

Ralph F. ...
ASIA/PD
PN-AAW-125

47637

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Bureau for Asia

2nd Regional Workshop for

Project Development Officers and Engineers

Pattaya - Thailand

January 27 - February 1, 1985

CONTENTS

1. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
2. RATIONALE FOR WORKSHOP
3. WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES
4. SCHEDULE OF THE WEEK
5. WORKSHOP PANEL ASSIGNMENTS
6. WORKSHOP PROCESS
7. OPERATING SUGGESTIONS
8. SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS
9. INDIVIDUAL DAILY SCHEDULES AND TOPICS

LIST OF PROSPECTIVE PARTICIPANTS
Second Asia Bureau Project Development Officer/Engineer Workshop
Pattaya, Thailand - January 27-February 1, 1984

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Resource Personnel</u>	<u>Project Devel. Officers</u>	<u>Engineers</u>
AID/W		Peter Bloom Robert Pratt Hasan A. Hasan	Ralph Bird
Contractor	Daniel Creedon	-	- -
Bangkok	Bandy Viragh* Peter Howley*	Basharat Ali Jeff Evans Thomas Johnson Willy Baum R. Resseguie (FSN Program Analyst)	John Neave Mintara S. Wanchai
Colombo	-	Christina Schoux	Leroy Purifoy
Dhaka	-	Robert Barnes J. D. Perry Graham Thompson	Gene George David Warner
Islamabad	R. Cunningham*	Robert Mathia	A. Sundermann
Jakarta	-	Dennis Zvinakis Gary Redman	
Kathmandu	-	Donald B. Clark	John J. Pinney
Manila Grayson	-	John Tennant	Abraham
New Delhi	-	Robert Nachtrieb G. P. Varshneya M. N. Wahi	-
Rangoon	-	-	-
Suva	-	-	-
ASEAN	-	Bruce Blackman	-
Totals	4	22	10

*Resource personnel will only be present at pertinent sessions

Breakdown: AID/W: 4 + Field: 28 = 32
 USDH: 27 + FSN: 5 = 32

RATIONALE FOR WORKSHOP

AID in general, and the Asia Bureau in particular, are undergoing basic changes in the way our business is done. Changes are occurring in decentralization of authority for project approval and implementation actions, reduced staffing levels in missions and Washington; changing technologies (computers and word processors); maturing relationships between AID and host countries; increased use of loan vs. grant funds; and merging roles of AID staff, e.g. PDOs, project officers, program officers, engineers, etc.

Our 1983 Workshop in Singapore took place as many of these changes were beginning or were already underway. We successfully identified a number of important issues, made useful recommendations and pursued several of them to successful conclusion, including expanded delegated authorities and improved practices. Now, we have the opportunity to make a similar contribution if we can focus on a limited number of key issues and formulate workable recommendations.

Another objective, apart from successfully formulating workable recommendations, is to increase our understanding of each other's concerns and experiences. We can then hopefully improve our performance of our respective jobs and obtain increased job satisfaction in the process.

Workshop Objectives

- . to exchange information between field and Washington staff on recent developments, points of clarification and mutual needs associated with project design and implementation, and those who practice these arts;
- . to encourage exchanges of experience, lessons, and methods among USAID missions to broaden options and perspectives;
- . to enhance professionalism and to contribute to the techniques, skills and knowledge that make up the discipline of international development;
- . to identify problems or issues which lend themselves to concrete recommendations, changes in procedures or improved practices;
- . to develop recommendations concerning measures to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our project design and implementation process in a time of change; and
- . to develop follow-up action plans and responsibilities and present these to the Asia Bureau's leadership.

4

Second Asia Bureau PDO/Engineer Workshop
Pattaya, Thailand - January 27-February 1, 1985

Sunday, January 27, 1985

11:00 Workshop team meeting for final
review/planning (Open Session)

4:30-5:00 Opening Session - Remarks and introduction
of USAID/Thailand Mission Director Bob
Halligan (Peter Bloom)
Welcoming remarks (Bob Halligan)

5:00-6:00 Notes and comments on Mission Director's
meeting (Bloom)
Summary/recap of 1983 Workshop; statement of
goals and expectations (Pratt)

6:00-6:30 Comments on Agenda - Agenda concurrence (all
participants)
Workshop process (Creedon)

6:30-6:45 Administrative details

6:45 Social get-together

Monday January 28, 1985

8:00-8:15 1983 Workshop design issues recap (Pratt)

8:15-8:30 Asia Bureau Experiment (Bloom)

8:30-9:30 Panel - PIDs: Their contents, preparation,
review, and approval

9:30-10:10 Plenary discussion

10:10-10:20 Divide into working groups

10:20-10:30 Coffee break

10:30-11:30 Working groups breakout

11:30-12:00 Working groups report

12:00-1:30 Lunch

Rocky Staples

1:30-2:10 Panel - PP Approval in the Field (Arndt Report)
2:10-2:40 Plenary discussion
2:40-3:30 Panel - Selected Design Issues (Rolling Design, Performance Disbursement)
3:30-4:00 Plenary
4:00-4:10 Select working group assignments
4:10 Coffee enroute to working groups
4:10-5:00 Working groups breakout
5:00-5:30 Working groups report

Tuesday January 29, 1985

8:00-8:15 1983 Workshop implementation issues recap. (Hasan)
8:15-9:15 Panel - Procurement Issues (Viragh and Howley resource persons)
9:15-9:45 Plenary
9:45-10:00 Working groups selection
10:00 Coffee on the way to working groups breakout rooms
10:00-11:15 Working groups breakout
11:15-12:00 Working groups report
12:00-1:30 Lunch
1:30-2:15 Panel - Pre-Obligation Implementation Actions
2:15-2:35 Plenary
2:45-3:00 Coffee break
3:00-3:45 Panel - Additional Implementation Authorities to Field Missions
3:45-4:05 Plenary
4:05-4:15 Select working groups
4:15-5:00 Working groups breakout
5:00-5:30 Working groups report

Rocky Staples

Wednesday, January 26, 1983

8:00-8:30 1983 Workshop recap role of PDOs/Engineers
in mission and on career development in
general (Bloom and Bird)

8:30-9:10 Panel - Roles of PDOs and Engineers in
Mission Organization

9:10-9:40 Plenary

9:40-9:50 Coffee break

9:50-10:30 Panel - Career Development, PDOs and
Engineers

10:30-10:40 Plenary

10:40-10:50 Select working groups

10:50-11:30 Working groups breakout

11:30-12:00 Working groups report

12:00-1:30 Lunch

1:30-2:10 Panel - Project
Monitoring/Reporting/Communication

2:10-2:40 Plenary

2:40-3:30 Presentation by Cunningham on Computer Uses

3:30-4:00 Plenary discussion of computer presentation

4:00-4:10 Working groups selection

4:10 Coffee on way to breakout rooms

4:10-5:00 Working groups breakout

5:00-5:30 Working groups report

Thursday January 31, 1985

8:00-10:15	Panels finish their reports - breakout rooms (10 panels)
10:15-10:30	Coffee break
10:30-12:00	First 3 panels report
12:00-1:30	Lunch
1:30-3:30	Next 4 panels report
3:30-3:45	Coffee break
3:45-5:15	Last 3 panels report

Friday February 1, 1985

8:00-10:00	Feedback and recommendations/final revisions of workshop report
10:00-10:15	Coffee break
10:15-12:00	Workshop oral feedback and written evaluation
12:30-2:00	Closing luncheon
2:30	Bus departs for Bangkok

Workshop Panels

<u>Panel</u>	<u>Chair</u>	<u>Members</u>
1. PIDs	Jeff Evans	Robert Barnes, <i>Peter Bloom</i> Alejandro Sundermann
2. PP Approval in Field	Christina Schoux	Gene George, <i>Col Pratt</i> Graham Thompson
3. Selected Design Issues	John Tennant	Thomas Johnson, <i>H. Howson</i> G.P. Varshneya
4. Procurement Issues	Gary Redman	Robert Mathia, John Neave Resource Personnel: Bendy Viragh Peter Howley
5. Pre-Obligation Actions	Basharat Ali	Abraham Grayson, <i>Col Pratt</i> Donald Clark Resource Personnel: Bendy Viragh Peter Howley
6. Additional Impl. Auth.	Dennis Zvinakis	David Warner, <i>Peter Bloom</i> Bruce Blackman Resource Personnel: Bendy Viragh Peter Howley
7. Roles of PDOs & Engrs	Robert Nachtrieb	Willy Baum, <i>Willy Bird</i> Minatra Silawatshananai
8. Career Development	Peter Bloom	Ralph Bird, Leroy Purifoy, J.D. Perry, Vanchai
9. Monitoring/Rep./Comm.	Leroy Purifoy	Robert Resseguie, <i>Ph. M. B. Bird</i> G.P. Varshneya
10. Computers	Robert Cunningham	John Pinney, <i>John Pinney</i> M.N. Watri

The Process

We will begin the workshop Sunday night with a review of the Agenda. This will result in its validation as is or as modified. Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday will be devoted to discussing a total of ten topics. Each topic will be discussed for an hour by a panel. A short general discussion will follow the panel presentation. Points made during the panel presentation and following plenary discussion will be distilled and marked on flip-chart sheets as the session progresses. These flip-charts will be used by the working groups as a starting point for discussion.

Participants will be organized into working groups for each panel. Participants will choose which working group they would prefer. There will be no fixed working groups; the composition will vary for each panel. Working groups will be organized around a major issue or a cluster of related issues that has emerged from the panel presentation and the following plenary discussion. They will discuss, examine and analyze an issue or issues on the subject addressed by the panel. About one hour has been scheduled for this process. Working groups will attempt to reach agreement on recommendations or suggestions based on their analysis. Each working group will appoint a spokesperson, who will make a short, 5-10 minute, presentation of the work group's views to the plenary session. It is suggested that a flip-chart be used in this presentation process.

The panel chairperson will be responsible for collecting the flip-chart and reports developed by all of the working groups that had addressed issues related to his/her topic. Each panel will consolidate and organize this material into a presentation for Thursday. All 10 panels will report back at that plenary session. The report should represent the Workshop's position on the topic addressed by the panel. Following each report, the participants will be asked to either accept the report, modify it, or reject it.

The panel reports are further consolidated and presented to the assembled workshop on Friday morning as the Workshop recommendations. Each participant will receive a copy of the Workshop report indicating all recommendations/suggestions, who will be required to take the action, who will follow through, when, and the anticipated impact if the recommendation is adopted.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PANELS & WORKING GROUPS

1. For Everybody

- . This is a collegial, problem-identification and, where possible, problem-solving gathering where we hope to reach consensus on particular issues or problems;
- . We do not want long lectures;
- . Remember your audience is composed of experienced senior people; and
- . During the discussion period, do not be defensive - keep the discussion moving - do not monopolize the "airtime" in plenary or your group.

2. For Panel Chairpersons

- . A short paragraph stating the topic issues and talking points to be considered by your panel has been included in the workbook that each attendee has received. You are free to expand or modify the talking points given in the paragraph. You should, however, follow the general theme of the paragraph;
- . As soon as possible, contact each of your panel members and gain their views on topics or points to be included in the panel discussion. This will enable panel members to organize their presentation;
- . Structure your panel presentation so that you will stay within your allotted time;
- . End your panel discussion on a note that will elicit questions and discussion in the individual work groups;
- . The plenary question period at the end of your presentation will be used to clarify/identify issues. It is not intended to be an in-depth discussion session. Leave that to the working groups.

3. For All Panels

- . Each panel chairperson will be responsible for summarizing and consolidating the recommendations of the working groups that considered their panel topic. These summaries will constitute the workshop's recommendations. All panels will be given time on Thursday, January 31st (from 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.) to work on the summary. They will then present these recommendations at the plenary session on Thursday some time after 10:00 a.m. At that time a consensus will be sought from the Workshop participants on the recommendation or modified recommendations. Please use a flip chart prepared beforehand for this presentation and provide Dan, our facilitator, with a written summary of the recommendations as modified in the plenary session. These recommendations will then be typed and provided to each participant on Friday;
- . The written summary should be prepared in a manner that would allow an individual who did not attend the Pattaya Workshop to place the recommendation in the proper working or policy context. Specifically, the recommendation should be clearly stated, the rationale for the recommendation should be included, and the "cost" if any and the expected benefits should be estimated;
- . Include plan for action and follow-up in your recommendation: suggest who should take action on recommendations, what is to be done, when should it be done, and how to do it (process or medium); and
- . Panel members may want to use an overhead projector--it can help a presentation. However, it makes a better presentation if you prepare the transparency before the presentation. If you intend to use A/V materials, let Dan Creedon know what you want.

4. For Working Groups

- . Your first task is to identify an individual who will record the issues, decisions or recommendations of your group and present the group's position at the plenary session; and
- . It may be helpful if a member summarizes the work group's position prior to moving on to a new topic. The procedure also allows the person acting as a recorder to "keep up" with the flow of information.

Summary of Workshop Sessions

A summary of each major workshop session will be found after the tab indicating the day on which that session is held. As we proceed, some sessions may be adjusted for emphasis, timing, participation, etc. Please use the summary sheets as a general guide and to record your notes, reflections, and reactions. This will be part of your record of the workshop, and can serve as a reminder for you to use during the evaluation at the end of the week.

Sunday, January 27, 1985

11:00 Workshop team meeting for final
review/planning (Open Session)

4:30-5:00 Opening Session - Remarks and introduction
of USAID/Thailand Mission Director Bob
Halligan (Peter Bloom)
Welcoming remarks (Bob Halligan)

5:00-6:00 Notes and comments on Mission Director's
meeting (Bloom)
Summary/recap of 1983 Workshop; statement of
goals and expectations (Pratt)

6:00-6:30 Comments on Agenda - Agenda concurrence (all
participants)
Workshop process (Creedon)

6:30-6:45 Administrative details

6:45 Social get-together

OPENING SESSION AND AGENDA CONCURRENCE
4:00-6:45 p.m. Sunday, January 27, 1985

Issue: The design of the Workshop and the development of the agenda have evolved in collaboration with field missions through the exchange of cables over the past four to five months. The agenda remains subject to modifications/adjustments by the participants before the first business session begins on Monday morning.

Objective: To agree on overall session design, workshop flow, allocation of time, and agenda of workshop as well as put in proper perspective the expected outcomes/- expectations of participants.

