Development

The fuller integration of women into development is mandated by the Foreign Assistance Act. This mandate applies with special cogency to activities carried out under Title XII. For it is largely through projects under that Title that A.I.D. will influence those institutions which most interact with rural families in their twin enterprises of producing food and making a living. U.S. agricultural universities, through their research and extension programs, have historically focused on improving the lives of both men and women in their respective states and, especially, on working with families rather than individuals. Therefore, the BIFAD has vigorously supported A.I.D.'s policies to advance the role of women in the developing countries.

Two mutually supporting elements are incorporated into A.I.D. policy: that women are to be fully participative both as agents and as beneficiaries of the development process. It is also A.I.D. policy that these two elements be incorporated into its assistance efforts. This is not always easy to achieve and is rarely an automatic consequence of an assistance effort. Therefore, it is important that Title XII projects be so designed as to be competently sensitive to their impacts on women in the cultures in which the projects are carried out, and to give full opportunity for participation of women in designing and in carrying out the projects themselves.

A first major need was to involve professional women from the U.S. agricultural universities more extensively in design of and as team members on Title XII projects. Several specific measures were taken to achieve this.

(1). Upon the recommendation of BIFAD, A.I.D. arranged, through a grant to the University of Arizona, a three-week training workshop on the Role of Women in Title XII, in Washington, D. C., in August, 1978. Participants from 34 universities attended. In the eighteen months since returning to their campuses these women have engaged in a wide range of

activities to improve their own institutions' capacities and performance on behalf of the role of women in development under Title XII projects.

(2). These women also developed a group of Policy Recommendations with supporting analysis, which were recommended by BIFAD to A.I.D. After thorough review, A.I.D. circulated to all missions, on May 5, 1979, a statement of all those Policy Recommendations with appropriate guidance and other comments with respect to each. Copies were also transmitted to all U.S. universities eligible for participation under Title XII. Appendix 2.

(3). The Guidelines and the proposal reviews for the Strengthening Grants to U.S. universities directed specific attention to the need for enhancing the capabilities of the universities with respect to the role of women in development. As a result, many of the strengthening programs include specific provisions both for developing the university's capability in subject fields of women in development, and for increasing the number of women to serve on university contract teams.

(4). During the summer of 1979, A.I.D. commissioned a follow-up study and report to the 1979 summer work shop directed primarily at determining desirable next steps. A.I.D. and BIFAD are currently examining the several recommendations of that study.

This beginning effort on behalf of the role of women in Title XII has already made significant impacts on the structure of both technical assistance and research projects and on U.S. university strengthening programs.

4. Baseline Studies

Title XII places special emphasis on developing or strengthening developing country agricultural education, research and extension institutions, and on the more effective coordination of these three functions. This is an important and proper emphasis. Many countries have serious deficiencies in capability in one or more of these three functions. Even where all three are reasonably adequate, they are often poorly coordinated so that farmers may not receive sound technical information, research may not be directed to local problems, or agricultural training may not be based on reliable, locally applicable information.

To ascertain the adequacy of their agricultural research, education and extension capabilities, and of the coordination among these functions, BIFAD recommended, and A.I.D. agreed, that baseline studies be carried out in selected developing countries. These studies were designed to provide relatively comprehensive, country-specific information on the current state of and future requirements for assistance in the strengthening or development of research, education and extension systems. They would also provide a basis for identification of opportunities for Title XII programs.

Comprehensive baseline studies, using a highly detailed analytic methodology developed for the trial tests, have been completed in Peru, Ecuador, and Jamaica. One is expected to be initiated soon in Guyana and one is under consideration for the Dominican Republic. These comprehensive studies were well suited to the special circumstances of these countries. Title XII activities in those countries will be importantly influenced by them. However, for most countries it was found more feasible to obtain necessary baseline information through other means, as parts of general sector studies, from information in hand from other sources, through less comprehensive special studies, etc. Virtually all missions have made special efforts to get Title XII baseline data as a necessary part of their regular programming processes, to serve as a basis for their CDSS and project documents. Special efforts will be made to analyze the group of Latin America/ Caribbean comprehensive baseline studies when completed for elements of possible general significance to other countries.

## III. ILLUSTRATIVE TITLE XII COUNTRY PROJECTS UNDERWAY

The agricultural circumstances and needs of the developing countries vary widely. In response to these varying needs, Title XII projects vary widely also. All Title XII projects have, however, several characteristics in common. They are directed at famine prevention and freedom from hunger. They involve U.S. universities eligible under Title XII and/or the U.S. Department of Agriculture (or the U.S. Department of Commerce for fisheries projects) as suppliers of technical assistance to the host governments or institutions. All are concerned with strengthening the host country institutional capabilities and expanding the numbers of local people properly trained to carry out needed developmental functions, the prime objective of a rapidly expanding number of Title XII projects and a major secondary objective of all the others.

Some projects are concerned specifically with building or strengthening a developing country college or university with integrated research, teaching and extension functions. Other projects work with such institutions to engage them more fully and more effectively in specific development efforts, such as increased crop production, soil conservation, or rural development programs. This is itself a very important means of strengthening local agricultural universities as their effective performance in improving agricultural production and farm income, or other aspects of rural life, is key to their long range support by the local people and governments.

Other Title XII projects work through host government Ministries and Departments on immediate problems. Hunger and the deterioration of resources from which food can be produced are urgent present problems. They demand immediate attention with whatever institutional resources are available. U.S. universities are challenged by the opportunities to provide technical guidance to governmental programs to help solve these problems: programs to increase crop and animal production on small farms, to control

serious plant and animal diseases, to develop better on-farm use of water, to reduce or reverse soil erosion or increase the production of tree crops, to develop efficient fish production industries, to improve use of credit, to develop improved marketing systems for farm products and supply systems for needed farm inputs.

Some projects are directed primarily at improving public policies affecting agriculture and at carrying out the economic analyses necessary for this purpose. This is seen as a growing need if country resources, and assistance from foreign donors such as A.I.D., are to be most productively used.

Especially in the very poorest countries, it is necessary to work substantially on the more pressing, immediate problems while more adequate institutional and human resource capabilities to support sustained agricultural and rural progress are being developed. Therefore, several different but interrelated types of Title XII activities are being carried out within a single country at the same time. In some instances, this can be done via several discrete projects: in other cases, an integrated, single project, implemented by a consortium of universities and sometimes other entities, is much more effective.

A few examples illustrate the nature and diversity of Title XII mission projects.

1. BOTSWANA: Agricultural College Expansion, South Dakota State University.

The purpose of this project was to help develop a local training institution responsive to the needs for basic and intermediate technical skills needed in the Botswana rural sector.

The Botswana Agricultural College currently offers a two-year certificate course in agriculture, animal husbandry and community development. All graduates are employed in field positions. In 1979 over 2,000 students applied for the 99 available course places at the school. The project is designed to expand the training facilities to accommodate more students to meet Botswana rural sector development needs.

This project is being implemented by South Dakota State University. The university participated in the development of the Project Paper and was thus able to move quickly and easily into the implementation phase. Five A.I.D.-financed technicians are presently in Botswana carrying out their duties as called for in the project implementation plan. This involves intensive in-service training of counterparts, improving course content and curriculum, improvement of libraries and teaching materials and arranging for sending participants from the college to the United States for long-term training.

2. MALAWI: Agricultural Research, University of Florida.

This project is to strengthen the capacity of the Department of Agricultural Research to help the 85% of the population engaged in subsistence farming increase their earnings by expanding their crop production. These smallholders need improved seed varieties, better crop/livestock combinations and improved farm management skills to upgrade their production. This project is an integral part of a country wide agricultural/rural development program jointly supported by both multilateral and bilateral donors and managed by the Government of Malawi.

The University of Florida was selected through the BIFAD/AID selection process. The Project Paper design team was largely made up of technical personnel from that University who are also involved in project implementation. The Florida team leader of the design activity is the Chief of Party for project implementation. The relationship developed between the University of Florida team members and the Government of Malawi officials who have project responsibilities is proving to be a distinct benefit in project implementation. The project will initially conduct field trials to test the viability of existing research. The University of Florida will be providing technical advisors, developing local physical facilities and providing training for participants. It will be working toward developing a highly effective research-extension network to reach the Malawi small farmers.

3. SIERRE LEONE: Adaptive Crop Research and Extension, Consortium of Southern University and Louisiana State University.

This project is designed to assist in developing an adaptive research and technology delivery system for food crops which meets the needs of rural smallholders.

Rapid population growth and resulting pressure for increased food production has reduced the amount of time land is allowed to remain fallow under the shifting cultivation system prevalent in the country. The risk is permanent loss of the fragile tropical topsoil. Improved cropping systems must be developed and introduced on these farms.

This project is being implemented by a consortium of Southern University (an 1890 Land Grant institution) and Louisiana State University. This consortium will assist the Sierra Leone Ministry of Agriculture and Njala University College in developing improved cropping and extension methods to help small farmers increase production and conserve soil resources and fertility.

Commodity procurement has been initiated; limited short term training carried out; members of technical staff from the universities have arrived; and a ministry-FAO team is carrying out on-farm trials financed under and an integral part of the project.

4. NEPAL: Resource Conservation and Utilization, the South-East Consortium for International Development (SECID).

The Resource Conservation and Utilization Project (RCUP) is a Title XII collaborative effort in which SECID and his Majesty's Government of Nepal are participating in a multifaceted and integrated project that will attempt to halt the rapid degradation of Nepal's environment. Under a prior project (Design Project) SECID prepared the Project Paper during Fiscal year 1979 with the use of resource personnel from its 31 member institutions, with Western Carolina University serving as the lead institution. SECID will continue its collaborative relationship with His Majesty's Government of Nepal during the implementation phases of the project. However, during these implementation phases up to three of its member universities will serve as co-lead institutions. This relationship will strengthen the project management aspects of the project. Resource conservation activities that will be undertaken during the first 5-year phase of the project are (1) reforestation, (2) range management, (3) alternative sources of energy, (4) improved agricultural methods, (5) watershed management and (6) a multi-tiered training program.

These operations will be undertaken in four hill areas or catchments of Nepal and are expected to receive A.I.D. assistance over a 15-year period.

5. SRI LANKA: Dryland Agricultural Production, the Mid-America International Consortium (MIAC).

The Dryland Agricultural Production Project is a Title XII involvement between the Government of Sri Lanka and the MIAC, a consortium of mid American universities. This collaborative effort is undertaken to increase the production of traditional food crops in the dryland areas. In late 1979 a four-man team under the leadership of Kansas State University was engaged to prepare technical papers that will be incorporated into a Project Paper. The latter will be prepared by the U.S. A.I.D. mission in Sri Lanka and submitted to AID/Washington during mid-FY 1980. This project is scheduled for an initial obligation in FY 1980 and an estimated project completion date during FY 1984. During the implementation period the project will provide (1) appropriate production technologies, (2) new varieties of food crops and seed storage facilities, (3) trained research officers and extension specialists and (4) an in-depth marketing study. These project outputs will benefit 320,000 dryland farmers plus those involved in marketing, processing, transport, as well as consumers who will benefit through increased food availabilities.