Process: All participants will be given copies of a workshop handbook which includes all schedules, materials and references. Participants will review the handbook and discuss as needed.

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

June 12, 1984

ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR, BUREAU FOR ASIA

THRU : DAA/ASIA, Eugene Staples
FROM : ASIA/PD, Robert G. Pratt
SUBJECT: The Second Project Development
Officer/Engineer Workshop

Problem: Your approval is requested to begin planning the second Project Development Officer/Engineer Workshop for January 1985.

Discussion: The first Project Development Officer/Engineer workshop was held in Singapore February 27-March 4, 1983. The rationale for that first workshop was to discuss the implications of expanded authorities delegated to field missions at the time and constraints to effective project implementation.

I believe the first workshop was a success. Not only were we able to get all key field PDOs and engineers together to discuss common concerns, and exchange thoughts among themselves and with their AID/W backstops, but the workshop resulted in some constructive changes in the way we do business. Following are some examples:

- . SER/IKM granted exemptions from the requirement that it clear all micro-computer purchases with project funds up to \$10,000;
- . OBR is developing automated consultant rosters to be used as a resource for missions' use in locating specialized skills;

- . Host country contracts and subcontracts are now counted toward minority business quotas;
- . Agency-wide policy is now to favor direct AID contracts vs. host country contracts;
- . An action memo will soon be presented to the Administrator to delegate more implementation authorities to the field to accompany the broader project approval authorities delegated last year;
- . We have begun evaluating PPs authorized in the field; last year Larry Harrison did a review of several PPs and we plan to repeat this exercise this year;
- . We now review the PDS funds allocation with DF to ensure that funds are available for project design and feasibility studies far enough in advance to ensure timely preparation of PIDs and PPs;
- . The "PID-like" cable is now routinely used by the Bureau in cases where "substantive" changes are introduced to an ongoing project through an amendment;
- . Bureau missions have institutionalized formal project design and review process authorized by mission directors. All missions now have mission orders outlining the process except Pakistan which is preparing one now; and
- . There is better information flow between ASIA/PD and the field through the ASIA/PD newsletter, regular letters from the Division Chiefs here and their counterparts in the missions, and by having missions share their quarterly reports with us.

The recommendations made by Workshop participants, and persistent follow-up in AID/W, were wholly or partly responsible for these actions.

I believe the time has come for PDOs and engineers in AID/W and the field to meet again. Aside from the benefits derived from fellow professionals meeting and discussing common problems, effective implementation of the project design and implementation aspects of the "Asia Bureau Experiment" warrants such a workshop. Specifically, we propose to analyze implications of changing Bureau/Mission roles and relationships stemming from the "Experiment" and earlier redelegation of authorities. We also want to discuss a number of project design and implementation issues including some remaining from the first workshop. Finally, it would provide Peter Bloom an excellent opportunity to meet some of our key field staff.

We propose to hold the workshop in late January 1985.

Recommendation: That you approve the Workshop in principle and authorize us to begin planning it.

Approved _____

Disapproved _____

Date _____

Clearances:

ASIA/PD:HSharlach (draft)
ASIA/PD:JNussbaum (draft)
ASIA/PD:SBUGG (draft)

ASIA/PD/ENGR:HAMASAN:sl:06/12/84:27367:1830k

Monday January 28, 1985

8:00-8:15 1983 Workshop design issues recap (Pratt)
8:15-8:30 Asia Bureau Experiment (Bloom)
8:30-9:30 Panel - PIDs: Their contents, preparation, review, and approval
9:30-10:10 Plenary discussion
10:10-10:20 Divide into working groups
10:20-10:30 Coffee break
10:30-11:30 Working groups breakout
11:30-12:00 Working groups report

12:00-1:30 Lunch

1:30-2:10 Panel - FP Approval in the Field (Arndt Report)
2:10-2:40 Plenary discussion
2:40-3:30 Panel - Selected Design Issues (Rolling Design, Performance Disbursement)
3:30-4:00 Plenary
4:00-4:10 Select working group assignments
4:10 Coffee enroute to working groups
4:10-5:00 Working groups breakout
5:00-5:30 Working groups report

THE ASIA BUREAU "EXPERIMENT"

I. Background

In November 1983, the Asia Bureau launched an "experiment" designed to:

- lighten the burden of CDSS preparation on the missions and increase the intensity of the AID/W review process;
- streamline the PIDs and PID review process; and
- increase missions' pre-implementation, implementation and project redesign authorities.

Revised CDSS guidance was sent to three missions: Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. PIDs were drafted and reviewed in accordance with experimental guidelines. The experiment was discussed with the mission directors at the January 1984 conference in Bangkok and subsequently revised after discussion with Asia Bureau staff. It is important to note that the Asia Bureau experiment does not directly address all of the implementation problems identified by the Yaeger Task Force (YTF). The working assumption of the YTF is:

"AID's programming, project identification and project paper processes have been criticized as ends in themselves rather than tools with which to achieve development objectives. Our continuing pipeline problems suggest a need to devote more management attention, personnel and financial resources to improving program management, monitoring, implementation support and portfolio supervision."*

The actions required to simplify the field-level management of many of these implementation problems are largely

* Memorandum to the Administrator from Leonard Yaeger, Chairman of the Implementation Task Force, dated October 19, 1983.

in the hands of M/SER/COM and M/SER/CM. We and the YTF are now working to address these problems. We believe these are the areas of greatest potential relief from implementation burdens.

Given this background, we firmly believe the Asia Bureau can significantly improve management through full adoption of the procedures described below.

II. CDSS, Program Week and the ABS

A. The CDSS

1. Simplified Guidance

The Asia CDSS guidance is short and simple and eliminates certain material that is routinely and unnecessarily repeated every year. In addition to the general CDSS guidance, the Bureau sent country-specific CDSS messages describing areas of special interest to be emphasized. Mission directors in Bangkok welcomed the Bureau experimental guidance.

2. Less Frequent Preparation

We decided CDSSs should not be required more than once every three years (although missions should have the options of redoing CDSSs more often if circumstances require). The Bureau may require a new CDSS at any time if, in its judgment, the political or economic situation justifies this. Generally, no annual update is required.

3. Review

We agree with the Implementation Task Force that the AID/W review of full CDSSs does not do justice to the amount of time and effort devoted to their preparation in the field. Therefore, we will devote up to a full week to focussing on major themes or issues (see attached agenda for Bangladesh, Pakistan, and India).

B. Program Week

1. Definition

A full week of Washington consultations with selected mission directors will be scheduled every year to review and decide next steps on a range of strategic and operational concerns described in the work plan. A

major purpose of these discussions will be to review project ideas with formal PID approval delegated to the field in appropriate cases. "Appropriateness" is defined as sufficient information available to ensure that the project conforms to A.I.D. policy, a demonstration of adequate technical expertise available to the mission, and a Washington judgment that the project will be viewed as generally "non-controversial" to interested groups, e.g., the Congress. The review is designed as well to identify major issues AID/W wants resolved as PID and PP work proceeds.

2. Work Plan

Work plans will be required of all full missions every year and most directors will be invited to Washington to participate in this review in a given year. The purpose of the work plan is to present the mission's program in terms of a review of the current program over the past year and a statement of specific objectives for the ensuing fiscal year. Accordingly, the work plan is divided into two sections.

Section one is a review of the mission's current program. This section should discuss actual achievements against last year's program and operational objectives (from section two of the preceding year's work plan). It includes the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) on the mission's on-going projects. These will form the basis for the first of the two semi-annual portfolio reviews which will henceforth take place during program week (no change in the PIR format is contemplated). Aside from looking at individual projects, the work plan discusses problems of design and implementation, as well as other constraints affecting the portfolio as a whole, including:

- funding issues (Pipeline aging, mortgage problems, loan/grant split problems, deobligation/reobligations;
- obligation schedule; and
- actions on audit recommendations and evaluation findings.

In general, this section of the work plan and its review in Washington will identify patterns or trends that are pertinent to future program directions and discuss ways that the mission, and/or AID/W can deal with them.

Section two looks to the next fiscal year, taking into account the lessons learned and problems identified in section one. To the extent possible, this section describes the mission's plans for the ensuing fiscal year in measurable or quantifiable terms. This section includes short narratives on new project ideas, including an indication of the required support from AID/W for the project development (TDYs as well as PD&S funds). It contains a discussion of the mission's ability to live within approved FTE levels, or a well-reasoned justification for a change in those levels occasioned by the proposed program; suggestions for change in management mode; the mission's project evaluation plan; and a brief description of analytical work to be done in conjunction with an upcoming CDSS. The overall mission performance evaluation* will be discussed in the work plan, in terms of timing, content and proposed evaluators.

Not all of these items will receive the same emphasis by all missions. Though all relevant issues will be addressed, their coverage and emphasis in the work plan will depend on which management issues are most pertinent and urgent to each mission. The length of the work plan (not counting the individual PIR sheets referred to above) will not exceed 15 pages.

Work plan contents may change as experience is gained through the program week review process.

3. Timing

Program week is delinked from both the ABS and the CDSS. Program weeks generally will be scheduled in the March-April period -- after the CDSS season and before the ABS Season -- although there may be reason to schedule a program week at ABS time. For the few missions submitting CDSSs in a given year, program week will be held coincidentally with the CDSS review. For these cases, work plans will be submitted with the CDSS and not the ABS.

4. Participation

Bureau personnel will review work plans with mission directors during program week. Participating office directors will solicit written issues from their staffs. DP will coordinate the preparation of short issues papers

Substance and procedures have not been worked out.

and will distribute them several days in advance. PPC, S&T and other central bureau participation will be invited as required. As noted above, it is not anticipated that every director will come to Washington for program week every year. This will depend upon the importance of the issues to be discussed, and mission/bureau scheduling constraints.

C. Annual Budget Submission (ABS)

The elimination of CDSS updates, the increased Bureau attention given to the CDSS and delinking the work plan from both the CDSS and the ABS, will result in annual budget submissions which basically contain tables, although a separate paper will be attached reflecting the PID and PP agreements arrived at following the review of the work plan. This makes it possible to eliminate the highly attended but superficial interagency ABS reviews. In their place, we suggest limited interagency meetings chaired by ASIA/DP, with PPC, OMB, and State representatives where political issues exist. These meetings will occur prior to the Bureau's formal submissions to PPC so that agreed-upon modifications can be made.

As noted earlier, the need for intensive ABS reviews is obviated by program week and the Bureau guidance given to the directors for preparation of the ABS.

III. Project Development

A. PID Approvals in Field

As noted, the work plans will include descriptions of projects proposed for the ensuing year.

Washington will review the descriptions during program week and (a) authorize the mission to prepare and approve a full PID, or (b) disapprove further work on the proposal, or (c) authorize the mission to prepare a full PID for Washington review. Obviously, full PIDs may be submitted at any time.

Approval will be given based on adequate information related to A.I.D. policy, a demonstration of adequate technical expertise available to the mission and a Washington judgment that the project will be viewed generally as "non-controversial" to interested groups such as the Congress.

24

B. PID Contents

Regardless of where it is eventually approved , a full PID should be prepared for every project. All PIDs will contain the following information in 15 pages or less:

1. Project objective, strategy and expectations (what is the development problem, how will it be addressed, and what can be expected by the end of the project).
2. Conformity with host country strategy and plans.
3. Consistency with AID mandate (including beneficiary identification); four "cornerstones"; other special concerns (Gray Amendment, WID, narcotics); the Bureau regional strategy; and the CDSS.
4. Costs and sources of funding by major components.
5. Design strategy, including personnel resources and funding required.
6. Lessons learned with similar projects.
7. Identification of proposed implementing agency or agencies.
8. Recommended environmental threshold decision.
9. Identification of technical, economic, social or administrative issues (e.g. issues of maintenance, user fees, beneficiary participation, recurrent costs, sustainability after LOP, subsidies, replicability). A complete analysis is not required as such and an indication of how these will be addressed during design.
10. Implementation plan or schedule, including the probable sources of procurement and proposed contracting mode (e.g. Title XII, minority set-aside).

This coverage corresponds very closely to the scope prescribed for the PIDs in Handbook 3 which we feel is necessary to identify the critical issues. However, we have made it clear that in the space allowed (15 pages),

25

we will not expect a full analysis of all the pertinent issues. Over the past several months, we have insisted that PIDs be limited to 15 pages and have had very satisfactory experience with the field's submissions.

C. PID Review

While we are not significantly reducing the scope of the PID, we felt that we could and should limit the review of PIDs in AID/W. Initially we thought the AID/W review should focus on "policy issues" only; "technical issues" would be left to the field. This distinction very quickly proved to be unworkable, as we considered some "technical issues" to be critical to a project's success (e.g., the Lakhra Coal project in Pakistan). We opt instead to rely on increased discipline and more limited participation in the PID review process itself. Accordingly, PIDs will be reviewed in AID/W as follows:

1. A Project Committee (PC) of representatives from the concerned Bureaus and Asia Bureau Offices will review the PID. The PC chairperson will eliminate non-controversial and non-essential issues. Remaining issues will be listed in an issues paper.
2. An Asia Project Advisory Committee (APAC) will be scheduled to review the project, based on the issues paper. As in the past, the APAC meeting will be chaired by AA/ASIA or his designee. Participation in the APAC will be limited to one person from each of the Bureau offices concerned, and one person each from PPC and S&T. Projects may be approved, disapproved, or conditionally approved, pending receipt of additional information on critical issues.
3. The APAC Chairperson will strictly limit the issues included in the reporting cable to the field. Reporting cables will be organized into three categories:
 - APAC decision and conditions essential to approval;
 - issues on which additional information is desired or dialogue with AID/W is necessary; and
 - suggestions/recommendations for design of the project, including support available from AID/W. These are not mandatory.

28

IV. Implementation Authorities

The Bureau is considering giving missions authority to extend projects up to a 10-year life-of-project (as compared to their existing authority to extend terminal dates by only one year). Initial authorizations would still be limited to seven years.

At a project design and implementation workshop sponsored by the Asia Bureau last year, we identified certain implementation authorities which our missions desired to expand. Since such actions would go beyond this Bureau's redelegation power, we are holding discussions with the Implementation Task Force and with M/SER/CM and M/SER/COM. A report with recommendations should reach you in the year future.

V. Redesign Authority

The Asia Bureau missions have ample project design authority provided the redesign is consistent with the original project authorization. No additional action is needed on this account.