6. INDONESIA: Eastern Islands Agricultural Education, Washington State University.

The Eastern Islands Agricultural Education project is designed to help the Eastern Association of Indonesian Universities to upgrade its agricultural resources program to accelerate economic and social development in the Indonesian archipelago. The association needs technical assistance to strengthen its administrative capability and to permit the universities

to play a direct role in the development of their communities and the region. Each university will seek to focus its efforts on those activities which are most closely related to the specific needs of its community.

The Association of Eastern Islands Universities was formed in 1976 by the GOI Directorate General of Higher Education so that the eight universities which make up the Association could assist each other to improve their instructional, research, and public service and avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. Washington State University has been selected through the BIFAD/A.I.D. selection process to collaborate with A.I.D. and the Indonesian universities in planning and implementing the project.

This project will help the association achieve its objective and will focus on the agrosciences since these appear to be most closely related to the development of the eastern region. The project consists of technical assistance, training, and commodity support.

7. YEMEN: Agricultural Development Support Project, the Consortium For International Development (CID).

The Agricultural Development Support Project serves as the vehicle for implementation of a major long-term Title XII program in Yemen. It is being carried out by the Yemen Government and CID, a group of 11 U.S. land grant universities, under collaborative assistance procedures. The project will comprise almost the total U.S. support to the Yemen agricultural sector. At the apex is a core umbrella project which will provide planning and policy analysis support to the Ministry of Agriculture, assist in design of a series of subprojects addressing critical constraints in the agriculture sector, and supply the necessary administrative and logistical support for the overall program. The core project has been approved and the first subproject, development of an Agricultural Training Center, is operational. New subproject initiatives to be undertaken in the near future are natural resources management and conservation, sorghum-millet research, poultry extension and a second agriculture secondary school. The overall program, estimated at $70 million, will consist of a large amount of technical assistance, and training of Yemeni officials, as well as necessary commodity support during the next 10 to 15 years. This sector-wide Title XII program will permit the CID institutions to develop a long-term relationship with the Yemen Government in the broad field of agriculture and natural resources development. It is expected that this relationship will last beyond the life of the program as envisaged at this time. CID and its member institutions will attain a fund of knowledge of Yemen's agriculture that will allow them to be excellent prime sources of expertise and training over an extended period of time.

8. EGYPT: Water Use and Management Project, the Consortium for International Development (CID).

In 1976 a four-man team from Colorado State University conducted a feasibility study under the Title XII approach and designed a project to develop and test a program of irrigation water management for later implementation throughout the Nile Valley and Delta. The project, begun in 1977 and slated to continue until mid 1982, has as its contractor CID, with Colorado State University serving as the lead institution. Small farmers in three pilot areas are cooperating in an effort to learn how to adopt improved water management practices, increase water use efficiencies, and decrease drainage problems. The project which has a $7 million life of project cost will provide 567 person months of on-site technical assistance in Egypt, training of Egyptian technicians and limited amounts of agricultural research and testing equipment. Preliminary results of the project indicate that excellent interdisciplinary cooperation is being achieved and that yield-increasing improved farming practices such as plant spacing, use of improved seeds, land leveling, fertilizer placement and use of underground pipes for water delivery are having increased farmer acceptance. The project is on schedule and favorable results are being attained toward improving Egypt's agricultural production.

9. ECUADOR: Baseline Study, Oklahoma State University, University of Missouri and U. S. Department of Agriculture (Contractor for follow-up implementation stage in process of selection.)

The Title XII Baseline Study in Ecuador was begun in July 1978, at the request of the Ecuadorean Ministry of Agriculture to examine the Research, Education, and Extension (REE) systems of the country. The general objective of the study was to describe the present REE system in Ecuador, identify limiting factors, and make recommendations to improve the type, quality, and quantity of services necessary to improve rural and agricultural development. the study involved the active participation of two U.S. universities, (Oklahoma State and Missouri), the USDA, A.I.D., and BIFAD staff. the study team worked directly with Ecuadorean counterparts from the Ministry of Agriculture, the semi-autonomous agencies, and the National Planning board. The final document produced in Spanish and English was completed in March 1979. Based on the recommendations of this detailed study, the Ecuadoreans and Mission and BIFAD staffs were able to design a highly innovative Title XII project which is scheduled to be signed in the third quarter of FY 1980 and which will be the first major A.I.D. assistance activity in the agriculture sector since 1977. The $4.5 million project will provide resources for strengthening and linking research, extension and education institutions, establishing a trained human resource basis, and developing appropriate technologies for small farmers.

10. PERU: Baseline Study on Agricultural Research, Extension and Education (REE), North Carolina State University and U. S. Department of Agricultural (Contractor for follow-up implementation stage in process of selection.)

The purpose of the project is to create an agricultural research, ex-

tension and education system to provide a continuous flow of technology which meets the needs of the small and medium sized farmer.

Starting in 1976 the Government of Peru (GOP) undertook a series of actions to consolidate its increasingly scarce human resources and reduce bureaucratic duplication of functions. This led to the establishment in 1978 of the National Agrarian Research Institute (INIA) and changes in the agrarian tenure structure of the country. With these actions essentially accomplished attention has been directed toward the task of rebuilding institutional competence for and programs of research, extension and education.

The initial steps of developing a program for implementation was the joint undertaking of a "Baseline Study of Agricultural Research, Education and Extension" by the GOP and A.I.D. in 1979. This study done jointly by the GOP, North Carolina State University and the U.S.D.A. Department of Agriculture identified the need for increasing research (physical-biological, socio-economic and agro-industrial), agricultural education and training activities as the critical program components essential to the development and support of the small and medium sized farmers. The selection of the U. S. university(ies) is now in process, with implementation scheduled for mid 1980, to provide technical expertise for development and extension of technology packages, the establishment of a management network and the training of Peruvian staff.

## IV. PROVIDING A FULLER ROLE FOR U.S. AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITIES IN A.I.D. COUNTRY PROGRAMS.

### 1. Background

In many of the earliest U.S. University Agricultural Technical Assistance contracts, started in the 1950's, the contracting university played very large roles. They were not used merely as instruments for implementing programs developed and planned in detail for them by the A.I.D. missions; they helped plan and design the country programs and especially the project in which they individually were involved, not only in the initial stages but throughout the life of the project. This participation brings forth a higher level of commitment and performance by the university and a better fitting of their professional and institutional resources into the project needs. Even more importantly, it provides missions with the needed technical expertise and institutional experience, available in the U.S. Universities, to work with host countries in developing and designing the project.

Gradually, however, U.S. universities were used primarily only as implementors of projects predesigned by country missions. This was commonly associated with trends toward country programs comprised largely of relatively small, discrete, usually short-term projects, or of small technical assistance adjuncts or components of capital transfer projects.

A major conference in 1964, co-sponsored by A.I.D., the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, based on several months' intensive joint studies, concluded strongly that this was a counter productive trend, that to be anything approaching optimally effective U.S. Universities should participate directly and significantly in designing projects they were called upon to implement. In its published Proceedings, Conference on International Rural Development, July 27-28, 1964, the conference also called for longer-term approaches with attention given to extended follow up supportive relationships between cooperating U.S. and host country institutions.

These conclusions of the conference were substantiated by a major A.I.D. research project to determine factors making for effective U.S. university agricultural technical assistance projects and by the study conducted by Dr. John Gardner, published in 1964 under the title, A.I.D. and the Universities. Nevertheless, for a variety of reasons the practice of minimal participation by universities in project development and design continued with only a few exceptions until enactment of Title XII. Indeed, the use of universities in total was a continuously rapidly diminishing dimension of the A.I.D. technical assistance effort.

2. Increased Use of Collaborative Assistance Method of University Under Title XII.

The evidence of the above conference and studies, and its own accumulating experience, led A.I.D. to work with university representatives to develop a new contracting approach, and a new instrument, for long term U.S. university projects involving collaboration with developing country institutions. This was a many years' joint analytical and experimental effort, out of which emerged the so-called "Collaborative Assistance Method" of university contracting.

This method involves several features, including:

— selection of the university(ies) after the characteristics of the project have been sufficiently well outlined to provide criteria and other specifications for selection of the university(ies) best suited to the task, but before project design and work plans have been so locked in as to prevent significant participation by the selected university in shaping them. This participation requires a two-stage process: (1) a short-term project design phase during which the A.I.D. mission, the host country and the U.S. university make final decision as to whether to move forward into (2) the second, long term implementation stage.

-- construction of a forward rolling project work plan, and A.I.D. project management featuring joint A.I.D./host country periodic evaluation of project outputs or results, allowing the U.S university flexibility to work with the host institution in making day-to-day decisions on mix and timing of inputs (such as long and short term technical advisors, participant training, library supplies, and laboratory equipment).

-- long term forward planning and A.I.D. commitment sufficient to permit universities to make arrangements for meeting their domestic responsibilities in order to be able to commit needed professional resources to the project.

Only a few, largely experimental Collaborative Assistance Method Contracts had been initiated prior to Title XII. The BIFAD, after intensive analysis, especially by the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development, strongly recommended that A.I.D. move as rapidly as possible to bring all suitable new projects under the Collaborative Assistance Method. (It was recognized that most short term projects are not suitable for this type contracting. Participating Agency Service Agreements, under which Federal Agencies provide assistance, already include most of the provisions of the Collaborative Assistance Method of university contracting and so are not directly affected). A.I.D. adopted this recommendation as its policy, allowing necessarily for adaptation by individual country missions to local circumstances and problems. As can be seen in Table 4 below, progress in implementing this policy has been substantial.

Table 4

Utilization of Collaborative Assistance Method of University contracting of Title XII Projects, in operation or approved, as of April 1, 1980.

| Regional Bureau | Total Number of University Title XII Contracts | Using Collaborative Assistance Method | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Number | Percent |
| Africa | 19 | 7 | 39 |
| Asia | 9 | 8 | 89 |
| Near East | 13 | 11 | 85 |
| Latin American and Caribbean | 40 | 3 | 8 |
| Total | 81 | 29 | 36 |

Differences among the regional bureaus though substantial should not be over-stressed. The Asia and Near East Bureaus in a real sense led the way for the rest of the Agency in experimenting with the approach (as did the Latin American and Caribbean Bureau for the baseline studies, as has been noted.) In so doing they uncovered some modification in the process necessary to make it more effective and, especially, more expeditious. Also, all regional bureaus made substantial modifications in many of their standard university contracts to incorporate some of the major features of the Collaborative Assistance Method.

3. University Support to Missions in Analysis and Program Planning

One clear need is for a facile means of providing to A.I.D. country missions a broad range of U.S. university technical expertise having special knowledge of the country's needs. This includes the special skills needed for the analytic and program development steps that must be undertaken by the mission to provide the information necessary for subsequent choice of the proper university(ies) for a Collaborative Assistance project. An absolute essential for success of such a project is the best possible choice of U.S. institution(s). This is especially true of these long-term projects.

A highly promising approach to solution of this and several other programming needs of the missions has been recently developed jointly by A.I.D. and BIFAD for early initiation on a trial basis. The approach is for individual missions to establish for a selected university (or a selected cadre of specialists from several universities) a long-term "Mission Support" agreement, to provide to the mission continuing assistance in carrying out its necessary analytical and program development responsibilities for the agricultural/rural sector. To work well and objectively, universities participating in these mission support activities should not normally be involved, in those same countries, in implementing the projects which result from their work since a major part of their responsibilities is to determine just what kind of assistance the country needs and thus by implication, which U.S. universities might be best candidates for selection. Provided with this analytical capability of university professionals experienced in the individual country, missions could with much greater assurance and effectiveness than at present specify the resources sought from the university(ies) to be selected for a long-term Collaborative Assistance project.