27

#1 PIDS: CONTENT, PREPARATION, REVIEW, AND APPROVAL
8:00 a.m.-12:00 noon, Monday, January 28, 1985

Issue: The process of preparation and approval of PIDs, particularly delegations of PID approval to field Missions, has evolved rather rapidly over the last year. As a result, the process is less focused and there are many questions that need answers.

Objective: To review the process of PID preparation and approval from the perspective of field missions and AID/W. To outline a clear PID process that is compatible with the needs of both and which is consistent with Agency policy.

Talking Points: Session will focus on all PID-related issues. For starters: program week, concept papers, their length, content, etc.; delegations to field of PID approval up to \$2.5 million and over \$2.5 million; ad-hoc delegation to approve PIDs after program week; criteria for Bureau decision to delegate; length of PIDs and their content, adequacy of HB 3 guidance on PIDs, Bureau review and approval of PIDs; focus on "policy" issues vs. nit-picking; and PID-like cable and PID for PP amendments.

Panel: Jeffrey Evans (Chair), Robert Barnes, Alejandro Sundermann

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

DRAFTED BY AID/PPC/PB:LRogers:SB

APPROVED BY AID/PPC/PB:JHUMMON

P 052233Z Dec 84 ZEX

UNCLAS STATE 359163

ADM AID FROM A/AID, M. Peter McPherson

SUBJECT: Revisions to the Agency's Programming System

1. For the past several months, the Agency has been reviewing possible revisions to the Agency's programming system. The implementation task force proposed several important new ideas, and the Asia Bureau has been experimenting with ways of putting these ideas into practice. The other Geographic Bureaus have also been developing new programming procedures tailored to their special needs. For example, Africa Bureau has developed a simplified planning process which eliminates CDSS requirements for small country programs..

2. A small Task Force which the Deputy Administrator chaired consolidated the various ideas and I have approved certain revisions to the Agency's programming system, which are summarized in this cable. These revisions constitute the beginning of change in the programming system, further changes may be made as we gain more experience with the Direction in which we are moving.

3. In general, the revisions provide additional authority to field managers. Additional decentralization allows for adapting agency policies to local conditions and is the best way to shift management attention toward implementation. It

is also logical, at this stage in the administration to place less emphasis on centralized control over planning and program design, since field managers have extensive experience with Agency policy.

4. At the same time, this increased authority for field managers will be matched by new procedures for periodically assessing mission performance and, as a result, will increase the accountability of field managers.

5. The proposals are also aimed at more efficient use of staff resources in both Washington and the field. At the margin, this will lead to some adjustment in staffing, will allow us to increase the proportion of staff in the field, will permit increased staff attention to implementation and will assist us in reaching OMB's manpower ceilings for FY 1986 and beyond.

6. It is also important that the system we have is flexible enough to permit Bureau AA's to adjust procedures to meet their own needs within an overall framework.

7. The following revisions to the Agency's programming system will be implemented as quickly as feasible.

A. The Agency's program planning process will be simplified and streamline. This will permit more orderly review of planning issues which do arise and more interaction between Washington and the field on planning problems.

The CDSS Guidance will be shortened and simplified and sent out by September 1 starting next year. Missions will be expected to use and refer to Agency policy papers, Handbooks and other existing sources for their policy guidance.

Multiyear CDSS approval will be the rule. Only in exceptional circumstances (perhaps a change in most Government or basic economic conditions) will CDSS's be required more than once every three years.

Bureaus in their supplementary CDSS guidance, cleared with PPC, will tailor submission requirements to the size of the country program and to special circumstances in the country. The African Bureau's Small Program statement concept will be applied to small programs worldwide, following Regional Bureau review of individual cases.

B. Information requirements for the budget process will be reduced to the minimum necessary to meet State, OMB and Congressional requirements. In addition, greater effort will be made to deliver resources quickly to the field and to ensure greater concentration on priority projects.

The ABS Guidance has already been slimmed down considerably. Opportunities for further reduction will be reviewed next year.

I found the ABS reviews this year particularly helpful in clarifying issues and establishing priorities. The format we established will continue.

We will review CP requirements with Congressional staffers to see where reductions can be made.

We will establish at least an interim OYB as soon as possible in the fiscal year so Missions can obligate funds as quickly as they are able.

C. Project development and approval responsibilities will be further decentralized.

PIDs for all projects with life-of-project costs less than dols 2.5 million normally will be approved in the field where there is a full mission. The action plan prepared for program week (see below) or other appropriate reviews planned by Bureaus will include brief descriptions of all projects proposed for the ensuing year, regardless of estimated life-of-project costs. Washington will review the descriptions during program week or other appropriate review and authorize the mission to prepare and approve a full PID, or disapprove further work on the proposal, or authorize the Mission to prepare a full PID for Washington review. Approval will be given based on adequate information related to AID policy, a demonstration of adequate technical expertise available to the Mission for project design and a Washington judgment that the project will be viewed as "non-controversial" to interested groups, such as the Congress.

Bureau AA's will be encouraged to delegate PID approval authority for projects larger than dols. 2.5 million after obtaining PPC clearance, which must be given within 10 days. PID's will be submitted to Washington only for those projects which raise significant issues.

PID reviews in Washington will be limited to consideration of significant issues by responsible decision makers. Meetings will be limited in size to reduce unproductive use of staff time. Decisions will be rendered within sixty days of submission of any project document. (Handbook deadlines for specific documents, such as PIDFs, will continue in force.)

PID review reporting cables will provide the Mission with explicit instructions on each significant issue considered and decided during the PID review.

D. AID/W will continue to exercise monitoring and oversight responsibilities.

Field Missions will submit annual "action plans" which establish program objectives for the coming year and report on progress toward objectives in previous plans. Bureaus would be given the flexibility to decide whether to review these plans as part of CDSS reviews, during "program week" (see below), as part of ABS reviews, or just prior to preparation of the CP. Central Bureaus will prepare action plans for major operating offices or program areas.

Bureaus will conduct intensive program reviews on major programs during a so-called "program week." These reviews will take place at least once every two years. Attendance will be limited to senior decision makers from Washington and the field. The "Action Plan" establishing mission objectives will serve as a basic source document for "program week." New project ideas will also be considered at these decisions, facilitating PID delegation to the field. How this review of major programs is handled will vary by Bureau--e.g., they may be covered in the ABS reviews. However, the concept of a thorough review of AID's most important programs is the key element.

The Deputy Administrator will continue to conduct quarterly management plan reviews with senior managers of each of the Bureaus. These management reviews will provide a vehicle to keep up-to-date management issues.

8. New procedures will be introduced to improve assessment of mission performance. These assessments will help ensure field programs are as aggressive as possible in support of Agency policy and that management is effective and efficient in using

resources. The Bureaus will be responsible for conducting these assessments. Assessments will be conducted every two years for all major field programs, often timed prior to preparation of a new CDSS and during a year when a "program week" is not scheduled. These reviews will be conducted by the AA or DAA. The Mission will be involved in topics to be reviewed.

9. I believe these modifications will help us better carry out our objectives and I look forward to your cooperation in carrying them out. I also welcome suggestions for additional changes which can help us carry out our mandate more effectively.

10. The field will receive additional guidance on this from your Regional Bureaus in general and in specific cases, and as appropriate from PPC. Schultz.

Following is State 199371, dated 16 July 1983:

From: AA/ASIA Greenleaf To All Asia Bureau Mission Directors,
SPRDO/Suva and ALO/Manila

SUBJECT: Project Amendment Notification Procedure

1. Our project amendment and project extension preparation, review and approval process has not been as systematic as has the new-project POD and project paper process. Participants at the recent Singapore PDO/ENG's workshop discussed this subject. In light of the increased redelegation of amendment authority to \$30,000,000, they recommended certain procedures be adopted.

I have agreed with their proposals and am introducing them as the Asia Bureau project amendment modification procedure by means of this cable. All substantive project modifications, including extensions, should henceforth be handled according to this procedure, which conforms to and amplifies guidance provided in A.I.D. Handbook 3, Chapter 13. d. 3.

2. As soon as the need for and nature of a substantive project modification is identified, missions should advise the Bureau by cable regarding the following:

(1) Extent of the proposed change,

(2) Rationale for it [including its compatibility with agency policies and priorities],

(3) Project achievements and problems,

(4) Possible alternatives,

(5) Its implications and proposed source of funds, and

(6) If additional funds will be required.

This step should be taken before initiating work on a PP supplement.

The Bureau will respond based on its view of the merits of the proposal.

This exchange of communications will be in lieu of a PID and in most cases will be sufficient to authorize the mission to proceed with detailed design of the project modification, preparation of a PP supplement, and authorization of the project amendment if it is within mission authority. [if, however, modifications represent major changes as indicated in paragraph 13 d. 3b. and c. and or substantial increase of funds, the Bureau may repeat may require that a PID be submitted to provide fuller explanation.]

3. The procedure described above is intended to provide opportunity for the missions and Bureau to propose and consider the merits of, and alternatives to, project modifications well before such action becomes urgent and options become limited.

4. In cases where missions have authority to amend projects but not to extended PACD's further, the Bureau will whenever possible provide ad-hoc redelegation to extend the PACD at the same time that it reviews the case for the project amendment as presented in the "notification cable". We hope in this manner to approve the required PACD extension in our approvals to proceed with proposed project amendments.

5. I believe this is consistent with the recommendation of the mission representatives at the workshop. If you have any questions or suggested refinements in this procedure, please let me know.

End State 199371

2/6

DRAFT

January 17, 1985

Excerpts of Jakarta 21635 dated 19 December 1984

Subject: Project No. 497-0333
Puspiptek Energy Laboratory Project Amendment

Reference State 199371 (16 July 1983)

1. Referenced telegram details project amendment notification process. The purpose of this cable is to inform Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. (AID/W), of our intent to amend subject project and begin work on a project paper (PP) supplement. AID/W is asked to concur to the Jakarta mission's preparation of a PP supplement and authorization of project amendment for the following description in lieu of a project implementation document (PID).

(Paragraphs 2 and 3 are deleted).

4. Jakarta mission anticipates approving the PP amendment for these additional funds by February 1985. A congressional notification cable will be sent shortly. Approval of PP amendment by February would put this action ahead of the earlier projected completion date of March 1985.

ASIA/PD/EA:DTiedt:sl:01/17/85:23516/3366k

2.1

#2 PROJECT PAPER APPROVAL IN THE FIELD

1:30-2:40 p.m., Monday, January 28, 1985

Issue: For the past two years field missions have been approving projects with funding levels below \$20.00 million. All missions now have mission orders defining this process, but there is no Bureau involvement or scrutiny.

Objective: To evaluate how well the preparation of project papers in the field has worked under recent delegations, determine whether the content of such PPs has changed, and to recommend adjustments as may be required.

Talking Points: The Bureau has sponsored reviews of samples of mission-approved PPs in 1983, (conducted by Larry Harrison) and in 1984 (conducted by Tom Arndt). Although both reviews concluded that PPs approved in the field were fine. Arndt noted that there has been a shift in emphasis away from project analysis. Tom Arndt's report also reached certain other conclusions that will be used to start the discussion.

Panel: Christina Schoux (Chair), Gene George, Graham Thompson

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

38

MISSION APPROVAL OF PROJECTS -- A REVIEW

Thomas M. Arndt
October 23, 1984

2/1

In April 1982, AID decided to give its field missions authority to approve projects of up to \$20 million. This authority, which quadrupled the previous \$5 million limit for field approval of projects, has been delegated to eight of the Asia Bureau's ten country or regional programs. As a result, the proportion of Bureau projects approved in the field has increased significantly:

	<u>Total PP's approved</u>	<u>PP's approved in field</u>	<u>percentage</u>
FY1981	25	9	36%
FY1982	30	12	40%
FY1983	27	12	44%
FY1984	25	16	64%

This memorandum addresses the question of what, if any, changes have occurred in the process of project preparation, presentation, review and approval under the increased delegation of authority. It summarizes a comparative review of fourteen 1984 field approved project papers, six 1984 Washington approved PP's, and meetings with about 30 project, program, and PD officers in the Pakistan, Thailand and Indonesia missions. (See attachment A for project papers reviewed.)

The review is the second in a series. It comes about one year after Larry Harrison's desk review in AID/W of 13 PP's. Harrison concluded on the basis of his readings that there was "not any appreciable difference in quality" between Washington and field approved project papers.

Perhaps because more time has elapsed or because of the insights afforded by talking to mission personnel, my conclusion is that Mission approved PP's are diverging in small but perhaps meaningful ways from their cousins submitted to AID/W. These changes are for the most part healthy and conform to the expectations which the designers of the increased delegation probably held explicitly or implicitly. They can be summarized as increased attention on the essentials of the project paper as the Mission perceives them and less attention to non-central issues or to embroidering the PP for a Washington audience.

Before going further, some caveats are in order: First the changes observed are not uniform among missions or projects. Of the missions surveyed, for instance, the two PP's prepared by the Pakistan mission for field approval were identical in all but a small degree from the four Pakistan PP's submitted to Washington. Pakistan has a centralized and unitary

PP preparation process and has been occupied more with project design relative to implementation than other missions over the past three years. This --along with other factors-- has worked to narrow any differences between their field and AID/W approved PP's. However, the small differences noted in Pakistan support some of the tendencies noted elsewhere.

In addition, many variables affect the style and content of specific project papers: The relative complexity of a project, whether it was prepared primarily in-house or by a consultant team, and the leadership and style of mission management, especially the mission director. It is difficult to isolate changes in PP's which are intrinsic to the redelegation of authority. Judgements on this question are necessarily subjective, but the conclusions below synthesize themes from a number of different people and papers and, I believe, are valid.

II - Comparing PP's Component by Component

Adherence to AID Policy: No differences were noted between field and AID/W PP's in terms of their conformity to AID or Asia Bureau's main policy directions (e.g. the "four cornerstones"). This is because CDSS's and PIDs are reviewed in Washington and, perhaps more importantly, because these policies are fully subscribed to or "internalized" (if you'll pardon the lapse into jargon) by field personnel. However, the delegation of authority does seem to be making it more difficult for AID/W to use the PP as a vehicle to call attention to special policy concerns which aren't a full part of AID's main line policy package. This is shown by the treatment of women in development in the respective FY 1984 field and Washington approved PPs.