4. Modification of University Selection Process

A.I.D. is considering modifications of certain of its' university contractor selection practices in order better and more rapidly to meet missions needs. For the larger, integrated long-term projects, this will include means of facilitating the early selection of the several institutions with the resources best fitted to specific components of the project and for welding these universities into a single project operating entity.

For some of the smaller and modest size projects, some of the larger U.S. universities may have available all the technical staff required. But most larger projects require a variety of specialized competencies not normally available in any one U.S. university: experience with both rice production and with dry-land farming is an example. Furthermore, there are many highly valuable specialized skills in the smaller U.S. universities, including the "1890" Land Grant universities, which go unutilized because few projects call for only those skills and for only those numbers of people who can be provided by a single, smaller institution. Pre-established consortia tend to pool resources from relatively similar institutions, often from within a single geographic region, and therefore do not provide access to the varied technical resources often required by a major Collaborative Assistance project. A.I.D. is now working with BIFAD toward solution of this problem.

5. Increased University Assistance with Agricultural Policy Problems.

Increasingly A.I.D. missions require special technical personnel resources for providing assistance to developing countries on major policy problems affecting agricultural and rural development. These policy issues vary greatly, and require several different kinds of technical talent.

Illustrative policy problems are:

— Allocation policies: concerned with public investments in agricultural vs non-agricultural sectors, priorities among different type investments within the agricultural sector, long vs short-term investments, etc.

— Pricing policies: agricultural commodity support and price stabilization policies, food reserve policies, incentive pricing to induce shifts among lines of production as for example between export and domestic food crops, input pricing policies, etc.

— Asset distribution policies: land tenure or land reform policies, taxation policies, water and land use regulatory policies, etc.

U.S. agricultural universities have substantial resources of specialized experts on these and other policy issues typical of developing countries. In fact, A.I.D. through its 211(d) program and through research projects and other programs has helped develop university expertise with special capabilities for dealing with these kinds of problems under the particular circumstances characteristic of developing countries. Many of the Title XII University Strengthening programs focus on developing special competence for one or more policy issues important to developing countries.

Many developing countries are, quite rightly, highly sensitive about receiving technical assistance on policy matters. Almost always studies of policy alternatives by joint U.S./host country teams are preferable to direct technical advice. For such sensitive type advisory assistance,

personnel under university contracts often are more readily acceptable than are U.S. government employees to host governments not only because of their specialized expertise but also because of their non-governmental employment status.

U.S Title XII universities are interested in participating more fully in policy analysis and advisory roles. A.I.D. and BIFAD expect to give emphasis to means of expanding such participation. For some countries, the special Mission Support agreements with selected universities, mentioned earlier, might be a useful device. In most case countries' needs for assistance on policy issues are associated with need for assistance in developing their own policy analysis capabilities. Hence long-term Collaborative Assistance projects with properly selected U.S. universities are ideal arrangements for this purpose. Such a project might be for assistance on policy issues and capabilities only, or a larger project in which the policy assistance is one specific component.

## V. RESEARCH: AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

Fiscal year 1979 has been a year of some substantial progress in Title XII research, and admittedly of some disappointments and frustrations.

BIFAD and especially the Joint Research Committee (JRC) have participated extensively in planning for the proposed Institute for Scientific and Technological Cooperation (ISTC), including budget considerations relative to its future Title XII activities. As A.I.D. has had for the period of this Report management responsibilities for such Title XII activities as may be assumed by ISTC, these activities are included in this report.

U.S. Support to International Agricultural Research Centers has continued at preceding years' levels of 25% of core costs. U.S. university programs of strengthening developing country agricultural research capabilities has expanded dramatically. A major Collaborative Research Support Program (CRSP) was initiated on sorghum and millets, with a grant of $5 million for two years funding. The CRSP on Small Ruminants (sheep and goats) funded in September, 1979 was moved into operation in a very promising way. And planning for several other CRSPs (notably on Beans and Cowpeas, on effects on Humans of Marginal Nutrient Deficiencies, on Soil Management, on Fisheries and Aquaculture, on Integrated Pest Management and on Peanuts) has been proceeding well. Unfortunately, centrally funded contract research has declined with no new projects started in FY 1979.

### 1. U. S. Support to the International Agricultural Research Centers,

During 1979 the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), the organization of donor and developing country representatives that provides policy and program guidance and coordinates

funding to the Centers,1/ adopted two major additional activities. They are, the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and the International Service for National Agricultural Research (ISNAR). IFPRI, an on-going research center in Washington, D. C. was adopted by CGIAR as a full member Center. Its activities focus on identification and analysis of alternative national and international strategies and policies for meeting food needs in the world, with particular emphasis on low-income countries and on poorer groups within those countries. ISNAR was created to assist developing countries improve their national agricultural research systems, a recognized major limiting factor to their agricultural development.

For several years the U. S. has acted on the principle of contributing approximately 25% of the total core budgets of the International Agricultural Research Centers. This contribution was $27 millions in FY 1979, with $30 millions and $37 millions planned for FY 1980 and FY 1981, respectively. This is by far the largest component of A.I.D.'s centrally funded contribution to research under Title XII, although, as will be indicated later it is much less than A.I.D.'s mission funded contributions to advancing research and, especially, strengthening the local research capabilities of developing countries.

U.S. support to International Agricultural Research Centers is a key and integral part of Title XII. As authorized in Sec. 297(a)(4) and (5), the clear intent of Title XII was to assure that research and related activities carried out by U.S. universities and the activities of the International Agricultural Research Centers should be correlated and mutually supportive. This is as it should be.

The BIFAD, and especially its Joint Research Committee, (JRC) participates actively with A.I.D. in all aspects of its decisions regarding that support. Several BIFAD and JRC members have visited one or more International Agricultural Research Centers. The Chairman of JRC has visited four centers and is on the Board of Directors of one; (ICRISAT). Representatives of CGIAR and individual Center Directors have appeared before BIFAD and JRC. Thorough discussions on the two new activities described above were held within JRC and with BIFAD.

2. U.S. University Participation in Research

U.S. Agricultural Universities engage with A.I.D. support in four different types of research enterprises: through mission funded assistance to developing country research and institution-strengthening programs; through A.I.D. centrally funded contract research projects; through Collaborative Research Programs (CRSPs) and, primarily with their

---

1/ Brief description of the programs of all the International Agricultural Research Centers may be found on page 19-21 of last year's Report to the Congress on Title XII, submitted April 1, 1979.

own resources, through reorientation of their domestic research toward more universality of applicability. It is a goal of Title XII that all these efforts be mutually supportive of each other and of the research undertaken by the developing countries and by the International Agricultural Research Centers.

(1) Through Country Mission Programs

Quantitatively by far the largest amount of Title XII University research is at the country, A.I.D. mission funded level. The bulk of this is in the form of assistance to developing countries in strengthening their own institutional and trained human resource capabilities for research. Very properly, emphasis is given to development of integrated (or at least coordinated) institutions to carry out research, educational and extension, (or "outreach") functions. As we have seen in Table 2, this is a rapidly growing component of Title XII, multiplying in A.I.D.'s Congressional Presentation requests nearly ten-fold between FY 1966-67 and FY 1981: totalling $90 million, $73 million and $205 million for fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981, respectively. Using broadest definitions of research, perhaps about one third of these funds are for strengthening institutional or manpower research capabilities, or for actually carrying out research on local problems (see, e.g. table 3). This amount is not determinable precisely, nor should it be as the highest use of such assistance is often that of helping countries toward the institutional integration of research, extension and teaching functions. For such purposes, flexibility in the use of project funds and freedom to assist with organizational activities not differentiated by these three functions, are essential. Some of the mission funded projects are to support direct country-specific research attacks on key local problems. Also, almost all mission funded institution strengthening projects involve some individual U. S. university scientists in collaborative research with their host country colleagues on local problems.

All of the International Agricultural Research Centers are involved in systematic efforts to make their research findings known to developing countries and to a necessarily limited degree (with the exception of ISNAR for which this is its major program) in helping developing countries improve their institutional research capabilities. It is therefore necessary that these U. S. university and international research center capabilities and activities be in significant measure correlated and coordinated.

(2) Through Centrally Funded Contract Research

U. S. agricultural universities and relevant federal agencies are engaged in A.I.D. funded research to make the enormous pool of existing and evolving scientific knowledge, developed to support U. S. agriculture, more readily applicable to use in developing countries. Because science is universal, all U. S. research is potentially useful to developing countries. However, as has been thoroughly demonstrated in the three decades

of U. S. agricultural technical assistance effort, relatively little of the knowledge so gained is directly and optimally applicable to the developing countries. The situation has been characterized as one in which most U. S. research based knowledge is almost but not quite applicable to developing country problems; but the gap denoted by the "not quite applicable" makes most such research essentially useless for direct application.

U. S. plant varieties and animal breeds rarely do well under real-life conditions in the developing countries. Plant and animal pests are different, or exist in different ecological settings and require different control techniques than are applicable in the United States. Tropical soils and tropical ecologies generally behave differently than those in the temperate zones where the bulk of the research by U. S. and other economically advanced countries has been and is being done. Mechanization in the more developed countries has been designed primarily to save labor, which is there scarce and costly. Conversely, developing countries require systems which will utilize abundant, cheap labor to substitute for land and capital which in most such countries are very scarce and costly. It is to be hoped that growing non-farm employment opportunities in developing countries will in time remove pressures on the land as the principal source of employment; but for the present, in most countries, population growth outstrips non-farm employment growth, and increases in per acre productivity of the land must provide the major source of expanded employment for the rural unemployed and underemployed people.

For these and other reasons profound adaptation must be made, through research, of U. S. technical knowledge before it can be effectively transplanted into developing country situations. Much of this adaptation, especially that at the immediate application edge of research, can best be done by the developing country institutions, as they become stronger for this role. However, individual developing country resources for such research are necessarily extremely limited. The research resource requirements of creating truly efficient, productive agriculture and improved rural incomes and living standards are tremendous. Very few of the developing countries can afford individually (even with the support of donors) more than a very modest fraction of the research needed to generate new technologies fitted to their needs and which effectively harness the full powers of modern science to the solution of their problems.

It would be extremely wasteful of developing country and donor resources, if not futile, to attempt to close all of the research gap by small scale duplicative efforts of individual countries. Fortunately, this is not necessary. Much of it can be closed by major, centrally organized research efforts which carry advanced-country technical knowledge much closer to the point of local testing and minor adaptation to local circumstances by the developing country institutions and by collaboration mechanism which tie increasing amounts of developing country and more developed country agricultural research into single systems of attack on problems with large common elements, to the betterment of both type countries. A modest indication of the potential of such efforts has been

demonstrated, for example, by the research contributions on wheat, rice and corn.

As a step toward this end, U. S. agricultural universities have been working since 1961 under problem-focused contracts with A.I.D. on some of this type research. This had in recent years been about a $10 million per year effort. Yearly obligations by A.I.D. have fluctuated quite widely because of multi-year funding, but the total program levels have remained more nearly constant. However, because of budget constraints, support for this research has diminished as support for CRSPs has been initiated; obligations for this research were $4.6 millions for FY 1979, with $7 millions planned for FY 1980 and $7 millions for FY 1981. All FY 1979 obligations were for funding on-going projects; no new projects were started during the year.

Most of this contract research is not designed for single, final answer solutions, but to improve greatly the applicability of U. S. scientific knowledge to developing country circumstances. In some cases, major country development programs have been based on such central contract research projects: such as the on-farm water management improvement programs in Pakistan, the corn improvement program which so greatly improved corn production in Kenya, and the Nicaraguan vampire bat control program which virtually eradicated bat-borne paralytic rabies in cattle (and incidentally in humans). But the major impact has been carried through the improved effectiveness of local scientists working on local problems with technical knowledge and research techniques much improved for their use by this A.I.D. financed research. This interaction is facilitated by the fact that U. S. agricultural universities and U. S. federal research agencies are involved at both ends, in the centrally funded problem focused research and in mission funded assistance to strengthen developing country research, extension and educational institutions.

As with their mutual outreach efforts, the Universities collaborate in these research efforts with the international research centers. An example is an A.I.D. funded Oregon State University project cooperating with the International Maize and Wheat Improvement Center (CIMMYT) in Mexico in a program to cross winter and spring wheats to increase capacities for disease resistance and ability to withstand drought and cold and hot weather. This was seen by CIMMYT, in recommending the project to A.I.D., as a necessary adjunct to their own research programs.

(3) Through Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs)

Under new Title XII authority, the Collaborative Research Support Program has been initiated. This program is designed even more specifically than the contract research to bring U. S. research and developing

country research into a single framework, so that developing countries can benefit more directly from our domestically oriented research. It builds on the increasing recognition among the U. S. agricultural universities that for certain, major portions of their research efforts, U. S. scientists can contribute more to the solution of their own state's problems by working on selected problems as part of an international research team than by working on them entirely within their own state or within this country. The Collaborative Research Support Program provides funds to do research on selected developing country problems to U. S. universities which see enough benefit from such participation to merit their supplying at least 25% of the total cost. (Actual U. S. university contributions to the two programs initiated to date have been in substantial excess of this minimum).

Because of this mutuality of benefit, these programs are frequently misunderstood as to purpose and design. They are often presumed to be for the mutual purposes of serving developing country and U. S. research needs, and to be designed to meet the dual objectives. This is not the case. They are totally designed to serve developing country purposes, are built out of analysis of developing country needs and knowledge constraints, and are designed with developing country representation in many ways throughout planning and initiation of the programs. The evaluation of an individual CRSP, for purposes of decision on continued funding, is to be entirely in terms of its contribution to and potential for meeting developing country needs. The criterion of benefit to domestic needs is applied only by the participating university or federal agency as a basis for decision as to whether it wishes to make the minimum 25% contribution required for participation in the research program. New Guidelines for this program were developed in 1979 to capitalize on experiences to date and, among other things, to assure conformance with this principle.

The Collaborative Research Programs, even more than the contract research, are designed to interact with country development programs and with research by the international agricultural research centers. For each CRSP, this interaction is an evolving process, the details being developed and modified through time as the research work unfolds. A few examples of these relationships may be taken from the program on small ruminants, initiated by a grant to the management entity, the University of California at Davis, on September 30, 1978. U. S. institutions selected to participate are the Land Grant universities of California, Colorado, Missouri, Montana, North Dakota, Ohio, Texas, Utah and Washington, California Polytechnic University at Pomona and Winrock International Livestock Center in Arkansas.

Following surveys of A.I.D. missions and a series of site visits by U. S. personnel, primary regional work sites were selected in Kenya, Peru, Brazil, Indonesia and Morocco. Memoranda of understanding with governments of these countries are in varying stages of completion. Each will involve direct linkages with field development programs on sheep and

goats to provide testing opportunities for research findings. Each country will also be contributing directly to the project. For example, the Indonesian Agency for Agricultural Research has received a World Bank Loan of $25 million to improve its agricultural research stations and this project will be collaborating with the expanding research on sheep and goats at those stations. Indonesia will be contributing $165,000 annually for 5 years directly to the CRSP, nearly equal to the U. S. contribution. The Government of Kenya will be contributing 120% of the dollar amount budgeted for the CRSP in Kenya.

Though not a part of the CRSP, A.I.D. contract research with the University of Florida and Utah State University, on nutritional requirements and mineral supplementation of grazing livestock, is linked into the CRSP and will provide data extremely useful to it.

Close and continuing contacts are established between the CRSP personnel and those at the International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD) in Kenya and the International Livestock Center for Africa (ILCA) in Ehtiopia.

Linkages are being worked out with several other developing countries with significant programs or interest in these animals, to assure maximum two-way flows of information and to provide opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperative research efforts.

Through time, this collaborative research effort will provide to all developing countries, and to all American technical assistance advisors, a massively improved body of knowledge, much of it embedded in improved animal breeds and germ plasm, tested under a wide variety of developing country conditions. The entire program focuses on the special characteristics of small scale producers of sheep and goats under both sedentry and nomadic production systems.

Similar interrelationships have been built into the CRSP on sorghums and millets, initiated in FY 1979 with a grant of $5 million for 2 years' program to the University of Nebraska, the university selected as the management entity for the program. Participating universities are: the universities of Arizona, Florida A&M, Kansas State, Kentucky, Mississippi State, Nebraska, Purdue, and Texas A&M. Eleven countries have been selected as primary sites: India, Yemen, Egypt, Sudan, Tanzania, the Cameroons, Mali, Guatemala, Honduras, Haiti and Ecuador. Sorghum and Millet (for human food) research done under this program will be integral parts of the efforts of the sorghum and/or millet improvement programs of those countries. The nature of the relationship will, of course, vary considerably in accordance with needs and program resources of the individual country. The CRSP is very closely coordinated with the work on these crops by the International Crops Research Institute for the Semi-arid Tropics (ICRISAT) located in India, the international center most concerned with these crops. On-going A.I.D. contracts for research

on sorghums with Purdue University, the University of Nebraska and Texas A & M University are being blended into the CRSP.

A special feature of this and other CRSPs is an arrangement for direct field mission or host country access to specialists from participating institutions for technical assistance. Mali, for example, has already received the services of two specialists under this technical services provision.

As understanding of the Collaborative Research Program increases, interest by A.I.D. Missions and developing country governments increases sharply also. For example, the Bean/Cowpea CRSP, currently under intensive planning, was designed only for Latin America and Africa — the principal region where these species are key food crops. Twelve Latin American and eight African countries have indicated desire to be chosen as primary research sites. Twenty-eight out of 40 countries whose interests were solicited wish to participate as primary sites in the Tropical Soils Management CRSP. Obviously not all can be accommodated in that manner. A very large interest in such participation is anticipated for all future projects, and clearly additional countries will wish to participate more intensively than at present in the two CRSPs now underway.

Funding to date and requested for fiscal years 1977 through 1981, for CRSPs, both for planning and implementation, is given in table 5. (See Appendix 3 for activity schedule)

Table 5. Collaborative Research Support Program Funding, 1977 - 1981

| | (000)s, |
|---|---|
| FY 1977 | $ 498 |
| FY 1978 | 5,250 |
| FY 1979 | 8,100 |
| FY 1980 (estimated) | 8,000 |
| FY 1981 (estimated) | 10,000* |

(4) In addition to those A.I.D. supported research activities, many U. S. Agricultural universities are undertaking a host of other activities which collectively will undoubtedly in time greatly increase the relevance of domestic research to developing country problems.

Most Universities participating in CRSPs are establishing close linkages between their research in the general subject matter of but not

---

* In addition, $2 million would be allocated for CRSPs from ISTC's new funds.

directly a part of the CRSP. This is in addition to their own direct, minimum 25% contribution to the CRSP. Effecting such linkages is of interest to the university in achieving maximum feed-back from the CRSP to their own research programs. It is of long range value to developing countries in expanding the systems of knowledge relevant to their research needs.

Several of the University Title XII strengthening programs strongly feature research. Again, in addition to the direct minimum matching contributions, universities are examining some of their domestic research programs with a view to relating them more closely with the Title XII program, to the mutual eventual advantage of the universities and developing countries. For example, one university has appointed a Vice-Chancellor with the specific assignment of examining and monitoring all of the university's research directed toward the needs of small farmers -- a sizeable fraction of the state's research -- for maximizing mutual benefits from closer ties with the university's A.I.D. funded Title XII activities. Universities are also utilizing other than A.I.D. funds for research in and for developing countries and integrating the scientific advances from that research as fully as possible into the universities' regular research activities.

In essence A.I.D.'s contract research, CRSP, and strengthening grants catalyze processes which promise greatly to universalize universities' agricultural research which will, in time, make the vastly greater amount of research carried out in the richer countries more accessible and useful to the poorer countries. The strengthening of developing country capabilities, the international agricultural research centers, the university contract research, the Collaborative Research Support Programs all are emerging as mutually reinforcing, essential components of a system for bringing the full powers of modern science to the service of the poor, agriculturally unproductive countries of the world.

A.I.D. contributions in FY 1979 to this entire system of Title XII research are given in table 6.

Table 6. A.I.D. Support to Title XII Research, FY 1979 and Requested for FY 1980 and FY 1981 (in $ millions)

| Type of Support | Fiscal Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 |
| 1. Strengthening developing country capabilities (est.) | $30 | $57 | $64 |
| 2. International Agricultural Research Centers | $27 | $30 | $37 |
| 3. Centrally funded contract research | $ 5 | $ 7 | $ 7 |
| 4. Collaborative Research Support Program | $ 8 | $ 8 | $10* |

A sustained, integrated research effort of the type outlined above is essential to realizing the abiding goals of Title XII: Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger. It is necessary for finding ways of making scarce resources of land and capital much more productive, of sharply increasing yields per acre which is the only alternative to hunger where cultivated acreage is fixed. Abundant scholarship has shown, in both advanced and less developed countries, very high returns per dollar spent on agricultural research - averaging about 30-60% per year - much higher than from any other form of agricultural investment. Scholarship has also shown that technologies emerging from research can be designed to be used as efficiently and adopted as quickly by small farmers as by large and, through labor intensive systems, to increase radically the productivity of land thereby using the most abundant resource in most developing countries (labor) to replace the most restricted (land).

## VI. U. S. UNIVERSITY STRENGTHENING PROGRAM

Title XII provides authority for A.I.D. to strengthen the capabilities of qualified U. S. universities in teaching, research and extension work to enable them better to implement programs authorized by Title XII. On the recommendation of and in close working concert with BIFAD, AID has developed a program of matching grants, in which A.I.D.'s contribution cannot exceed, in any year, the direct cost contribution of the university to the program. As universities, in addition, contribute all the indirect costs for both the A.I.D. and university matching contribution, and as many of them "over matched", the total university contribution to this program is approximately double that of A.I.D. These grants may not be more than the larger of $100,000 per year or 10% of the volume of the university's

---

* In addition, $2 million would be allocated for CRSPs from ISTC's new funds.

technical assistance work for A.I.D. (computed as a 3 year moving average) and in no case more than $300,000 per year. The 42 Matching Grants made thus far have averaged $108,550 per year.