Five of the six '84 AID/W PP's contained a discussion of women in development. (The sixth was an energy policy and commodity project where WID was not relevant.) Less than half of the field approved PP's mentioned the subject, and there were only two which treated it in any depth. This may partly be a matter of presentation. Many of the field approved projects promised to provide benefits to women despite the absence of a specific women's section in the paper. On the other hand, discussions of WID in AID/W papers are sometimes camouflage --a few pages to appease a Washington based interest group which the field knows will be at the AID/W review.

In at least one case, however, a field approved project overlooked discussing women's issues despite the project's clear relevance to women and despite an admonition to treat the issue in the PID approval cable. The explanation given in this case was that the project committee had been focusing primarily on critical organizational issues related to the project and had not dealt with WID.

Without wanting to overstress any one project or issue, I think the general point is valid: field approval of projects will make it more difficult to use the PP as a vehicle to call attention to special policy concerns such as WID, or minority contracting, or (in an earlier day) environment. Because of this, attention to these issues in field approved PPs will be more irregular than when PP's were being sent to AID/W.

What this raises is the efficacy of using the PP as a vehicle to force attention to this kind of issue in the first place. For instance, given the sensitivity of women's issues and the difficulty of designing interventions which can truly improve women's status in third world countries, it's never been clear that the pressure to "include women" in most, if not all, of AID's projects in most, if not all, of AID's host countries has been an effective way to make progress in this area. More targeted approaches might have gotten us further by now. In any case, such more targeted strategies for this type of issue will probably be required in the future given that many PP's are not coming to Washington for review by the particular interest group concerned.

Project Operations --Detailed Description and Implementation Plan: There was no discernible difference between AID/W and field approved PPs in the completeness or thoroughness of their project descriptions or implementation plans. However, persons in all three missions visited stated that delegation to the field facilitated the process of negotiating the project design and implementation plan with the host government. The missions knew that they could agree on project elements or make last minute changes in the design without worrying about being second guessed by Washington or having to justify their decisions in headquarters. One person said, "I can (make a commitment) with my counterparts without having my legs cut out from under me." Another, commenting on the difficult negotiations which he had had with the host government, stated that "we might not have a project yet" without the flexibility which the delegation provided. A third person noted that "the delegation allows missions to better incorporate the views of the host country in the PP."

On the other hand, one designer of an AID/W project noted that --had the project been slated for approval in the field-- he might have included a bit more technical assistance. He felt limited extra assistance would have been beneficial, but left it out in order not to raise Washington concerns over excessive American presence.

Some persons also said that the fact that projects approved by Missions were instantly ready for implementation (no

two months "dead time" waiting for AID/W review) meant that project designers were more conscious of, and concentrated more on, immediate implementation requirements as they prepared and reviewed their projects. Several persons said, in addition, that the knowledge that the Mission was the court of last resort on each project enhanced their sense of responsibility --their sense that ambiguous issues had to be resolved and could not be bucked to AID/W.

Finally, no mission officers I talked to felt that field approval left them more exposed and in the position of finding it difficult to say no to inappropriate host government suggestions without the crutch of referral to AID/W to fall back on. Most said that if one had difficulty directly saying no, one could always cite "AID regulations" or say "that's against Washington policy" and cover one's refusal with face saving subterfuge.

As noted earlier, none of this is to say that AID/W approved projects are less complete or realistic in their design or implementation plans than field approved projects. It is simply to note the feeling on the part of many project designers that the delegation had made their job easier, had allowed them to concentrate their full attention on what they considered to be the real design needs of a project, and in this sense had contributed to producing better projects.

Supporting Analyses: Page for page and pound for pound, field approved PPs contained less analysis --technical, economic, financial, administrative, institutional, and social-- than their AID/W approved counterparts. As an indicator of quantity, not quality, the analytical sections of the AID/W papers I reviewed were proportionately more than double the volume of the field papers. The quality of analysis in both field and AID/W papers was uneven, with neither having a qualitative edge in those cases where a full analysis was attempted. There are instances in both types of papers of perfunctory analysis -- a few pages to fill an apparent requirement. There are four possible reasons why field papers contained less analysis:

(1) It's a matter of presentation. This is partly true. In many field approved projects ample analyses were contained in evaluation, consultant, or World Bank reports, but were not re-written in the project paper since it was not felt necessary to summarize them for the AID/W audience.

(2) Many field projects are simpler than their larger Washington approved brethren and don't require as much analysis. This is also true in some instances.

(3) Missions are wisely concentrating on those analyses which they feel are truly relevant and eschewing others. This is sometimes true. For instance, in one water project, the host government was reluctant to accept loan financing for institution building, so the Mission took pains to include a complete analysis of economic benefits which would flow from more efficient operations. Other analyses were less relevant and so less completely developed.

(4) A final reason for less analysis in field PP's may be that much of the analysis now required for projects is either expensive, methodologically difficult, or not very relevant to central project issues so that --in field approved projects--missions are "voting with their pens" to do less analysis while submissions to AID/W still feel compelled to provide ample (if sometimes only descriptive) analytical sections.

The first three reasons above --to the extent they are operating-- are basically sensible adjustments to the redelegation and are not causes for concern. However, to the extent that the final reason above holds true (and I believe it is a factor) some further consideration of how much analysis is required for projects may be in order for both field and AID/W approved papers.

For instance, economic analysis is not meaningful for many institution building projects. These projects aim for qualitative improvements in institutions which are not susceptible to quantitative measurement. At best economic analysis in such cases is methodologically very difficult and expensive. Financial analysis --in the sense of analyzing the sufficiency of cash flows of public or private sector entities-- is often not relevant and has become in many project papers simply a restated project budget. Good institutional and social analysis is difficult and expensive and much of what is currently put forward in project papers is simply descriptive. It's also not clear what purpose social analysis is intended to serve at this time. Is it to identify cultural factors conditioning project success; to specify project beneficiaries; or both? Few of our projects face real issues of technical feasibility. For instance, an irrigation project needs to address the technical feasibility of building a dam at the proposed site or whether the soils in the area are suitable for irrigation, but many projects involve the application of known and relatively simple techniques whose feasibility is not in doubt. Some projects recognize this and exclude technical analysis while other provide re-writes of the technical sections of the detailed project design.

It might be useful for Missions and AID/W to examine the requirements for analysis and clarify how much analysis is warranted. The policy aim should be fewer analyses done better. Missions should be clearer in their PIDs as to which analyses they plan to do and which they plan to omit. This recommendation complements that in Larry Harrison's report last year that the quality of analysis in PPs is "spotty" and that more attention should be given to improving analytical methodologies.

Project Review: Field reviews of PP's are not of the same character as AID/W reviews. But they are as thorough, if not more so. Only one of the three field missions visited (Thailand) uses a formal issues paper and a review process which to an extent mimics the flavor of an AID/W APAC review. This mission asks a PD officer not previously involved in the project to read the final draft PP and prepare an issues paper for discussion at the final meeting.

Frankly, while there is no objection to this procedure if it fits the style of Mission management, I did not find it particularly compelling. Unless an outsider has some special competence in the project under review (in which case why was he left out of project development in the first place?), he is likely to come up with a flurry of issues which are only tangentially relevant to the project being discussed or which have already been resolved in the course of project development. The "outside" issues papers given me seemed to suffer this defect.

What has to be realized is that in the missions --small as they now are-- project review is an organic process which engages mission management, including the director, from the time the project is first broached, through the PID, drafts of the PP, and ultimately to the final product.

In Pakistan, the director, deputy, chiefs of the program and PD offices, and other personnel exhaustively review as many as four drafts of a PP before approving the final product. In Indonesia, the director, as well as being involved in project reviews, has a system of tri-weekly meetings with his technical office chiefs to review, inter-alia, issues surrounding project development. The involvement of mission management in the smaller Thailand mission is equally intense and continuous throughout the project process. In this context, the final review meeting is the culmination of a one year to 18 month process and tends to concentrate on remaining policy issues and operational matters rather than starting de novo as in a AID/W review.

Theoretically, the wide ranging AID/W review can improve a project by providing exposure to a broader range of experience or fresh insights which the project planners may have overlooked. In practice, this happens extremely rarely. Unless a mission is quite large, attempts to recapture the AID/W review flavor by using "outsiders" or creating an us vs them atmosphere are likely to be artificial. The key to project review in missions is that mission management be involved at all critical stages in project development and I found this to be clearly true in the three missions I visited. In this context, the final review is inevitably less of a milestone and of a different character than an AID/W review.

Response to APAC Issues: Most Mission approved projects reviewed for this paper contained an explicit section showing how the PP responded to issues raised by the Asia Project Approval Committee in reviewing the PID. Others had made design changes in order to accommodate issues raised by the APAC. In interviews, mission officers stated that they took the PID approval cables seriously. Many expected AID/W to compare the completed PPs with the PID approval cables once they reached Washington.

As noted earlier not all issues raised by the APAC were given equal time in the missions' responses to PID cables. There were some oversights and some of what Missions considered less important issues were edited out, particularly in cases where the APAC provided an extensive list of issues. In this connection, AID/W's declared intention to limit PID comments to relevant policy issues is welcome although there is doubt in missions that AID/W will have the discipline to stay within these limits.

A related concern for AID/W is to guard against any tendency to take away with one hand the autonomy it has granted with the other. The Asia Bureau, for several projects now being developed in the field, has approved the PID, but asked the field to approve a special report for submission to headquarters before preparing the PP. This, in effect, revives the old PRP (Project Review Paper) and -while justified in some circumstances- could undermine the delegation of authority if it becomes too prevalent.

Presentation: PP's for Washington are written with three audiences in mind: The mission itself, the host government, and AID/W. Field approved PP's largely omit the third audience. They are shorter and have less background material. For example, most AID/W PP's reviewed for this paper contained an explicit section describing how the project conformed with AID's "four cornerstones". Only one field PP had

such a section. Not that field PP's lacked conformity with the four cornerstones; their authors just did not feel it necessary to write a 1-3 page section explaining the project in these terms while the authors of the AID/W PP's apparently did.

Several mission officers noted that --when writing a PP for Washington-- they are aware that certain groups in headquarters will be scrutinizing their paper with their particular interests in mind. Therefore, they need to write the paper in such a way as to acknowledge and satisfy the concerns of these groups. Writers for field approved projects do not have this need. Field PP's are briefer with a consequent saving of drafting time and increased efficiency.

There is no difference between field and AID/W PP's in terms of clarity or writing style. They remain difficult documents to read in part because of their repetitive format.

The several differences between field and AID/W PP's noted above all point toward the field approved PP becoming a more workmanlike "meat and potatoes" document which concentrates on operational matters and the real project issues as the mission perceives them. There is less attention to collateral issues and less writing in the analytical and other sections.

Reviewers of AID procedures (e.g. Yeager report) often decry AID's relative overemphasis on design versus implementation. To the extent that field approval of PP's --as described above-- (1) facilitates negotiations with host governments on project components; (2) allows greater relative focus on what missions consider the real issues and most important aspects of the project; and (3) reduces the time and resources devoted to drafting and presentation; and (4) forces more immediate concern with implementation by reducing the lag time between the design and implementation processes, the increased delegation to the field may -de facto- be helping redress this design-implementation imbalance.

III- Some (Unsolicited) Comments on PP's Generally.

Objectives: In both AID/W and field PP's, project designers could improve the clarity of their project purpose statements. In too many cases, the project purpose is stated as "improve the capacity of institution X to do A, B, or C". Although the sub-project purposes often provide more detail as to what this improved capacity is supposed to mean, the above formulation is imprecise and subject to various interpretations by the different actors involved in a project. Framing the project purpose more in terms of the end product desired --that is what are the attributes of a mature institution of the type being assisted-- would be an improvement.

Lessons from Experience: The Pakistan mission includes a specific "Lessons from Experience" section in each PP. It encourages the project designer to use not only evaluation reports from similar AID projects in Pakistan or elsewhere, but to delve into World Bank reports or general development literature to discover factors which have conditioned the success or failure of this kind of project around the world. Other missions do this occasionally but in a less systemic or wide ranging fashion. The Pakistan procedure is commendable, especially for projects designed mostly in house and not returning to Washington. Larry Harrison recommended greater attention to this aspect of project development in his report last year, and there is still room for improvement.

Evaluation: Many evaluation plans are simply schedules. (On the order of: the first evaluation will be in November, 1987 and the final evaluation will be at project completion in 1989.) However, a number of projects are attempting to provide for collection of base line data from inception of the project and a few others were quite specific in spelling out the criteria which a future evaluation should use in examining the project's success. These trends have apparently been pushed by the Asia Bureau and should be continued. I noted no difference between field and AID/W projects in terms of the completeness of their evaluation plans.

Communication: One potentially negative aspect to the delegation of authority is that AID/W officers are not as familiar with mission projects as they were in the days when reviews were held in AID/W. Also, junior officers and IDIs will be deprived of some of the training benefits which participation in project reviews provided. It behooves Missions in this context to avail themselves of every opportunity to invite appropriate AID/W officers to participate in project development in order to minimize gaps in understanding.

Blueprint vs Rolling Design: The Handbook 3 project design format is based on a known spurious assumption: That a project planner, if he asks enough questions and does enough analyses, can blueprint a project in elaborate detail out to its final completion 5-7 years hence. As project implementers, we all know that by the end of a project much will have changed from the original blueprint and a number of mid-course corrections will have been made.

An alternative design approach is a more flexible procedure in which project goals are clearly fixed and agreed upon, but project details --especially in the later years--are left more open to lessons of experience and the adjustments which changed circumstances will inevitably require.

48

Evaluations of projects identify two conditions, among others, as correlating highly with project success. First, the designers understood the on-the-ground situation and the critical barriers to achieving the project's goals. This enabled them at the outset to design interventions which were realistic in terms of local conditions. The second critical element was a management system which provided effective feedback on what was happening in the project and which was able to respond quickly to changed conditions. The first factor above relates to the quality of the analysis which is done before the project strategy is finally settled upon; the latter relates to an effective monitoring and evaluation system. From my experience and knowledge of development literature, project success does not depend on ability to spell out five - seven year detailed implementation plans. This reinforces the need for good pre-project analyses and for ongoing evaluation.