As A.I.D. has relatively few technical experts in relation to needs, it is heavily dependent upon the U. S. agricultural universities for the specialists to carry out field programs. Moreover, as the developing countries focus more on improvement of small farm agriculture and general rural development, they require and request more highly-trained persons with a combination of technical competence and special ability to adapt their knowledge to local needs. The present pool of such expertise in this country is inadequate and, unfortunately, diminishing. The Title XII university strengthening program is designed to expand the pool of U. S. experts and technical knowledge of the type required by developing countries, and to make that pool of expertise and knowledge more directly relevant to developing country application and more readily available to A.I.D. programs.

The Title XII legislation includes by definition, the minority land-grant institutions. These seventeen agricultural colleges and one or two other which may also qualify are eligible to apply for the special minority institution preliminary strengthening program designed to expand minority participation in Title XII field activities. The minority university strengthening program provides one-time, five-year grants which do not require matching funds from the university. Its purpose is to bring the minority institutions to the point where they can participate in the matching formula mode. Minority institutions may apply for and receive Matching Formula grants solely or concurrently with Minority Institution grants; there is one example of each case already.

All activities in the strengthening programs, whether funded by A.I.D. or the universities, are to strengthen the universities' capability to carry out the A.I.D. foreign assistance efforts specified by Title XII. As stipulated in the agreed upon Guidelines issued to participating universities:

> "It is important to note that, in the original review and approval and in subsequent extensions of these grants, identical requirements and criteria are used in determining appropriateness of all expenditure items whether from the A.I.D. or university matching contribution."

Of the 77 institutions now meeting the criteria necessary to apply for Matching Formula Strengthening Grants, 53 institutions have applied and 42 grants have been awarded thus far. Of the 18 institutions now meeting the criteria necessary to apply for the Minority Institution Strengthening Program, 12 institutions have applied and 4 grants have been awarded thus far. A.I.D. made each of these grants after a very rigorous evaluation

process by a BIFAD selected peer review group and a specific BIFAD recommendation followed by careful A.I.D. examination of each proposal. This rigorous process is designed to insure that these strengthening programs at each university, whether Matching Formula or Minority Institution program, will specifically and effectively serve A.I.D. and developing country needs. (See Appendix 3).

There are 11 additional Matching Formula Strengthening Proposals and 8 Minority University Strengthening Proposals currently in process of review and evaluation.

In developing guidelines for the administration of and reporting on grant implementation, as well as the policies and procedures for foreign travel under these grants, AID and BIFAD have held a series of regional workshops with the involved universities. University participants reported significant impact from this strengthening program even before many actual strengthening activities got underway. For example, the exercise of developing a university's strengthening proposed program has forced the institution as a whole to make hard choices as to which types and locations of overseas ventures most squarely fit the institution's resources and long term interests. This is providing a more purposeful and focussed rationale for commitment to A.I.D. programs by specific universities. University-wide councils or committees have been established at recipient institutions to do such things as 1) define the future institutional role in Title XII activities, 2) develop criteria for strengthening activities which will strengthen that role, 3) apply these criteria to select those strengthening activities which enhance the university's capability to assist LDCs, and 4) periodically assess the actual impact of these activities on the university's involvement and effectiveness in Title XII assistance.

Among the strengthening activities actually underway in these grant programs are such things as:

- providing language training to university agricultural scientists, professors, extension workers and advanced graduate students to enable them to work effectively in non-English speaking countries, thereby removing a greatly limiting factor in A.I.D. technical assistance efforts.

- providing opportunities for university faculty members expert in various subject matter fields to work in developing countries to make their knowledge and skills more applicable to developing countries.

- providing graduate students opportunities to do thesis work in a developing country, thereby expanding both relevant knowledge in that field and providing the student excellent training and ex-

perience for future overseas work.

- attaching agricultural scientists and educators without developing country experience to short or longer-term teams in developing countries; while contributing professional expertise, he or she is learning about the country's problems and A.I.D.'s assistance techniques.

- scholarly exchanges between U. S. and developing country institutions

- research on developing country problems.

The first year's required Annual Reports for these grants are not yet due. However, it is clear even at this early date that the activities undertaken with these joint A.I.D./University funds are greatly strengthening university capabilities more effectively to participate in Title XII programs in the developing countries.

## VII. OTHER NOTEWORTHY ACTIVITIES

Since the submission of the last Report to the Congress, three activities worthy of special note have taken place.

BIFAD and the agricultural universities share with A.I.D. the determination to do everything possible to make university activities for A.I.D. as effective as possible. The preceding discussions have dealt with a broad spectrum of actions toward that end, deriving from the participation of BIFAD in A.I.D. policy and implementation process. Two other such activities are (1) a series of three regional conferences involving all "eligible" universities under Title XII, (2) establishment of a special Office by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and (3) enunciation by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) of a Statement of Principles for universities participating in international programs, including Title XII.

### 1. Regional Title XII Seminars

Three regional seminars were held to facilitate best possible mutual understanding between university and A.I.D. officials regarding A.I.D. overseas agricultural and rural sector programs, and to achieve maximum support from the University Strengthening activities for improving university performance in those overseas programs. These Title XII Seminars were held on a regional basis at Washington, D. C., St. Louis, Mo. and Salt Lake City, Utah during January, 1980. They were developed and presented jointly by BIFAD and A.I.D. in a true joint effort, carried out by A.I.D., university and BIFAD staff members, under the general management of the BIFAD Support Staff.

The same program was presented at each regional seminar and was comprised of two principal subjects: (1) A.I.D.'s Rural Sector program and Title XII Universities, and (2) Development and Administration of Strengthening Grants.

Discussion of A.I.D.'s rural sector program devoted one-half day each to three main sub-topics: (1) the Nature of A.I.D.; (2) the A.I.D./university interface; and (3) opportunities for Title XII. In considering "the Nature of A.I.D." information was provided to university administrators on A.I.D.'s organization, mandate, policies for agricultural and rural development, and programming process. The second topic focused on the instruments being utilized under Title XII for linking U.S. agricultural universities with A.I.D. country program demands, with special emphasis on acquisition of Title XII institutional resources. The third topic was concerned with specific project needs and opportunities in A.I.D.'s various regional bureaus, and constraints to increased university involvement.

The second major agenda item--Strengthening Grants--included guidelines on preparation by universities of required annual reports and A.I.D. evaluation of them, and approval requirements for travel. Concomitantly, discussions were held by BIFAD staff with universities interested in submitting proposals for strengthening grants. A final session was focused on actual experiences in implementing strengthening grants, with case studies being presented. The seminars were well attended as illustrated in the following summary:

Table 7. Attendance at Regional Title XII Seminars

| | Attendance | | Institutions Represented (Excluding AID/BIFAD) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Participants | AID/BIFAD Staff | Title XII | Other |
| East | 50 | 14 | 30 | 5 |
| Midwest | 54 | 13 | 28 | 4 |
| West | 32 | 13 | 17 | 1 |
| Total a/ | 136 | 14 | 68 | 10 |

At least 136 people representing 68 Title XII universities and 10 other institutions or universities attended one of the seminars. At least 4 BIFAD staff and 9 A.I.D. staff were in attendance at each seminar. Two BIFAD members attended the seminars.

a/ Total are not sum of columns for columns 2 and 3 because the same staff or institutions attended more than one seminar.

These regional seminars were carried on in an extremely frank, candid manner. Communication and mutual understanding were greatly facilitated, and response has been uniformly intensely enthusiastic.

2. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities

(AASCU) has recently announced its intention to establish an Office to be concerned with Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition which will give special emphasis to its member participation in Title XII institutions.

3. Statement of Principles for University Participation

Since its inception, the BIFAD has been interested in effecting in the university community adoption of a set of principles to guide universities and to assure their optimum effectiveness in carrying out Title XII programs.

On February 13, 1979, the Executive Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) adopted a "Statement of Principles for Effective Participation of Colleges and Universities in International Development Activities" and forwarded this statement to the BIFAD and to the A.I.D. Administrator. This action was taken as a step in the process of improving the professional performance of member universities in the conduct of international development activities. A sub-committee of the Association's International Affairs Committee was formed to initiate follow-up activities related to implementing the intent of the Statement. Workshops are planned, consulting services will be offered to universities requesting assistance, and problems and constraints will be analyzed on a continuing and systematic basis. These activities will be conducted in cooperation with BIFAD, the Association of U.S. University Directors of International Agricultural Programs, and other appropriate organizations. It should be noted that, quite properly, NASULGC applies these principles for university participation in all international activities.

In A.I.D.'s view, this action is of such significance in both the specific substance of the statement and as evidence of university commitment as to merit reproduction in full in this Report.

"STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES
FOR EFFECTIVE PARTICIPATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES*

"There has been a growing awareness in the U.S. in recent years of global interdependence, and a recognition of the need for greater cooperation between the U.S. government and the American higher education community in international development work. This perspective is fully in keeping with

---

* Adopted by the NASULGC Executive Committee, Feb. 13, 1979

the community's long standing sensitivity to the broad needs of society, and with a developed attitude of enlightened self interest which dictates that institutional sensitivity and commitment extend to the needs of societies of other nations, particularly the less developed.

"Colleges and universities across the nation are seeking ways of strengthening their capacities to participate, particularly in international development assistance, and to do so with optimal effectiveness and accountability. The purpose of this statement is to set forth some basic principles of good practice for such participation.

"Universities and colleges engaged in international development contracts should be expected to perform professionally in ways most likely to lead to success abroad, in keeping with the acknowledged importance as well as the difficulty and complexity of the task. International development contracting cannot be taken lightly. It calls for a special effort and attention to certain policies and practices which are in addition to those followed for successful domestic programs.

"Recognizing the healthy diversity among U.S. colleges and universities and the considerable variation from one international contract project to another, there are certain basic principles of good practice which experience supports as being critically important. Each principle is important. Lack of attention to one or more would show lack of determination or seriousness of purpose, and would not auger well for the institutions performance in international project relations. Yet, each might be pursued differently on different campuses and in different contractual arrangements.

"The following are considered necessary factors to provide a basis for effective institutional participation in international developmental activities:

1. Evidence that the administration and faculty of the institution are committed to international development work.

2. Adequate internal administrative and faculty review procedures to assure that the choice of overseas project opportunities is consistent with the institution's mission, commitment and competencies.

3. Availability of requisite personnel resources to assure effective, continuous institutional involvement in chosen projects.

4. Personnel policies and practices which assure that high quality, professionally active faculty members have incentives to become involved in developmental activities.

5. Appropriate administrative practices and policies to facilitate the provision of timely logistical support and professional services for individuals and groups abroad for varying time periods and in diverse locations.

6. Concerted effort, in the planning process, to gain a full understanding of the unique cultural variations applicable to each project personnel.

7. Established procedures within the institution for seriously evaluating its international work so that projects can be monitored on a continuous basis and performance corrected promptly when necessary.

8. Deliberate and sustained effort to assure that the benefits of international development experience are integrated into both ongoing campus programs (e.g. curriculum, research, individual courses) and relationships with institutions abroad.

9. Policies and practices recognizing not only the training component needs of development projects, but also the concomitant special requirements related to matriculation, advising, programming, and support services needed to provide appropriate training for foreign students, particularly participant trainees."

February, 1979

## VIII. SEPARATE STATEMENT OF THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The BIFAD is pleased to report to the Congress that, in its judgment, significant progress has been realized during the past year in implementing the major programs authorized in the Title XII Amendment. The BIFAD fully concurs with the report of A.I.D. on Title XII that sets forth the specific accomplishments under the amendment during the past year.

The Board, however, does wish to further emphasize three points made in the report. First, the overwhelming bulk of Title XII activities, in which BIFAD participates, consists of A.I.D. Mission-funded country programs of direct assistance to the LDCs. BIFAD has also worked with A.I.D. to insure that the remaining small portion of Title XII activities, including collaborative research support and other centrally-funded programs, is directed at making those assistance programs more effective.

Second, the processes developed by A.I.D., the BIFAD, and its subordinate committees (JCAD and JRC) for developing and recommending Title XII programs, involve IDCA, the Agency, the Board, and the agricultural university community in a truly integrated, joint effort. The careful planning for such integration during the early part of the Board existence is bearing fruit in the form of efficiently mobilizing university institutional resources in the war on world hunger.

Third, U.S. Title XII universities are contributing substantially from their own non-federal resources in support of U.S. Foreign Assistance efforts. Much of this contribution is in the unaccounted and unreimbursed time and overhead for faculty participation in many foreign assistance activities and programs. For example, reimbursements for training an LDC student under an A.I.D. contract cover less than half of the actual expense to the university. Also, they assume considerable extra costs of modifying their domestic research programs and of establishing international linkages to coordinate with A.I.D.'s international research activities.

In addition, Title XII universities contribute non-federal funds in some programs which specifically require matching or joint funding. For example, the 42 Title XII universities which received $4.5 million in Strengthening Grants in FY 1979 contributed an additional $5.44 million to the direct costs of those efforts to strengthen capacities to assist the LDCs; further, they contributed all the indirect costs of the total Strengthening Program, adding another $3 million.

In the two Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs), the participating universities contributed approximately $2.6 million in non-federal funds, 1½ times the required share of 25%.

While these auditable contributions are a small part of the total reimbursed contributions of the universities, this response clearly

illustrates the depth of commitment of the university community to the objectives of Title XII and work in international agricultural development.

The Board also wishes to report on changes in the membership of the BIFAD since its inception on October 18, 1976. Dr. Anson R. Bertrand, Mr. Charles Krause, and Mr. J. J. O'Connor who were charter members here either resigned, or completed their terms. They were succeeded by Dr. Rebecca Robbins Polland, Mr. David Garst, Dr. Johnnie Watts Prothro, respectively. Dr. Polland is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, Mr. Garst is a farmer and partner in Garst and Thomas Hybrid Seed of Coon Rapids, Iowa, and Dr. Prothro is a Professor of Nutrition at Georgia State College.

Subsequently, the terms of Dr. Clifton Wharton, Jr. (Chairman of the Board), Dr. Orville G. Bentley, Dr. Gerald W. Thomas, and Mr. M. Peter McPherson were completed. On February 15, 1980, the President announced the reappointment of Dr. Wharton to the Board and his redesignation as Chairman. The President also announced the appointment of three persons as new members of the Board for three-year terms. They are:

C. Peter Magrath, President of the University of Minnesota and Professor of Political Science there. He is a specialist in American Government. He held many positions at the University of Nebraska - Lincoln. To name a few, Dr. Magrath was the Dean of the College of Arts & Science (1968-69); Professor of Political Science (1968-72); and Interim Chancellor & Vice President 1971-72).

H. F. Robinson, Chancellor of Western Carolina University. He is a specialist in genetics and plant breeding, and has served as Executive Director of the President's Science Advisory Committee Panel on the World Food Supply. He chairs the Committee of Agriculture, Rural Development & Natural Resources of the American Association of State Colleges & Universities (AASCU).

E. T. York, Chancellor of the State University System of Florida. He was formerly Vice President for Agricultural Affairs at the University of Florida. Administrator of the Federal Extension Service (USDA) 1961-63, and Chairman of the Agronomy Department at N.C. State University 1949-56). He has worked extensively in the field of international agricultural development.

The Chairman of the Board, Clifton Wharton, Jr., is Chancellor, State University of New York. He is an economist, educator, and Foreign Policy expert. During his first appointment as the BIFAD Chairman, Dr. Wharton held the position of President and Professor of Economics at Michigan State University. These newly nominated Board members were sworn in on March 27, 1980. After that date, the Board will be comprised of:

| Person | Expiration Date of Appointment |
|---|---|
| Dr. Clifton R. Wharton, Jr. | 1983 |
| Mr. David Garst | 1981 |
| Dr. C. Peter Magrath | 1983 |
| Dr. Rebecca R. Polland | 1982 |
| Dr. Johnnie W. Prothro | 1981 |
| Dr. Harold F. Robinson | 1983 |
| Dr. E. T. York | 1983 |

Dr. D. Woods Thomas who served as Executive Director of the BIFAD Staff resigned on December 31, 1979 after more than 3 years of service. Dr. Thomas has returned to his position as Director of International Programs at Purdue University. Dr. Elmer R. Kiehl was recommended by the Board and appointed by the Administrator to serve as the new Executive Director. Dr. Kiehl is former Dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Missouri. He has a distinguished career of service in domestic and international agriculture and was instrumental in the development of the Title XII Amendment.

## COUNTRY PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII PROCESS

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | (a) | Africa Bureau | 2 pages |
| | (b) | Asia Bureau | 2 pages |
| | (c) | Latin America & Caribbean Bureau | 5 pages |
| | (d) | Near East | 2 pages |

AFRICA BUREAU

PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS a/

| Country | University, Consortium or Other Contractor | Project | Implementation Mode b/ | Date Contracted | Life of Proj. Funding Millions $ | Duration of Proj. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Projects for which Contracts or PASAs have been Signed** | | | | | | |
| Burundi 0102 | Auburn | Highland Fisheries Development | SU | 1978 | 1.45 | 3 years |
| Mali 0203 | USDA | Central Vet. Lab | PASA | 1977 | 10.30 | 4 years |
| Niger 0213 | Mich. State | Applied Agri. Research | SU | 1978 | 4.00 | 5 years |
| Chad 0201 | CID | Range & Livestock Development | SU | 1977 | 1.50 | 5 years |
| Lesotho 0065 | Wash. State U. | Farming Systems Research | CA | 1978 | 8.28 | 5 years |
| Tanzania 0135 | Utah State U. | Agriculture Education & Extension | SU | 1978 | 0.85 | 3 years |
| Botswana 0074 | S. Dakota State | Agri. Training School | SU | 1978 | 4.0 | 5 years |
| Malawi 0202 | Univ. of Florida | Agri. Research | CA | 1979 | 9.0 | 5 years |
| Sierra Leone 0102 | Southern U. and Louisiana State U. | Adaptive Crop Research & Extension | SU | 1979 | 6.1 | 5 years |
| | | | | | 35.18 | |
| **B. Projects which have been Approved but Contracts not Signed** | | | | | | |
| Chad 0002 | | Agri. Instit. Devel. | SU | | 3.50 | 5 years |
| Ethiopia 0179 | | Upper Didesa Devel. | SU | | 2.40 | 5 years |
| Ethiopia 0193 | | South Gemu Gofa Area, Ext II | SU | | 2.20 | 5 years |
| Niger | | Range and Livestock | | | 5.28 | 5 years |

| Country | University, Consortium or Other Contractor | Project | Implementation Mode | Date Contracted | Life of Proj. Funding | Duration of Proj. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cameroon 0013 | | Natural Cereals Res. & Extension | SU | | 6.00 | 3 years |
| Cameroon 0135 | | Higher Education for Development | CA | | 16.00 | 5 years |
| Liberia 0135 | | Ag. Research & Extension | CA | | 2.60 | 5 years |
| Rwanda 0109 | | Ag. Education | SU | | 5.80 | 5 years |
| | | | 8 | | 43.78 | |
| C. Projects in Advanced Planning Stage | | | | | | |
| Cameroon 0032 | | Manders Aris Develop. | CA | | 13.30 | 5 years |
| Ethiopia 0208 | | Agric. Planning, Analysis & Eval. | CA | | 2.00 | 2 years |
| Mali 0211 | | Integrated Ag. Research & Training | | | 28.00 | 5 years c/ |
| Mali 0210 | | Operation Haute Valee | | | 18.40 | 4 years |
| Mali 0297 | | Improvement of Ag. Offices & Training | | | 5.00 | 4 years |
| Somalia 0112 | | Agric. Delivery System | SU | | 7.75 | 5 years |
| Zambia 0201 | | Research & Extension | CA | | 8.00 | 5 years |
| | | | 7 | | 82.45 | |

a/ Includes host country contracts
b/ Standard University Contract (SU), Collaborative Assistance (CA), PASA or other contract
c/ PID is approved. AID/W has given approval to design PP which may require two years by a university or universities and up to 20 disciplines.

DRAFT 2/26/80

## PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS[a/]

### ASIA BUREAU

| Country | University Consortium or Other Contractor | Project | Implementation Mode[b/] | Life of Project Funding ($ million) | Duration |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Projects for which contracts have been signed** | | | | | |
| Indonesia 0293 | Wash. State U. | Eastern Island Ag Education | CA | 7.50 | 5 years |
| Nepal 0133 | SECID | Resource Conservation & Utilization Project Design | CA | 1.00 | 1.5 years |
| Philippines 0302 | Kansas State | Integrated Ag Production & Marketing | SU | 9.80 | 5 years |
| | | | 3 | 18.30 | |
| **B. Projects approved but contracts not signed** | | | | | |
| Indonesia 0290 | U. of Wisconsin | Graduate Ag School | CA | 6.50 | 5 years |
| Nepal 0132 | SECID | Resource Conservation & Utilization | CA | 28.00 | 6 years |
| Philippines 0322 | Texas A & M | Fresh Water Fisheries Devel. | CA | 6.50 | 3 years |
| South Pacific (Regional) | U. of Hawaii | School of Ag, University of the South Pacific | CA | 5.00 | 6 years |
| Sri Lanka 0058 | MIAC | Dryland Ag Production | CA | 7.00 | 5 years |
| | | | 5 | 53.00 | |

a/ Includes host country contracts
b/ Standard University Contract (SU), Collaborative Assistance (CA), PASA or other contract

PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS

ASIA BUREAU

| Country | University Consortium or Other Contractor | Project | Implementation Mode | Life of Project Funding | Duration |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C. Projects in Advanced Planning Stage | | | | | |
| Bangladesh 0040 | | Integrated Land & Water Use | | 10.00 | 5 years |
| India 0470 | | Ag Research & Education | CA | 20.00 | 5 years |
| Indonesia 0286 | | Small Scale Fisheries Devel | | 1.50 | 5 years |
| Indonesia 0297 | | Sumatra U. Ag Prog. | | 9.00 | 5 years |
| Sri Lanka 0055 | | Reforestation & Watershed Management | | 3.50 | 4 years |
| Thailand 0294 | | Highland Area Devel. | | 5.00 | 4 years |
| Thailand 0308 | | Northeast Rainfed Ag Development | | 9.50 | 6 years |
| Philippines 0305 | | Agro Forestation | | 3.60 | 5 years |
| | | | 8 | 62.10 | |