IV- Recommendations:

Based on my review, projects are in good hands under the delegation of authority. The changes observed are in the direction of improving the efficiency of the project design process at the expense of extraneous considerations. Two recommendations are:

A) As stated earlier, Missions and AID/W should review and clarify requirements for pre-project analysis. Missions should specify more clearly at the PID stage which analyses they intend to perform with an eye to eliminating those that will not produce information which is really relevant to the project design and to improving those which will. The function of analysis should be to illuminate options for project design not to rationalize ex-post facto choices already made. Some analyses, for instance social and institutional analyses, might be designed to continue during the life of the project where such information is critical to project success.

B) Given that the delegation of authority is working well, missions and the Asia Bureau should consider whether to extend the re-delegation to all projects in the eight delegated missions. Project review in AID/W would occur only where policy issues, political sensitivity, or the complexity of a project seemed to warrant such a review. The current \$20 million cut-off is arbitrary and there is some tendency in Missions to adjust project size to fit under the limit. More importantly, some \$50 million projects may be quite straight-forward while some \$5 million projects may be complex and problematical. In this context, a complete re-delegation should be considered with projects recalled to Washington only when special issues arise.

Projects Reviewed For This Paper
(Attachment A)

Mission approved projects:

Indonesia

Upland Agriculture (0311)
Financial Institutions Development (0341)
Agriculture Planning II (0342)
Education Policy Planning (0344)
Private Sector Management Development (0345)

Nepal

Radio Education Teacher Training II (0145)

Pakistan

Social Marketing of Contraceptives (0484)
Management of Agriculture Research Technology (0489)

Philippines

PVO Co-Financing II

Sri Lanka

Diversified Agriculture Research (0058)
Water Supply and Sanitation (0088)

Thailand

Agriculture Technology Transfer (0337)
Rural Development Monitoring and Evaluation (0339)
PWWA Institutional Development (0331)

Washington Approved Projects

India

Hill Areas Land and Water Development (0489)
Maharashtra Minor Irrigation (0490)

Pakistan

Baluchistan Area Development (0479)
Energy Commodities and Equipment (0486)
TIPAN (0488)
Food Security Management (0491)

#3 SELECTED DESIGN ISSUES - ROLLING DESIGN AND PERFORMANCE DISBURSEMENTS

2:40-5:30 p.m. Monday, January 28, 1985

Issue: The Agency is encouraging projects with elements dealing with policy reform, institutional development, technology transfer, and private sector involvement. Also, although the Agency's workload has increased over time, the number of its officers has shrunk. This calls for adopting innovative project design concepts that address Agency policy but require less AID manpower to design or implement. Rolling design and performance disbursements are two concepts which may meet these requirements.

Objective: To discuss innovative project design concepts in general using experience with rolling design and performance disbursements as examples, and make recommendations regarding theme and process.

Talking Points: Rolling design implies a "design-as-you-go" approach where the general project framework is fixed but considerable latitude is permitted in levels of outputs, direction of implementation, and emphasis. USAID/-Philippines has been experimenting with this concept in three projects. The recent Philippines Mission Performance Evaluation identified weaknesses in the concept dealing with the lack of clearly stated outputs, input-output linkages, implementation and evaluation planning. Additionally, an evaluation of rolling design per se revealed that it is more labor-intensive than traditional projects.

Performance disbursement implies fixed amount reimbursement for performance as opposed to physical outputs. Examples of the former would be training some people, adopting a new policy direction, or establishing a unit in a ministry. Examples of the latter include the number of kilometers of water canals completed, the number of schools constructed, or the number of house electric connections made. GC/ASIA Herb Morris prepared the attached paper on this subject which will be used as a basis for discussion.

Panel: John Tennant (Chair), Thomas Johnson, G. P. Vershnaya

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

DRAFT CABLE: H.E. MORRIS, GC/ASIA

SUBJECT: Performance Disbursement; Request for Mission Views
and Comments

1. Purpose of cable. It appears that several Missions are already in the process of using a disbursement procedure, not presently incorporated in Agency Handbooks or other guidance, which might best be called "performance disbursement." Utilization has been in a small number of selected activities. Possibility of use in other Missions has been urged by Asia Mission personnel along with a request for Agency guidance on the technique, and the issues and problems created by its use.

The purpose of this cable is twofold. In the first instance, it is to set forth an outline of the concept, existing and possible usages, and policy, programming and implementation issues arising from usage along with some of our preliminary views and concerns regarding certain of these aspects. Secondly, it is to solicit Mission views and comments on these questions and an indication of potential usage in any Mission program. It is not, however, an invitation to develop projects along these lines.

Once Mission responses are received, the entire subject will be reviewed in the light of those responses, and recommendations formulated to A/AID for action leading to guidance to field Missions. Recommendations may possibly entail orchestration with other agencies, and possibly with the Hill so that your expeditious, albeit carefully thought-through responses should speed formulation and issuance of the desired guidance.

2. The Concept and Existing Examples. The basic concept of performance disbursement centers on the agency disbursing funds in a given project to accomplish (or, in a sense, pay for) desired policy changes, development planning and budgetary procedures or other forms of developmental targets at the time of host country agreement to, and/or achievement of such changes, procedures or targets rather than timing disbursements to the provision of goods and services, other inputs, or the accomplishment of physical outputs. It might be best explained by brief reference to some of its existing uses. In selected Philippines and Egypt decentralization projects, for example, A.I.D. funds are used for local cost implementation of subprojects at village or local level. However, tranching disbursements are made on an annual basis when Missions are satisfied that required host government financial contributions are available to the local level, that local planning strategies and budgets are in place reflecting A.I.D. subproject and beneficiary

57

eligibility criteria, that host country federal, and local managerial and procurement processes are established, and that accountability requirements (host country and A.I.D.) are clearly set forth. Succeeding annual tranches of assistance depend on performance evaluation in geographic areas receiving funds in the first year.

Another example is found in a 1977 Pakistan Basic Health Services project where the Mission essentially predicated six semi-annual tranches releases of loan funds for local cost funding of physical facilities, training, etc. on achievement by the host government of specified quantified targets such as the number of physical units completed, personnel trained, and manuals issued. The Mission also took into account pertinent aspects of host country capability noted above with respect to decentralization projects. A Bangladesh Rural Finance grant provided certain local currency requirements for the rural finance system with full disbursement pegged to agreement to and issuance by the host government of certain key system reforms such as increased interest rates, reliance on savings rather than central bank refinancing, and penalties on overdue loans.

Finally, the release of project funding in certain FAR projects can be timed to emphasize desired policy or institutional changes. For example, in certain irrigation projects, where A.I.D. is utilizing FAR disbursements for local costs involved in the completion of canals, the disbursement procedure could be modified to emphasize the creation and progress of farmer-riparian organizations. A percentage of A.I.D.'s financing in these cases, covering the costs of physical inputs, could be released when these institutional steps are accomplished rather than be tied exclusively to canal completion progress.

These examples obviously are not intended to exhaust the possible universe for which performance disbursement might be appropriate. They do illustrate the *raison d'etre* for this disbursement procedure, however, in that the thrust of each of these projects in principle is to use disbursement with maximum leverage to obtain two of the Agency's critical objectives, institutional change and policy effort.

It is important to emphasize that the actual use of the funds, along with host country contributions, reflects traditional project design. Apart from conditions attached to certain ESF cash transfers which are not at issue here, buying policy or institutional change as such, without regard to project funding that ultimately delivers goods or services or finances local cost



requirements, is not authorized. What is new here is disbursement release timing, geared, to some extent, to the maximum leverage point for exacting institutional or policy change while also funding traditional cost requirements. We would appreciate Mission comment on concept definition as well as other examples of possible application to assistance activities.

3. Issues. The issues presented by the use of a performance disbursement procedure are significant and range from broad policy concerns down to specific project implementation questions. In view of their significance, we must move most cautiously in this area, and easy resort to such use would be unwarranted.

A. The Trade-Off between Development and Loss of Interest.

While use of performance disbursement does not have to mean release of Agency funds any earlier than with traditional disbursement techniques or for a greater period than that normally permitted under U.S. Treasury Cash Management procedures (see e.g., State Cable 273219, dtd. 10/19/79), actual examples of usage indicate that this is the result. Of course, that means loss of interest to the U.S. Treasury of these funds and can only be justified to the

56

extent performance disbursement can demonstrably achieve greater economic development impact than traditional disbursement methods. Accordingly, our present thinking is that performance disbursement "cost-benefit" analysis in these terms will be required at first for any project and presumably will have to show why the same or equivalent developmental benefits cannot be achieved with more traditional methods. Moreover, even if performance disbursement is utilized, actual releases should be timed on as traditional a basis as possible i.e., no sooner than necessary (normally for one calendar quarter) to achieve the intended policy or institutional reform. Finally, it would appear that a proposal for use of this technique might well have to grapple with the difficult issue of why certain progress in achieving the desired target is worth the amount of A.I.D. funds proposed for release (e.g., the Pakistan example noted above).

B. The Advance Question. Where justified and approved, the Agency could presumably argue, in an appropriate case, that use of the technique obviates the advance and liquidation problem. We would assert that the funds are not advances, for which liquidation will be required, but reimbursement in a specified physical input payment amount for the quantum of performance progress agreed to, and/or achieved. As reimbursement, moreover, our payment would be like any other authorized payment on which the host country can draw interest or which it can use as it sees fit (but see discussion of decentralization projects below).

C. "Untied" Financing. As noted earlier, performance disbursement, in a most extreme form, could in theory be premised on a grant of dollars untied (not tied to any physical activity or output) as to either use of the dollars or local currency contributions in order to obtain bolder policy or institutional change. Such a proposal, based on certain discussions in the Agency and with Congressional staff, would be unacceptable. As noted earlier, a proposed performance disbursement activity would still have to reflect usage of our contribution in the form of traditional project inputs, whether alone or in combination with host country or other contributions; the timing of disbursements is the "new" tool involved.

D. Host Country Capability. As seems obvious, very selective use of the technique seems advisable in the face of certain additional prerequisites involving host country capabilities. Presumably use is appropriate only when planning, management and implementation strengths exist in the beneficiary organizations. In emphasizing performance on a policy or institutional basis by use of this disbursement technique, one is not only attesting to host country capability and the will to achieve that performance but also relying more than in a traditional disbursement situation on its capability to implement successfully actual "bricks and mortar" aspects of the project.

E. Project Presentation and Design. Another important consequence of use of performance disbursement in a given activity will be clear delineation of its particular application in all project documentation commencing with appropriate reference in the Congressional notification. In the PID, and even more importantly in the PP, it will be necessary to explain the developmental reasons for its use, the achievements against which releases will be measured, and a carefully drawn plan of implementation, including the manner in which such elements as procurement rules, monitoring, and sanctions (e.g. refund) will be applied (see discussion below). In addition, if the activity, for example, involves decentralization with funds passing through various levels of the host government down to the village level, it will be important to note whether such passage is to be immediate and if not, whether the host government will be allowed to draw interest on that portion of the funds representing the U.S. contribution for use in the project and the justification therefor.

F. Procurement and Related Rules. Since A.I.D. fund release in these cases is being timed in terms of performance rather than traditional procurement of goods and services, it might also be argued that none of our procurement rules apply. This will not be possible, however, since the funds are still provided for goods, services and other traditional inputs. While for some purposes (e.g. advance and liquidation, accumulation of

interest in certain situations) a different result obtains than in traditional disbursement situations, commodity and service procurement rules still apply. Accordingly, where foreign exchange costs are involved, bringing into play most statutory and policy considerations, it would seem the better course to except such financing from a performance disbursement approach. In short, foreign exchange technical service contracts or commodity acquisition would be handled in the traditional manner even in an activity where local costs are also A.I.D. financed and disbursed pursuant to performance criteria. This mixed approach has been used in existing performance disbursement activities.

As to local cost financing activities, shelf-item rules, of course, must still be considered. Competition and contract review and approval are other considerations which have to be faced and might be treated differently in different projects. In some activities, review of host country procurement procedures might arguably suffice while in others closer USAID involvement may be necessary. This could turn on such factors as host country capability, the value of contracts let, etc.

G. Monitoring, Audit, and Refund Rights.

i. These issues in the context of performance disbursement also present new challenges. To some degree, however, they (and the procurement rule issues discussed above) are already present in some forms of sector assistance where one focusses with respect to these issues primarily on policy or budgetary actions and secondarily on the accomplishments in the "bricks and mortar" outputs. For example, in a sector support grant requiring local currency emphasis or concentration in a given area of the sector, design would be based essentially on budgetary action and deal with physical outputs as evidence of total carry-through in the budget area. Presumably, when it comes to monitoring, one is most concerned with the budgeting and movement of funds, and as to physical outputs, an overview of fund application rather than each separate unit of sector infrastructure with which our funds may be associated.

The same focus would appear to be pertinent in performance disbursement projects where policy or institutional change would presumably be the principal focus of monitoring. Nonetheless, prudent accountability of ultimate use of the funds might require at least random or spot checking of physical accomplishments to assure

both adequate evidence of policy or institutional change but also prudent use of U.S. assistance funds for physical outputs. Analogy with certain ICI monitoring perhaps is helpful; the key focus may be on the institutional change we are seeking, but an overview of sub-borrower performance is also necessary.

ii. While audit rights would presumably not be limited in terms of breadth as presently set forth in standard assistance agreements, clear delineation of monitoring focus in the PP hopefully would guide auditors in their responsibilities and approach.

iii. The refund right clause in agreements may well have to be modified in a performance disbursement situation in view of the emphasis on payment for performance rather than for inputs or physical accomplishment.

We welcome Mission comments on all these accountability aspects of performance disbursement. It is a new and relatively uncertain area, and poses complex and challenging questions with respect to assuring prudent expenditure of public funds.

4. Summary. We have attempted to set out an outline form or overview on performance disbursement, examples of present limited usage, its advantages and disadvantages, and the resultant issues we perceive in its use. Properly employed, it could be a new instrument in achieving greater development impact in a carefully

62

selected assistance activity in an appropriate LDC situation. While monitoring and disbursement considerations may appear advantageous, they are by-products of the process and cannot be the reason for its adoption. We are hopeful that you will do some hard thinking on the subject and provide us with your comments so that we can determine whether to proceed with recommendations, decisions and guidance.

Finally, in addition to the PP materials noted above in point 2, we can pouch for your assistance on request a copy of Herb Morris' Memorandum of June 14, 1983 entitled "Performance Disbursement; Bird's Eye View" which has previously been forwarded to all RLAs.