Caribbean Bureau

AND/OR POTENTIAL PARTICIPATION

| COUNTRY | PROJECT NO. & TITLE | DURATION OF PROJECT (YRS) | LIFE OF PROJECT FUNDING (Millions) | | IMPLEMENTATION MODE* | CONTRACTOR | STATUS |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A. Ongoing Projects - Contractor (s) Identified | | | | | | | |
| PERU | 527-0170; On-Farm Water Management | 4 | G | .50 | SUC | Utah St. Un. | Ongoing |
| PERU | 527-0149; Soybean & Corn Production on Small Farms | 5 | G | 2.11 | SUC | INSTOY | Ongoing |
| PERU | 527-0144; Fresh Water Fisheries Development | 3 | G | .47 | SUC | Colo. State | Ongoing |
| PERU | 527-0156; Sierra Water and Land Use | 5 | G | 11.00 | HCC | CID | Ongoing |
| COLOMBIA | 514-0191; Fisheries Research | 5 | L | 2.20 | SUC | Auburn Un. | Ongoing |
| BOLIVIA | 511-0451; Basic Food Production & Marketing | 6 | G | 6.90 | SUC | CID | Ongoing |
| BOLIVIA | 511-0485; Farm Policy Study | 3 | G | 1.11 | SUC/PASA BUCEN | Ariz. State | Ongoing |
| ROCAP | 596-0048; Agricultural Research & Inform. Service | 6 | G | 3.51 | PASA | USDA | Ongoing |
| JAMAICA | 532-0059; Fish Production System Development | 3 | G<br>L | 1.00<br>3.00 | SUC | Auburn Un. | Ongoing |
| DOM. REP. | 517-0128; Swine Fever | 3 | G<br>L | .20<br>6.00 | PASA | USDA | Ongoing |
| DOM. REP. | 517-0117; Agricultural Sector Analysis & Planning | 4 | G | 1.35 | PASA | USDA/BUCEN | Ongoing |
| LA REGIONAL | 598-0584; Vertebrate Pest Control | 4 | G | .85 | PASA | Dept. of Int. Denver Wildlife Service | |
| GUATEMALA | 520-0255; Small Farmer Diversification Systems | 5 | L | 5.00 | CA | MI. State Un. | Signed 6/79 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| GUATEMALA | 520-0249; Integrated Area Studies | 3 | G | .50 | SUC | Iowa St. Un. | Ongoing |
| GUATEMALA | 520-0232; Food Productivity & Nutritional Improvement | 5 | G | 1.76 | SUC CIMMYT/CIAT/ Private | Texas A&M/ | Ongoing |
| CAR. REG. | 538-0017; Improved Agricultural Extension | 5 | G | 1.70 | CA | MUCIA | PP approved 1/80 |
| PANAMA | 525- Fish Production | | L | 2.74 | SUC | Auburn State | Authorized 6/ |
| | | 17 | | 51.90 | | | |

B. Approved Projects - Contractor(s) Not Identified

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| BOLIVIA | 511-0509; Conservation & Environment Protection | 4 | G | 2.00 | PASA/SUC | | |
| ROCAP | 596-0083; Small Farm Production Systems | 5 | G | 6.96 | SUC | | RFTPs t be issu by ROCA |
| PARAGUAY | 526-0118; Minifundia Crop Intensification | 5 | G | 1.90 | SUC | | RFTP issued 2/30/80 |
| PARAGUAY | 526-0109; Small Farm Technology | 4 | G<br>L | 1.00<br>5.00 | SUC | | |
| JAMAICA | 532-0061; Agricultural Planning | 5 | G | 2.00 | SUC | | |
| HAITI | 521-0092; Agricultural Development Support II | 5 | G | 4.05 | SUC | | |
| HAITI | 521-0096; Integrated Resource Management | 5 | G | 3.65 | SUC/PASA | | |
| COSTA RICA | 515-0145; Natural Resource Conservation | 4 | L | 9.80 | SUC/PASA 8/15/79 | | Authori |
| CAR. REG. | 538-0015; Small Farm | 5 | G | 2.00 | SUC | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| L SALVADOR | 519-0184; Small Farm Irrigation Systems | 4 | L | 2.30 | SUC | RFP requeste |
| L SALVADOR | 519-0213; Small Enterprises Development | 4 | G<br>L | .75<br>5.75 | SUC<br>SUC | PP approved 1/80 |
| ONDURAS | 522-0139; Agricultural Research | 5 | L | 1.91 | SUC | |
| ONDURAS | 522-0157; Rural Technologies | 5 | G | 10.00 | SUC | PP Approved 7/79 |
| ONDURAS | 522-0136; Water Resources Management/Environment | 4 | G | 10.00 | SUC/PASA | PP approved 11/79 |
| UATEMALA | 520-0238; Small Farmer Marketing | 6 | G<br>L | .80<br>3.40 | SUC | Under Negotiation |
| UATEMALA | 520-0245; Rural Enterprises Development | 3 | G<br>L | 1.17<br>7.00 | SUC/PASA | |
| ANAMA | 525-0191; Watershed Management | 5 | L | 10.00 | PASA | |
| ANAMA | 525-0180; Agricultural Technology Development | 5 | G<br>L | .50<br>6.00 | SUC | Authorized 9/10/79 |
| ERU | 527-0192; Agricultural Research Extension & Educ. 1/ | 6 | G<br>L | 2.00<br>9.00 | SUC | PP approved 2/80 |
| | | 19 | | 108.94 | | |

. Projects in Planning Stage

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ERU | 527-0220; Soil Conservation | 3 | G | 2.00 | PASA | PID approved |
| CUADOR | 518-0012; Small Farmer Agricultural Development | 5 | G<br>L | 1.00<br>6.00 | To be determined | PID approved 2/80 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ECUADOR | 518-0023; Forestry & Natural Resources Conservation | 5. | G<br>L | .30<br>2.00 | PASA/SUC | FY 81 |
| ECUADOR | 518-032; Rural Technological Transfer System 1/ | 5 | G | 4.00 | SUC | PID approved 2/80 |
| BOLIVIA | 511-0502; Improvement of Agricultural Ext. Services | 5 | G<br>L | 2.00<br>5.00 | SUC | PID to be re-received 3/80 |
| BOLIVIA | 511-0509; Conservation & Environmental Protection | 3 | G | 1.40 | PASA | |
| JAMAICA | 532-0060; Agricultural Marketing | 4 | L | 10.00 | SUC | PP under revision |
| JAMAICA | 532-0062; Agricultural Research, Education and Extension 1/ | 4 | L | 3.00 | SUC | PID bein develope |
| LAC REG. | 598-0595; Seed Training Outreach | 4 | G | 3.00 | SUC | PP in process |
| COSTA RICA | 515-0148; Agrarian Restructuring | 3 | L | 6.00 | SUC | |
| EL SALVADOR | 519-0192; Agricultural Services | 4 | G | .50 | SUC | PP under develop-ment |
| NICARAGUA | 524-0135; Small Farm Enterprises | 3 | G | .40 | SUC | |
| | | 12 | | 46.60 | | |
| PANAMA | 525- ; Education for Rural Development | | | | | PID to reviewe 3/80 |
| GUYANA | 504-0086; Small Dairy Farm Development | | | | | PID bein develope |

D. Baseline Studies

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PERU | Baseline Study (REE) | 6 mos | PD&S 135 | PASA | USDA/No. C. State State | Complet |
| ECUADOR | Baseline Study (REE) | 6 mos | PD&S 115 | PASA | USDA/Okla. St./Un. of Missouri | Complet |
| JAMAICA | Baseline Study (REE) | 4 mos | PD&S 110 | SUC | U. of Ky. | Complet |
| GUYANA | Baseline Study (REE) | 4 mos | PD&S 113 | SUC | | RFTP issued 2/80 |
| DOM. REP. | Baseline Study (REE) | Potential Study identified during 8/79 RWG visit. | | | | |

*SUC - Standard University Contractor; PASA - Participating Agency Service Agreement; HCC - Host Country Contractor; CA - Collaborative Style; 1/Follow on project evolving from REE Baseline Study.

## PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS [a]

### NEAR EAST BUREAU

| Country | University Consortium or Other Contractor | Project | Implementation Mode [b] | Life of Proj Funding ($ million) | Duration |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **A. Projects for which contracts have been signed** | | | | | |
| Egypt 017 | CID/CSU | Water Use and Management | CA | 7.00 | 5 |
| Egypt 041 | Univ. of Ca/Davis | Agri. Dev. Systems | CA | 12.90 | 5 |
| Tunisia 304 | MIAC | Agri. Tech. Transfer | CA | 4.50 | 3 |
| Syria 005 | USDA & Univ. | Agri. Sector Study | PASA | 2.00 | 1.5 |
| Portugal 001 | Univ. of Rhode Is. | Univ. Inst. of Azores | CA | 0.60 | 3 |
| Yemen 052 | CID/NMS | Agri. Dev. Support (Ibb) | CA | 11.00 | 5 |
| Egypt 070 | CID/NMS | Major Cereals | CA | 30.00 | 5 |
| | | | 7 | 68.00 | |
| **B. Projects Approved but contracts not signed** | | | | | |
| Egypt 064 | KCM Inter.(A&E portion) | Aquaculture | Open bidding | 27.50 | 4 |
| Egypt 027 | Univ. of Ca/Davis | Rice Research & Training | SU | 9.80 | 5 |

[a] Includes host country contracts

[b] Standard University Contract (SU), Collaborative Assistance (CA), PASA or other contract

PROJECTS SHAPED BY TITLE XII REVIEW AND SELECTION PROCESS

NEAR EAST BUREAU

| Country | University Consortium or other Contractor | Project | Implementation Mode | Life of Proj. Funding ($ million) | Duration |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| B. Projects approved but contracts not signed (cont'd.) | | | | | |
| Egypt 031 | | Agri. Mechanization | Open bidding | 40.00 | 3 |
| Morocco 136 | MIAC | Dryland Applied Res. | SU | 4.50 | 4 |
| Syria 003 | Univ. of Nebraska | Agri. Education | CA | 7.20 | 4 |
| Morocco 160 | Univ. of Minnesota | Agronomic Institute | CA | 9.70 | 5 |
| Yemen 052 | CID/Ariz. | Agri. Dev. Support (CORE) | CA | 21.40 | 5 |
| Tunisia 312.2 | | Dryland Farming Sys. Res. | CA | 2.80 | 5 |
| Tunisia 312.3 | | Small Holder Irri. Dev. | CA | 4.80 | 5 |
| | | | 9 | 127.70 | |
| C. Projects in Advanced Planning Stage | | | | | |
| Morocco 145 | CID (IQC) c/ | Range Mgmt. Improvement | | 2.00 | 5 |
| Tunisia 312.8 | | Range Development | | 2.90 | 5 |
| Tunisia 312.9 | | Rural Ext. & Outreach | | 2.50 | 5 |
| Jordan 241 | | Crop Productivity | | 1.50 | 5 |
| Egypt 131 | (INTSOY) Univ. of Ill. c/ | Oilseed Production | | 10.00 | 5 |
| Egypt 142 | | Agricultural Planning | | 5.00 | 5 |
| | | | 6 | 23.90 | |

c/ Contract for project design

# A.I.D.'S RESPONSE TO POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE WORKSHOP ON WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT TO A.I.D. AND THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (BIFAD)

I. The A.I.D. Policy Determination Paper 60 (PD-60) of September 1974, entitled "Integration of Women into National Economies, be fully implemented."

Because of the general interest in the subject of women in development, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) periodically asked for reports from bureaus on actions being taken to implement the Agency's policy (A.I.D. Policy Directive 60) on integrating women into development roles in A.I.D. programs. Recent responses indicated that priority emphasis is being given to the implementation of the policy. A.I.D. is now in the process of carrying out relevant measures recommended by the participants of the 1978 Workshop on Women in Development, as discussed herein.

1. "A.I.D. Policy Handbook 1, Part IV, 'Sector Policies,'" should be amended to include Section 5, 'Women in Development Efforts.'"

A.I.D. policy instruction, "Integration of Women Into National Economies" in Section 5, Part IV, Handbook I, which became effective July 7, 1975, is explicit in requiring recognition of women in development roles, and in requiring consideration of how the capacities of women can be more fully utilized in the design and implementation of each A.I.D.-supported project or program.

2. "A.I.D. Policy Handbook, Part I, Appendix 4A, "Social Soundness Analysis Guidelines" (Tab E) should be revised to require inclusion of baseline data on women and children. It should also include an assessment of the potential impact of the program on the family unit."

A.I.D. is in the process of amending the Social Soundness Analysis Guidelines, first issued in 1975, to include a requirement that the analyses take into account the potential impact of projects and programs on the traditional roles of women and children, as well as the role of the entire family unit within their community and in their society. This and other major changes will be included in a revision which is expected to be completed before the end of this fiscal year.

A.I.D. also has a general policy of encouraging expansion and improvement of host countries' economic and social data base both nationally and in key priority areas to the extent resources permit. This also applies to the support or encouragement of information and data collection by the countries themselves as well as by international organizations on the role and status of women and children to the extent feasible.

3. "Evidence that women's issues in host countries have been adequately addressed should be one criterion for evaluation of PIDs."

A.I.D. policy instructions in Section 5, Part IV, Handbook 1, require bureaus and missions to consider how the capacities of women can be more fully and effectively utilized in the design and implementation of each A.I.D.-supported project or program, and to analyze the problems and discuss possible remedial actions in all plans or proposals.

4. "Evidence that Women in Title XII Eligible Universities Participate in Formulating Grants and Collaborative Research Support Proposals."

A.I.D. endorses university and BIFAD initiatives with universities in involving women and minority faculty members in the preparation of proposals for strengthening grants and for collaborative research support grants. However, evidence that women in Title XII universities participate in the formulation of such proposals cannot be considered as one of the criteria for the evaluation of such proposals. A.I.D. is utilizing various means to inform universities of its policy of "Integration of Women Into National Economies" (Section 5, Part IV, Handbook 1) for their consideration in planning overseas activities under A.I.D. contracts and grants.

5. "An official Women in Development Review Board should be established in each host country for the purpose of assuring that all A.I.D. projects address and respond to the needs of women in agriculture and rural development."

A.I.D. cannot require host governments to establish "Women in Development Review Boards," but A.I.D. missions were advised, through Handbook I, Section 5, "to assist LDCs, if requested, and within A.I.D. resource limitations, to establish or strengthen government and non-government national women's organizations and independent groups which promote the integration of women into the development process and, thus, improve chances for contributing to regional, national and international programs."

6. A.I.D. should initiate regional training conferences which would:

a. Improve dissemination of information about contributions of women to the development process and the impact of social and economic change on women;

b. Contribute to the creation of collaborative communication networks among universities on a regional or consortium basis;

c. Facilitate university understanding of changes in AID/BIFAD policies, structures and priorities for Title XII implementation.

A.I.D. affirms its support for improving the dissemination of information to and communication with universities on all aspects of Title XII, including specifically the role of women in development. Appropriate means for bringing this about, including the possibility of holding regional workshops, are being considered by A.I.D. and BIFAD.

II. "The total contribution of women to agricultural production, storage and distribution be documented systematically and made available to program planners."

A.I.D. encourages and supports the collection of improved data on the roles of women in development. Also, A.I.D. requires an analysis of the potential impact on the traditional roles of women and benefits to women in project and program proposal documents. However, A.I.D. cannot systematically document the total contribution of women to agricultural production, storage and distribution, as such data are often not available in many LDCs.

III. "Development programs include strategies for improving women's skills and abilities to participate actively in the total development process through projects aimed specifically at increasing quantity and quality of family food supply and family income."

This recommendation is in keeping with A.I.D.'s policy. Improving the quantity and quality of family food supply is the major goal of Title XII. Improving incomes is implicit in A.I.D.'s emphasis on growth with equity for low-income target groups.

A.I.D. has an overall collaboration policy, part of which is to utilize the knowledge of host country nationals in project design, research, implementation and evaluation of development activities and to help strengthen their capacities.

IV. "Programs be designed to facilitate the transition of all members (men, women and children) of the target population from dependence on assistance to independence and self-help at the grassroots level."

This recommendation continues to be the basic objective of U.S. assistance programs.

V. "The social, cultural and psychological impacts on the target population be given greater emphasis in design and implementation of programs."

In recent years, A.I.D. has given special attention to these aspects through direct hire and contracting of experienced social scientists, whether Americans or country nationals, to work in the field and in Washington. As noted under recommendation 2, the amended Social Soundness Guidelines will give greater emphasis on impact upon women.

VI. "Nutrition be designated as a primary program area of equal importance with sectors such as agriculture and health."

The importance of improving nutrition levels of people in less developed countries is recognized under the "New Directions" legislation of FY-73. This has led to emphasis upon creating adequate awareness, developing professional and institutional competence to deal with the nutrition problem, and building of nutrition elements into multi-disciplinary programs. Such programs include health, agriculture, rural development, formal and non-formal education, social services, and others.

VII. "All evaluations assess the effects of the project on nutrition, health and social factors as well as on agricultural production."

A.I.D. finds that this recommendation would be impractical and costly to implement and with doubtful results. A.I.D. favors evaluation of impacts on nutrition, health and social factors of agricultural production projects when these form significant components of the project purpose and design.

VIII. "A.I.D./BIFAD seek to expand representation of disciplines and of qualified women on the Board and its committees, the Joint Research Committee (JRC) and the Joint Committee on Agricultural Development (JCAD)."

A.I.D. agrees in principle with the recommendation. Two of the seven BIFAD members are women. The JRC and the JCAD each has a woman member. A.I.D. will continue to cooperate with the Board to increase qualified women membership of the joint committees and to maintain a proper mix of disciplines on the three bodies.

IX. "All eligible universities have a Title XII committee composed of women and men representing a wide range of disciplines."

While sensing the probable usefulness to many universities of having the type of committee recommended, A.I.D. recognizes that the decision rests with each university. A.I.D. will commend to the BIFAD its consideration as to what, if any, organizational arrangements it wishes to suggest to universities.

A.I.D.'s above responses to the recommendations were prepared by DS/XII with the concurrence of BIFAD. They were approved by Robert H. Nooter, Acting Administrator on June 20, 1979.

## ESTIMATED SCHEDULE OF COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH SUPPORT PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTATION, FY 1977-1981 IN $,000s

| Program | Fiscal Year | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | FY 1977 | FY 1978 | FY 1979 | FY 1980 | FY 1981 |
| Sorghum/Millet | | | | | |
| Planning | X | X | | | |
| Program | | | X | X | X |
| Fisheries and Aquaculture | | | | | |
| Planning | X | X | X | | |
| Program | | | | X | X |
| Beans and Cowpeas | | | | | |
| Planning | | X | X | X | |
| Program | | | | | X |
| Peanuts | | | | | |
| Planning | | | | X | X |
| Soils Management | | | | | |
| Planning | | | X | X | |
| Program | | | | | X |
| Small Ruminants | | | | | |
| Planning | X | | | | |
| Program | | X | X | X | X |
| Animal Health | | | | | |
| Planning | | | | | X |
| Pest Management | | | | | |
| Planning | | | X | X | X |
| Post Harvest Food Losses | | | | | |
| Planning | | | | | X |
| Effects on Humans of Marginal Malnutrition | | | | | |
| Planning | | X | X | | |
| Program | | | | X | X |

## STRENGTHENING GRANTS

### MATCHING FORMULA

| UNIVERSITY | Budget Contributions 1st year AID | UNIVERSITY* |
|---|---|---|
| U. of Arizona | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| Auburn U. | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| Cal. St. U. (Fresno) | $ 88,152 | $ 88,152 |
| Cal. St. U. (Pomona) | $ 92,590 | $101,094 |
| Colorado St. U. | $ 98,903 | $103,988 |
| Cornell U. | $100,000 | $138,986 |
| U. of Delaware | $100,000 | $138,700 |
| U. of Florida | $100,000 | $102,956 |
| U. of Hawaii | $100,000 | $136,000 |
| U. of Illinois | $112,000 | $213,000 |
| Iowa State U. | $100,000 | $117,109 |
| Kansas St. U. | $137,600 | $165,429 |
| U. of Kentucky | $100,000 | $128,423 |
| Louisiana St. U. | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| U. of Maine (Orono) | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| U. of Maryland | $100,000 | $173,600 |
| Michigan St. U. | $300,000 | $300,000 |
| U. of Minnesota | $100,000 | $125,000 |
| U. of Missouri (Columbia) | $100,000 | $174,200 |
| Montana St. U. | $100,000 | $100,063 |
| U. of Nebraska | $100,000 | $124,000 |
| New Mexico St. | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| No. Carolina St. | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| Ohio St. U. | $100,000 | $169,000 |
| Oklahoma St. U. | $100,000 | $106,511 |
| U. of Puerto Rico (Mayaguez) | $100,000 | $185,032 |
| Purdue U. | $185,000 | $185,000 |
| U. of Rhode Island | $ 99,375 | $126,175 |
| Rutgers | $100,000 | $136,727 |

### MATCHING FORMULA (Continued)

| UNIVERSITY | Budget Contributions 1st year AID | UNIVERSITY |
|---|---|---|
| Sam Houston St. U. | $100,000 | $105,619 |
| So. Dakota St. | $100,000 | $127,890 |
| So. Illinois U-Carbondale | $100,000 | $116,230 |
| U. of Tennessee | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| Texas A&M | $208,028 | $210,528 |
| Texas Tech. | $100,000 | $153,139 |
| Tuskegee | $ 29,550 | $ 30,700 |
| Utah St. U. | $164,495 | $165,507 |
| U. of Vermont | $ 99,731 | $101,248 |
| Va. Poly. Inst. | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| Va. State U. | $ 50,000 | $ 50,000 |
| Washington St. U. | $100,000 | $100,000 |
| U. of Wisconsin-RivFalls | $ 99,875 | $ 99,970 |

### MINORITY INSTITUTION (Non-Matching)

| UNIVERSITY | AID GRANT |
|---|---|
| Alabama A&M | $103,128 |
| Lincoln U. | $ 79,773 |
| No. Carolina A&T | $101,800 |
| Va. St. U. | $150,000 |

*/ In addition to this direct cost contribution, universities contributed all overhead or indirect costs for both the A.I.D. and University funded direct cost components. This overhead plus direct cost contribution, constituted an aggregate university contribution about double that of A.I.D.

APPENDIX 4