Draft: GC/ASIA:HEMorris:hp12/13/84

0224g

Tuesday January 29, 1985

8:00-8:15 1983 Workshop implementation issues recap.
(Hasan)

8:15-9:15 Panel - Procurement Issues (Viragh and Howley
resource persons)

9:15-9:45 Plenary

9:45-10:00 Working groups selection

10:00 Coffee on the way to working groups breakout
rooms

10:00-11:15 Working groups breakout

11:15-12:00 Working groups report

12:00-1:30 Lunch

1:30-2:15 Panel - Pre-Obligation Implementation Actions

2:15-2:35 Plenary

2:45-3:00 Coffee break

3:00-3:45 Panel - Additional Implementation Authorities
to Field Missions

3:45-4:05 Plenary

4:05-4:15 Select working groups

4:15-5:00 Working groups breakout

5:00-5:30 Working groups report

#4 PROCUREMENT ISSUES

8 a.m.-12 noon Tuesday, January 29, 1985

Issue: Many implementation problems are rooted in the way host countries do business, others are more subject to influence by AID. Procurement is one of the most important areas that could be influenced by AID project managers, particularly since it is now Agency policy to shift toward the direct AID contracting mode. In view of this change in policy and shrinking staff resources, lessons of experience may be applied to improve future procurement actions and keep them straightforward and timely.

Objective: To share experiences, get better acquainted with new regulations, identify problem areas and develop practical recommendations based on the collective experiences of participants.

Talking Points: Although session will focus on all procurement issues, there are several areas that merit particular attention. These include the recently developed Federal Acquisition Regulations, the procurement of shelf items, direct AID contracting as the favored mode over host country contracting, Gray Amendment procurement of commodities and services, use of freight forwarders, choice of procurement entity, (e.g. Mission, consultant, agent), and the use of procurement services agents (PSAs).

Panel: Gary Redman (Chair); Bob Mathia, Leroy Purifoy (members); Bendy Viragh, Peter Howley (Resource Personnel)

NOTES-REFLECTIONS-REACTIONS

65

Small and Disadvantaged Business Contracting/
Gray Amendment

Overview

The Agency is working to meet two sets of goals with respect to contracting with small and disadvantaged business organizations. The first set of goals are those negotiated with the Small Business Administration for contracting with small and disadvantaged business firms. They are for direct contracting only and include contracts with small disadvantaged businesses and small businesses in general for the provision of services and commodities. The second set of goals are the "Gray Amendment" goals which are mandated in the Continuing Resolution for FY-85; namely, that not less than 10% of Development Assistance and Sahel funds shall be made available for economically and socially disadvantaged enterprises, historically black colleges and universities and PVOs which are controlled by individuals who are economically and socially disadvantaged. Economically and socially disadvantaged individuals include women. Gray Amendment contracting includes contracts, grants and cooperative agreements and covers both direct and host country contracting. Subcontracts are counted in reaching our goal as well as contracts with large minority firms. Gray Amendment includes contracting for commodities as well as services.

Progress in Meeting FY-84 Goals

The Bureau's total FY-84 direct contracting goal was \$9.675 million. Approximately \$16.4 million in direct contracts were awarded to small and small disadvantaged businesses. (This was more than triple what we did in FY-83). Progress in meeting our Gray Amendment goal, however, was not as good. Approximately \$7.5 million was awarded to Gray Amendment organizations compared to our goal of \$23.7 million.

Goals for FY-85

The following table shows the Bureau's FY-85 small and disadvantaged business direct contracting goals. They are approximately 10% higher than our goals for FY-84 and include specific goals for subcontracting.

FY-85 Direct Contracting Goals
(\$000)

<u>Goal Category</u>	<u>Goal</u>
Small Disadvantaged Businesses - 8(a) process	2,420
Small Disadvantaged Business - Other than 8(a)	1,155
Small Business (excluding SDB)	<u>6,875</u>
Total SDB and SB	10,450
SB and SDB Women-owned firms. (subsumed within total above)	(550)
SDB Subcontracting	82
SB Subcontracting	<u>110</u>
Total Subcontracting Goal	192
 TOTAL Asia Bureau Direct Contracting Goal	 \$10,642

Gray Amendment goals for FY-85 have not yet been established but are expected shortly.

Discussion Items

1. Including ESF in Gray Amendment Goals: A question has been raised as to whether ESF should be included in contracting under the Gray Amendment. If ESF is included, it will increase our goal even higher. During FY-84 the Bureau awarded several contracts using ESF money that did not count against the Gray Amendment. These contracts did, however, count against our direct contracting goals. In keeping with the spirit of the Gray Amendment, we encourage consideration of disadvantaged organizations when practicable for contracts to be awarded using ESF funds.

2. Language for Commerce Business Daily and RFPs: In October 1984 a cable was sent to Asia Missions requiring all Commerce Business Daily notices and Requests for Proposals contain language encouraging the participation of Gray Amendment organizations and small businesses as prime contractors or subcontractors. The language is as follows:

The Government of (Country) and the Agency for International Development encourage and welcome in this activity the participation, to the fullest extent possible, of small, minority and women-owned businesses as individuals and as members of contracting or subcontracting firms. In this respect, it is anticipated that the prime contractor will make every reasonable effort to identify and make maximum practicable use of such personnel and firms.

What does the above language really mean? How are Missions dealing with this requirement with respect to evaluating proposals? Can we award points for submitting subcontracting plans which include use of small or minority organizations?

3. Subcontracting: Since August 1984, AID/W has sent cables and other guidance to the Missions concerning subcontracting with small and disadvantaged organizations. Briefly, under Section 19.702 of the Federal Acquisition Regulations, any contractor receiving a direct contract of more than \$10,000 must agree in the contract that small and small disadvantaged business concerns shall have the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in contract performance. Further, Section 19.708 of the FAR requires prime contractors to prepare a subcontracting plan providing for small and small disadvantaged U.S. participation for all direct construction contracts valued in excess of \$1 million and for all other direct contracts in excess of \$500,000. The requirement does not apply to personal service contracts or to contracts which, together with all subcontracts, are to be performed entirely outside the U.S., its territories or possessions. (Many contracts or subcontracts for overseas performance by U.S. organizations may be partially performed in the U.S. by virtue of indirect cost allocations.) In the case of direct contracts, the principal burden has been placed on the contractor, either through the best efforts clause or by virtue of requirements for a plan in certain circumstances noted in the FAR. Acting through the contracting officer, the Mission should ensure compliance and provide to the contractor any information available regarding qualified organizations. Even where not required to do so, such consideration should be given. Although the FAR provisions do not apply to host country contracts, it is Agency policy to actively promote subcontracting opportunities for such organizations under host country contracting as well as direct contracting.

4. Reporting: Existing mechanisms for reporting awards made to Gray Amendment organizations and small business are inadequate to get accurate information about awards made to such organization. For instance, host country contracts are reported only if the contract is over \$100,000. The information that is recorded by FM on host country contracts is not such that we can identify contracts awarded to small and disadvantaged organizations. There is no reporting mechanism for subcontracts. OSDBU has contracted with a consultant to look into the problem of reporting and how it can be improved. The consultant (Stan Strauder) gave a presentation on reporting at the Mission Director's Conference.

63

5. "Big-Brother Concept": A new initiative being pursued by the Agency is the "Big-Brother" concept. The concept was developed by the Special Assistant to the Africa Bureau and is intended to broaden the base of 8(a) firms capable of providing technical assistance under A.I.D.-financed projects. The concept was originally intended to be an AFR Bureau initiative, however, after discussions with Jay Morris, it was decided to implement the concept on a pilot basis, Agency-wide, for one year. Several bureaus (including Asia) have expressed real reservations about implementing the concept as it is presented.

Questions: What are Missions' reactions to the concept? What are alternatives for providing 8(a) firms with the type assistance described in the concept paper? (A subcontracting arrangement is one possibility.) If we are required to go ahead with this, how will missions decide which projects will be selected (the Bureau will need to come up with nine projects)?

ASIA/PD/PCS:1/8/84:21761:doc3224k

PRINCIPAL ASIA BUREAU AUTHORITIES/REDELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY

ASIA/PD 1/02

Delegation		I. <u>Project Design, Approval and Authorization</u>			
<u>Redelegation #</u>	<u>HB References</u>	<u>Authority</u>	<u>Held By</u>	<u>Documents</u>	<u>Comments</u>
	HB 3, Ch 2.E.6-8 HB 3, Ch 5.E.2.a	1. Approval of PIDs	AA/ASIA	PID & Approval Cable	A/AID concurrence needed if project will require waivers, have LOP in excess of 10 years or involve policy issues that only A/AID can approve.
	HB 3, Ch 13.D.1-2	2. Substantive modifications to PIDs after PID approvals	AA/ASIA	PID & Approval Cable	Cable request for modification usually sufficient. Resubmission of PIDs is very rare.
#133.1	HB 3, CH 3.E.6 HB 3, CH 5.E.2.b(1)	3. Approval of PPs and Project Authorizations	8 USAIDs* - \$20 Million	PP & Project Auth.	Authority concurrently held by AA/ASIA. Projects must not present significant policy issues, require A/AID waivers, or exceed 7-year LOP. AA/ASIA can authorize up to 10-year LOP.
#133.1	HB 3, Ch 5.E.2.b.(2) HB 3, CH 13.D.3-4	4. Approval of PP Supplements and Project Authorization Amendments	8 USAIDs* - \$30 million	PP Supplement & Project Auth. Amendment	Authority concurrently held by AA/ASIA. Must not present significant policy issues, require A/AID waiver, or exceed 7-year LOP. AA/ASIA can authorize up to 10-year LOP. Approval may be based on PP "supplement" entailing either a full PP Amendment or only an Action Memorandum.

II. Project Agreements, Modifications and Implementation

#5 & #38 series	HB 3, Ch 5.A.4.d-e	1. Negotiation/execution of Loan and Grant Agreements	8 USAIDs* - Unlimited AID RDO/Fiji - \$1,000,000 AID Rep/Burma - \$500,000 ASIA/PD Director - Unlimited. U.S. Country Ambassador - Unlimited	L/C Agreements	Ad hoc redelegations may be made by AA/ASIA to AID Rep/Burma & AID RDO/Fiji with regard to foreign governments, foreign government agencies and international organizations (consisting primarily of foreign governments). Authority may not be redelegated.
#5 & #38 series	Same	2. Negotiation/execution of Amendments to Loan and Grant Agreements	Same as above		Same, except that authority may be redelegated.
#5 & #38 series	HB 3, Ch 13 D.6.c HB 3, Ch 5.E.2.b(3)	3. Extension of Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD)	Principal officers** (excludes USAID/Nepal Dir. & AID RDO/Fiji)	Action Memo	PACD extensions up to cumulative period of one year but not exceeding a total of 10 years for project. AA/ASIA authority to extend up to 10 years. A/AID for longer periods.
		4. Basic Implementation Functions	Principal Officers**		
		A. Review and approval of CPs			
		B. Signing of PILs			
		C. Signing of PIOs			
		D. Approval of documents in Host Country and AID Direct Contracting (RFPs, IFBs, etc.)			

* 8 USAIDs - Mission Directors for Thailand, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Indonesia, Nepal, India and Philippines/Nepal

** Principal officers - 8 USAIDs plus AID Rep/Burma, AID RDO/Fiji, and ASIA/PD Director

NOTE: Redelegations and references continually change. Therefore, user should use this document only as an aid and check delegations and references for existing authority.

70

III. Host Country Contracts

<u>Delegation/ Redelegation</u>	<u>HB References</u>	<u>Authority</u>	<u>Held by</u>	<u>Comments</u>
#5 & #38 series	HB 11, Ch 1, 2.2.1	1. Approval of Host Country Contracts	Principal Officers**	Must approve all contracts exceeding \$100,000 in value; optional for lower values.
See STATE 314247 10/23/84	HB 1B (2.C.4.a)	2. Waiver of Competition - Negotiation with a Single Source	Principal officers** up to \$1,000,000 for technical, professional or construction services & commodities.	All waivers must be summarized and cabled to AA/ASIA. Waiver approvals based on recommendation of Non-competitive Review Board.
	HB 11, Ch 1, 2.42 HB 11, Ch 2, 2.2.3.3 HB 11, Ch 3, 2.2.5	A. Professional & Technical Services B. Construction Services C. Equipment and Materials	AA/ASIA up to \$1,000,000 for services or commodities. A/AID for larger amounts.	For construction services only AA/ASIA may authorize use of competitive negotiation vs. formal competitive bidding.
#5.25 #38.23	HB 1B (12.C.4.b)	3. Waiver of Requirement for advertising IFB or RFP in <u>Commerce Business Daily</u> or elsewhere.	Mission Director up to \$250,000 in estimated value; AID Reps & RDOs up to \$100,000. AA/ASIA for larger amounts.	Does not apply to PSCs, contracts under \$100,000, follow-on work, or contracts where a waiver of competition has been approved.
		A. Professional & Technical Services B. Construction Services C. Equipment and Materials	For construction services, AA/ASIA authority cannot be redelegated.	CBD advertising not required, but may be used, for construction services procurements under \$500,000 estimated value.
#40.10 (revised) See STATE 314247 10/23/84	HB 1B (5.B.4.c.) HB 1B (5.C.4) HB 11, Ch 1, 2.6.2.6.c HB 11, Ch 2, 2.5.2.4 d HB 11, Ch 3.2.6.1.3 c HB 15, Ch 2.A. 9.A	4. Waiver of Source, Origin and Nationality	Principal officers** to \$5,000,000, Director, ASIA/PD to \$1,000,000 (exclusive of transportation costs per transaction). AA/ASIA up to \$5,000,000 per transaction. A/AID above \$5,000,000 per transaction.	Requires consultation with appropriate mission technical and legal officers; may not be redelegated. Must be reported to AA/ASIA. Applies to Host Country and AID direct procurements of goods and services Applies equally to shifts from Code 000 to 941 or to cooperating country, and from Codes 000 and 941 to Codes 899 or 935.
	HB 1B (5.D.10.d) HB 11, Ch 1.2.6.2.6.d HB 11, Ch 2.2.5.2.4.e	5. Waiver to Make Government-Owned Organizations Eligible	Mission Director or AA/ASIA, depending upon whether U.S. firms are involved in competition.	Motor vehicles limited to \$50,000 per transaction Requires consultation with M/AAA/SER and GC, and S&T/ENGR in case of competition in which U.S. firms have expressed interest.
	HB 1B (12.C.4.a(2)(c)) HB 11, Ch 3, 2.4.2	6. Proprietary Procurement - Waiver of Rule Regarding Non-Restrictive Specification	AA/ASIA in consultation with SER with SER/COM.	Mission Director may approve proprietary procurement of spare parts and accessories required for equipment on hand

<u>Delegation/ Redelegation</u>	<u>HB References</u>	<u>Authority</u>	<u>Held By</u>	<u>Comments</u>
40.10 (Revised) 4/15/82	HB 1B (4.c.2.d.4)	7. Motor Vehicles - Waiver of Requirement of Manufacture in U.S.	Principal Officers** up to \$50,000 per transaction, exclusive of transportation costs. AA/ASIA for larger amounts.	Maximum redelegation authority (\$50,000) has been exercised by AA/ASIA. AA/ASIA waivers must indicate consultation with GC and SER/COM.
	HB 1B (7.B.4.b)	8. Ocean Transportation - Waiver of Eligibility Rules	SER/COM in consultation with Asia Bureau.	Principal officers have limited authority to waive flag eligibility requirements. They may do so only for shipment of commodities for which they have approved a commodity source waiver pursuant to Redelegation of Authority 40.10 and for which the cost of shipment does not exceed 25% of the dollar limit of their authority to waive source requirements.
IV. <u>AID Direct Contracts and Grants to Non-Governmental Organizations</u>				
#99.1 (various) See also STATE 30010 of 2/4/83		1. Signing of Contracts, Grants, Cooperative Agreements and Amendments thereto	M/SER/CM, redelegated as follows: (i) Jakarta at \$5,000,000 (ii) Manila at \$300,000. (iii) \$100,000 per contract for other Mission Directors and AID Reps in Asia Bureau.	Basic authority for all Principal Officers is \$100,000; consultation with ACOs and RLAs encouraged; ad hoc requests for additional authority should be cabled to Asia Bureau (for endorsement) and will be acted on by SER/CM. In principle SER/CM redelegates \$500,000 per contract to Mission Directors who have full-time Contracting Officer and \$5,000,00 per transaction (not per contract) to Mission Directors who have full-time Area Contracting Officer (ACO). Note: ACOs in Manila (Doucette) Bangkok (Howley), Jakarta (Kelley) and New Delhi (Stuart) have personal redelegations of authority
#99.1.200 #99.1.23 #99.1.204 99.1.205		2. Signing of OPGs	\$1,000,000 for 6 USAIDs, AID Rep/Burma and RDO Fiji.	Excludes Pakistan and Indonesia, which are signed by Area Contracting Officer.
#99.1.120		3. Signing of Grants to Indigenous non-profit NGOs	\$5,000,000 for Principal Officers**	Excludes AID Rep/Burma and RDO/Fiji.
AIDPR 7-3.107 See also STATE 149952 dated 5/22/84		4. Waiver of Competition	Current AA/M redelegations.	AA/ASIA certification still required for procurements resulting from unsolicited proposals, but such procurements now exempt from non-competitive Review Boards.
		A. For Contracts Executed in AID/W	(i) up to \$250,000 to SER/CM. (ii) over \$250,000 to Non-Competitive Review Board.	
		B. For Contracts Executed by an AID Mission	(i) up to \$10,000 to Mission Contracting Officer if other than Mission Director. (ii) up to \$100,000 to Mission Director. (iii) over \$100,000 to Mission Non-competitive Review Board.	\$100,000 limit on Mission Directors applies equally to procurement of services or commodities.

2

<u>Delegation/ Redelegation</u>	<u>HB References</u>	<u>Authority</u>	<u>Held By</u>	<u>Comments</u>
AIDPR 41 CFR 7, Appendix 1		5. Waiver of Source, Origin and Nationality 6. Waiver of Salary Limitation for Contractor Personnel Not to Exceed (oid) FSR-1 Level	Contracting Officers	See discussion under Host Country Contracts. Same rules apply. Based on technical memorandum approved by AA/ASIA (in AID/W) or Mission Director (at USAID).

V. COMPARISON OF ASIA BUREAU REDELEGATIONS WITH OTHER BUREAUS

		<u>Amount New Projects</u>	<u>Life New Projects</u>	<u>Amount Amended Projects</u>	<u>Life of Extension</u>
Redelegation Maximum		\$20 million	10 years	\$30 million	10 years
ASIA		\$20 million	7 years	\$30 million	1 year
LATIN AMERICA		\$5 million ⁽¹⁾	10 years	\$5 million	2 years
NEAR EAST	a. Egypt	\$20 million	10 years	\$30 million	1 year
	b. All Others	\$10 million		Lesser of 50% or \$30 million	
AFRICA	a. Full Mission	\$20 million	5 years to obligation	10% NTE \$2 million	3 years
	b. All others with concurrence REDSO	\$10 million	5 years to obligation 10 years to disburse	10% NTE \$1 million with with REDSO concurrence	3 years with REDSO concurrence

(1) Higher amounts given on ad hoc basis. Central America under revision in FY 85 to be in line with other Bureaus.

74

#5 PRE-OBLIGATION IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS
1:30-3:00 p.m. Tuesday, January 29, 1985

Issue: In most instances project implementation begins after project agreement is signed. This has made sense because both AID and host countries are reluctant to make commitments prior to the availability of funds. However, waiting until after pro-ag signatures to commence implementation has deprived projects of momentum and has caused delays.

Objective: To exchange experiences and ideas regarding pre-implementation actions and develop a list of typical pre-obligation implementation actions that would not commit AID or the host country funds but would move the project forward while processing the pro-ag.

Talking Points: There are several pre-obligation actions that apply to most projects. Examples include preparation of preliminary scopes of work, preparation of requests for technical proposals, publication of notices in the Commerce Business Daily, implementation seminars with the involvement of host country officials, screening/selection of potential trainees and obtaining host country concurrence/clearance on certain actions.

Panel: Basharat Ali (Chair); *Bob Pratt* Alejandro Sundermann, *Mike Cannon*
Donald Clark (members); Bendy Viragh, ~~Peter Howley~~
(Resource Personnel)

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

#6 ADDITIONAL IMPLEMENTATION AUTHORITIES TO FIELD MISSIONS
3 p.m.-5:30 p.m. Tuesday January 29, 1985

Issue: Asia Bureau field missions have been delegated extensive authorities in the design and authorization of projects under the "Asia Experiment." Missions recently have also been delegated implementation authorities on advertising and procurement. However, there is a feeling that more implementation authorities should be delegated in order to make design and other authorities more effective.

Objective: To examine what other implementation authorities could be delegated to the field in order to be consistent with delegated design/project approval authorities.

Taking Points: One important area that missions have identified is the lack of authority to extend project assistance completion dates (PACDs) beyond one year. AID/W processes more action memo's for the AA/Asia's signature dealing with PACD extensions than any other type of actions. Another point is that many implementation authorities are vested in SER/CM and SER/COM in the Management Bureau.

Panel: Dennis Zvinakis (Chair); David Warner, Bruce Blackman (members); Bendy Viragh, Peter Howley (Resource Personnel).

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

Wednesday January 30, 1985

8:00-8:30 1983 Workshop recap role of PDOs/Engineers
in mission and on career development in
general (Bloom and Bird)

8:30-9:10 Panel - Roles of PDOs and Engineers in
Mission Organization

9:10-9:40 Plenary

9:40-9:50 Coffee break

9:50-10:30 Panel - Career Development, PDOs and
Engineers

10:30-10:40 Plenary

10:40-10:50 Select working groups

10:50-11:30 Working groups breakout

11:30-12:00 Working groups report

12:00-1:30 Lunch

1:30-2:10 Panel - Project
Monitoring/Reporting/Communication

2:10-2:40 Plenary

2:40-3:30 Presentation by Cunningham on Computer Uses

3:30-4:00 Plenary discussion of computer presentation

4:00-4:10 Working groups selection

4:10 Coffee on way to breakout rooms

4:10-5:00 Working groups breakout

5:00-5:30 Working groups report

#7 ROLES OF PDOs and ENGINEERS IN MISSION ORGANIZATION
8:00-9:40 a.m. Wednesday, January 30, 1984

Issue: The roles of PDOs and engineers in the internal mission organization differ from mission to mission. PDO and/or engineering offices or divisions have different functions in each mission and these vary from a strictly staff function to a strictly line function, but are in many instances a combination of the two. Some missions do not have a PDO and/or engineering division at all and PDOs and engineers are assigned to other divisions such as agriculture, health, etc.

Objective: Through sharing experiences, explore how PDOs and engineers best fit in a mission organization in order to optimize their effectiveness.

Talking Points: Should the Bureau or AID have a flexible but typical organizational structure for PDO/Engineer Divisions? What are the trade-offs and balances between line and staff responsibilities? How important is it to have an independent PDO and/or engineering office? Is there a synergistic effect to having all PDOs and/or engineers in the same shop? How important is it to have PDOs and/or engineering offices coordinate all of the design of new projects and monitor project implementation within a mission?

Panel: Robert Nachtrieb (Chair), Willy Baum,
Mintra Silawatshanani

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

10

#8 CAREER DEVELOPMENT - PDOS AND ENGINEERS
9:50-10:50 Wednesday, January 30, 1985

Issue: The roles of PDOS and engineers are changing as Agency directions, staffing levels, ways of doing business, and Washington-field relationships change. These changes will impact on the career development of PDOS and Engineers in many ways, particularly upward mobility.

Objective: To discuss the implications of change for the career development of PDOS and engineers and formulate realistic suggestions for career paths that would provide career enrichment, increase job satisfaction, and broaden chances for upward mobility.

Talking Points: Crossovers into other backstops, excursion tours, switching between geographic bureaus, AID/W and field assignments, routine training and long-term training, executive (EPAP) positions.

Panel: Peter Bloom (Chair), Ralph Bird, Leroy Purifoy,
J. D. Perry, Vanchai

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

A

May 14, 1984

A STRATEGY TO PROVIDE SELECTED CORE TRAINING COURSES
FOR AID FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	
A. Scope and Purpose of this Paper	1
B. Training Priorities	2
C. Overview of Core Training	3
1. Improving Basic Training for New Employees	3
2. Training to Improve Project Management	5
3. Training for Technical Excellence	6
4. Management and Leadership Training	6
D. How to Use This Paper	7
II. COMMON KNOWLEDGE & SKILL NEEDS & SUGGESTED TRAINING	
A. New Officers--Entering on Duty in AID/Washington	7
B. New Officers--Arrival at Post	14
C. Officers who have completed 1-3 tours	15
D. "Mid Career" Officers (4 or more tours)	17
E. Senior Officers	18

91

STRATEGY TO PROVIDE SELECTED CORE TRAINING COURSES

FOR A.I.D. FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Scope and Purpose of this Paper

The Foreign Service Act of 1980 (FSA) places AID officers on the same professional basis as members of the State Department and other foreign affairs agencies. The Act also sets broad guidelines for professionalism in foreign affairs and requires all concerned agencies to have career development programs to promote such professionalism. While progress is being made on policy and planning measures to improve staff professionalism in AID, implementation needs to be accelerated. This means that we must upgrade and expand Agency training programs to help employees update and broaden their professional knowledge and skills. We recognize that training is only one element in a Career Development Program. However, rather than wait until the Agency's total career development system is in place, we need to move ahead on training which meets some of the more obvious needs. The training strategy and program can be modified over time to meet changing conditions and needs. In short, this paper covers certain common training needs. It is part of a more comprehensive training strategy which is being developed. The training strategy will eventually become part of an Agency career development strategy

This paper calls for the Agency to give first priority in training to the development and implementation of a series of Agency-oriented core training courses which can be taken at appropriate career stages. The paper concentrates more on the general needs of U.S. Foreign Service officers. However, much of the training discussed herein is relevant to other groups of employees and joint training should be provided to the greatest possible degree. Moreover, M/PM is, or will be, preparing more specific training strategies covering other Agency needs or staff categories (e.g., Foreign Service National [FSN] employees, secretarial staff, and some categories of Civil Service employees).

The training and development of employees is a responsibility which must be shared by supervisors and employees throughout the Agency. Parts of this paper are therefore designed to help staff identify general career training needs and options for meeting some of these needs.

02

The paper concentrates primarily on formal or group training activities, although self-study, guided work assignments, counseling, outside classes, or related measures may be equally important in helping an employee to develop and maintain professional competence. More specifically, the paper tries to: (a) identify the most common kinds of knowledge and skills needed by Foreign Service Officers as they progress through a career with AID and (b) suggest the types of training which might be taken to address these knowledge and skill needs.

This paper was initiated in December 1982 as a preliminary outline of the training which an AID Foreign Service Officer might need at various stages of a "typical" career with AID. It was one of the staff papers used in the 1983 review and reorganization of the Training Division (M/PM/TD). Subsequent revisions of the paper have incorporated suggestions from Bureau reviews, various staff members, recent training reviews, and field responses to the June 1982 Report of the Task Force on AID Career Development and Training (Kivimae-Valentino Report).

B. Training Priorities

Administrator McPherson has indicated an interest in a mass updating of the AID staff's knowledge and skills. He has suggested that we should be thinking about a "...large-scale, long-term, and systematic retraining of our Agency for what will be, in important part, different functions in the decade ahead." The demand for all types of training is also likely to increase as a result of recent legal mandates and the felt needs of employees. Our strategy and action program should therefore provide training which helps the Agency develop and maintain the staff talent needed to:

- (a) develop and maintain high levels of professional competence for our technical, managerial, and other staffs,
- (b) meet both current and projected field operational requirements of the Agency--particularly the need for continuous innovation and improvement (e.g., training to support priority programs outlined in the Regional Bureau Assistance Strategies and the Agency's Strategic Plan (now in process), and
- (c) provide Agency staff with the new knowledge and skills needed to function effectively in the Information Age.

The minimal core training suggested in this paper would total at least 52 weeks out of a career of about 20 years (including about 30 weeks for language training). The Agency's Plan for Professional Development of the Foreign Service, submitted to Congress in June 1981, indicated that 48 weeks out of a career of about 25 years would be devoted to training. Given the rapid rate of change in many professional and technical areas, knowledge and skills can quickly become obsolete.

83

Consequently, the 5% of career time suggested herein may be inadequate to keep employees in some areas up to date. On the other hand, the amount of training per person suggested herein may still be viewed as ambitious. Nevertheless, it still seems vital to start identifying what we should do in training if: (a) we are to realize our potential as international development professionals and (b) the Agency is to continue playing a significant leadership role in international development during the coming years.

Since resources will always be less than perceived demand for training, first priority should be given to core training courses which are relevant to the broadest range of employees. Table I lists some of the core training programs which are now needed. Some of these are already available, but several are still in the talking or planning stage.

The starting dates and frequency of the new courses discussed herein will be determined by the level of funding provided to PM/TD, funding available to Missions for training travel, and the action of Agency managers in releasing targeted staff to take training.

C. Overview of Core Training

Following are some general comments on the Core Training Courses outlined in Table I.

1. Improving the Basic Training Given to New Employees

Feedback from field Missions and other sources suggests that there is an urgent need to increase the quality and amount of orientation or basic operations training given to new mid-level employees before they depart for post. After reviewing the current two-week orientation program against probable staff preparation needs, one analyst concluded that orientation or basic operations training for new staff should be increased to eight weeks (including two weeks of project design and implementation training).

214

TABLE I - Suggested Core Training for AID Foreign Service

TARGET GROUP	PROPOSED TRAINING
All new-hires	<u>Basic Operations</u> (5-6 weeks) (Proposed) (Existing entry course is 2 weeks. New program would include 1 week Basic Project Design and Course) (Note: Interns receive additional classroom and on-the-job training)
Foreign Service	<u>Language Training</u> (8-30+ weeks) (Ongoing) (as required for assignment, tenuring, promotion, etc. See Handbook 28)
All staff going to new posts	<u>Area Studies:</u> AID's self-study modules and/or FSI Area Courses (2 weeks) (Note: FSI Language courses include some area studies)
All new Project Staff	<u>Basic Proj. Design & Implementation Course</u> (1 week) New course for late FY84. Overview course primarily for new employees.
Project Staff with 2-5 years of service	<u>Project Implementation Course</u> (2 weeks) (Ongoing) The PI Course is given 8-10 times a year in the regions and Washington. Stress is on USG/AID rules and processes, and implementation issues.
Technical staffs in priority AID functional areas/sectors	<u>Technical & Sectoral Updating Courses</u> (Proposed) Proposed new course in each key aid sector. These new courses could combine (a) an update on "state of the arts" technology of relevance to AID with (b) review of AID field experience and current policies. Priority should be given to starting such training in: (1) Food Production and Marketing/Small Farm Agriculture and (2) Health, Population, & Nutrition
Staff with 6-10 years service (Priority to FS-2/GS-14)	<u>Development Studies-A</u> (4 weeks) (Ongoing) <u>Development Studies-B</u> (4 weeks) (Planned) Replaces 12 week DSP. Those completing DSP-A would take DSP-B after 1-2 years.
Supervisors & program mgrs. with 5 or more years service.	<u>Management Skills Course</u> (1 week) (New) New course is being designed in FY 1984 for initiation in FY1985. Covers group leadership skills, communications, problem solving, etc.
Selected FS-1's, SFS, and equivalent GS staff.	<u>AID Senior Seminar</u> (4 weeks) (Proposed) New course projected for FY 1985. Will focus on Mission leadership knowledge & skills.
Staff with 15+ years of service	<u>Retirement Seminar</u> (2 days) (Ongoing)

25

Such training should acquaint the employees with the Agency's history, legal mandates, organization, program and personnel processes, recent operational experience, and selected achievements and problems. The training should also cover such broader areas as recent trends in economic development, U.S. foreign relations, host country perceptions of aid, cross-cultural change, technology transfer or adaptation, increased use of the private sector, and approaches of other donors and other U.S. agencies working abroad. New employees should also receive needed basic training in information processing skills (word processing, microcomputer use, etc. as suggested in Section II A.11, below).

In spite of field recommendations to provide new-hires with more basic operations training, we doubt that most Missions will support an 8-week basic training program (especially when new employees also have to take language training before departing for post). Consequently, the PM/TD unit charged with designing a new orientation or Basic Operations Training program may have to think in terms of 5-6 weeks (including a one-week module on Basic Project Design and Implementation). This Basic Operations Training would be in addition to Foreign Language training, Area Studies or on-the-job training in the employee's Bureau. Section II A. of this paper suggests some topics for inclusion in the training for new employees. Parts of the Basic Operations Training will also be useful to experienced employees who need updating in certain areas.

2. Training to Improve Project Management

Since field projects are the Agency's basic "bread and butter," M/PM/TD's analysis of training needs concluded that the Agency should give first priority to increasing basic project management training. The Administrator's Task Force on Implementation also recommended that training in project management be expanded and, in April 1983, the Administrator approved that recommendation. Consequently, M/PM/TD took steps to expand the number of Project Implementation (PI) courses being offered in Washington and in the field to ten per year. M/PM/TD also tried to initiate a new course in Project Analysis and Design (PAD) in FY1983, but this effort was abandoned due to contracting snags, and later, budget reductions for FY1984. Based on subsequent analysis and discussions with concerned people from other Bureaus, it was decided to develop a new one-week course on Basic Project Design and Implementation. This course, targeted toward new employees, is in the process of being contracted out.

16

3. Training for Technical Excellence

Economic growth and development are closely linked to the development of technology. It is therefore essential that AID staff keep current on existing and new technologies which can promote development in our cooperating countries.

Senior AID managers have noted the need to: (1) upgrade and update our existing technical personnel and (2) provide them with more opportunities for advancement into management positions. The S&T Bureau and the Sector Councils must take the lead in identifying what has to be done in upgrading our technical staffs. Some Sector Councils have started to identify training needs and possible resources for meeting these needs. A course on Small Farmer Farming Systems is being offered in Spring 1984 and will be followed by a one-week technical update course for Agricultural Development Officers. A related course on Educational Costs was recently offered for Human Resources Development staff.

In order to get more training started in this critical area, this paper suggests that regular two-week "Technical or Sectoral Updating" courses be started in the Agency's priority functional areas. Since training funds and staff are very limited (in relationship to the needs), such training should start with the Agency's two most basic areas of concern: (1) food production & marketing and (2) health, population, and nutrition. This technical training is discussed further in Section II C2, below.

4. Management and Leadership Training

The Development Studies Program (DSP) has been the Agency's primary program for upgrading/updating the knowledge of experienced employees on development theories, assistance trends, and program trends and priorities. The course was reorganized in 1983 and is now strongly recommended for newly promoted FS 2 officers. The new course is described in Section II D, below.

Agency managers and staff have indicated a strong interest in the initiation of program management and leadership courses. While the Agency formerly operated an "Advanced Management Course," none of our current courses cover the interpersonal and general management skills needed as AID Foreign Service Officers move into more responsible positions. To address the management and interpersonal skill needs of less experienced supervisors and program managers, a new Management Skills Course is being designed and tested in FY 1984. Subject to funding availabilities, this will be initiated on a regular basis in FY 1985. More details are contained in Section II D, below.

There is also an urgent need to provide training to senior technical and managerial staffs. A new course for Senior Foreign Service officers was included in the Agency's Foreign Service Career Development Plan submitted to Congress in 1982 and 1983. This was to start in FY 1984, but budgetary decisions have caused postponement until FY 1985. Restoration of the AID Senior Seminar is proposed in the plan to be designed in 1985. We have not had one since 1981. No impact has been noted. A decision on starting it up again will be delayed until we see the proposal in more definite design. The Senior Seminar is discussed in Section II E, below.

D. How to Use This Paper

This paper can be used as a rough checklist for determining the most common types of knowledge and skills required at various stages of a career with AID. The list of needs begins at the point where a new employee enters AID, so it is cumulative. Consequently, if the employee has not yet acquired the knowledge and skills listed for an earlier stage of his/her career, he/she will have to decide if these are still important. Moreover, if employees are aiming toward specific career fields, specializations, or jobs, they should also consult with others closer to the area or position in which they are interested. Employees should also maintain contact with their bureau's Executive Management Staff (EMS), backstop officers in PM (AID Office of Personnel Management), and PM Career Counselors since these people should be aware of current staffing and development needs and opportunities.

Self-study programs or individual courses in outside institutions are other avenues for developing and maintaining knowledge and skills. Employees are therefore encouraged to plan ahead with their counselors and supervisors to identify such opportunities for training while overseas or in Washington on rotation.

II. COMMON KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL NEEDS AND SUGGESTED TRAINING

A. New Officers--Entering on Duty in AID/Washington

NOTE: At present, most new officers (except IDI's) receive only two weeks of formal Orientation Training, plus area/country self-study and some exposure to Bureau operations. It has been proposed that at least 5-6 weeks of new-entry training be provided to ensure that employees are more adequately prepared to design and implement field activities (including one week of basic training on project design and implementation). Until these proposed new courses are in place, the new employee desiring to get the knowledge/skills discussed below may have to combine the present two-week Orientation Course with self-study and on-the-job training in the bureaus/Mission.

A 1. NEEDS: All new employees need to be aware of the unique contexts and organizational environments in which AID operates---both here and abroad. They should thus understand AID's organization structures, policies and basic legislation (Foreign Assistance Act and 1980 Foreign Service Act), current program trends and priorities, and major domestic and international constraints on operations.

A 1. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

General Knowledge of AID Structures, Policies, and Program Priorities:

A 1.1 Introduction to the Foreign Assistance Act/Foreign Service Act, and related legislation and policy directives (including Sections 103-107 of FAA)

A 1.2 Overview of Agency's Top Priorities (The FAA "New Directions," the Agency Assistance Plan, and the Administrator's special concerns (e.g., Private Enterprise Development, Institution Building, Policy Dialogues, & Technology Transfer/Adaptation) (NOTE: More detailed coverage on some of these areas is discussed under A3 and C2 below).

A 1.3 Case Studies of Constraints and Field Implementation of Selected Policies (Some of these studies will come from the Agency's Impact Studies, available through PPC/E.)

A 2. NEEDS: General knowledge of LDC conditions, common development needs and problems, and current development theories/concepts. General understanding of the role played by major foreign donors in host country development.

NOTE: New employees who already have a good general knowledge of LDC conditions might spend the time studying specific issues related to their country or regions.

A 2 SUGGESTED TRAINING:

General Knowledge of "LDC" conditions and needs, current theories/concepts of socio-economic development, and validity of such theories/concepts:

A 2.1 Defining "development" and "underdevelopment": Alternative ways of looking at development, "less developed countries" (LDC's), and "developing" countries. Indicators used by AID, IBRD and other agencies to measure development (e.g., GNP and the Physical Quality of Life Index [PQLI]). Case studies of national development in selected countries (including some former/present AID-assisted countries which are considered "successful"--e.g., Korea or Taiwan). Strategies for identifying a country's most urgent foreign assistance needs.

84

A 2.2 Current theories or prescriptions for promoting socio-economic development and their basis and empirical validity (including use of trade, aid, etc.). How AID uses economic theory in designing programs. The role of economists in USAID Missions. The general role of economic analysis in sector and project planning. Impact of the Information Age on development theory and the role of foreign assistance.

A 3. NEEDS: Basic knowledge of the economic sector/subsectors to which the employee will be assigned (i.e., typical problems and needs) and understanding of the role being played in the sector by AID or other donors. Employee should be aware of specific centrally-funded or bilateral/regional projects in his/her assigned geographic region. She/he should also be able to (1) identify, collect, and evaluate the basic data needed to specify host country needs for foreign/domestic investments or technical assistance and (2) assess alternative options for AID assistance (including identification of potential AID-assisted projects, sector or program loans, etc.).

A 3. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

Basic knowledge of economic sectors to which assigned:

A 3.1 Overview of Current AID Sectoral Priorities and Relevant Experience. This training should provide staff with: (a) an overview of AID's top priority sectors or areas of focus and (b) some examples of "less successful" and "more successful" efforts in AID. More indepth sessions on technical or sectoral issues may also be appropriate--see C2 below. Topics may include:

- (1) improving food production & agromarketing systems (includes use of PL-480 food aid and PL-480 self help requirements as tools for influencing host country policies and programs);
- (2) population, health, and nutrition assistance;
- (3) bilateral policy dialogues (to confirm/increase host country commitment to development in areas critical to host country goals and the USAID program);
- (5) private enterprise (as a component of other USAID projects or as a separate assistance effort); and
- (6) institution-building and technology transfer or adaptation.

A 3.2 Overview of sector in country of assignment: This may be largely a self-directed learning effort of at least 3 to 5 days in the geographic bureau, Science & Technology

Bureau, or other central staff units. The employee needs to understand the issues, needs, and ongoing assistance projects being funded by AID or other donors in the sector where he/she will be working.

A 4. NEEDS: Knowledge and skills needed to function effectively as a USAID Project Officer.

While we commonly use the term "Project Management" to describe this area of operations and training, the USAID Project Officer does not normally "manage" the project; more often he/she is managing the AID inputs into a host country project which AID is supporting. Consequently, the Project Manager is usually a host country counterpart. Nonetheless, the USAID Project Officer must still understand all phases of Project Management (selection, design, implementation, evaluation, etc.) if he/she is to (1) help host country counterparts and U.S. contractors do a good job and (2) meet AID requirements for project financing, monitoring, termination, etc.

The Project Officer should know how to help host country counterparts to design, implement, and evaluate: (a) economic development projects and (b) related cultural/organizational change efforts. This means that he/she should have a basic understanding of (a) the concepts and techniques involved in cross-cultural communication, institution-building, and technology transfer/adaptation and (b) AID's experience in some of these areas.

The Project Officer also needs to know how to use AID rules, policies, procedures, documentation, etc. in project design, implementation, and evaluation (especially AID Handbooks 1, 3, and sections of others dealing with contracting, commodity procurement and participant training). The Project Officer must be fully conversant with various program documents (e.g., PID, PP, Project/Loan Agreement, PIL, PIO's, contract scope of work and/or draft contract, PES/evaluation reports).

AID Projects are being increasingly designed, implemented, and evaluated by contractors and other outside intermediaries. Consequently, the Project Officer may spend considerable time in the development, execution, and implementation of contracts and grants. He/she must therefore be familiar with the USG/AID contracting rules, processes, options, documents, and offices which are involved. She/he must also be able to monitor and report on project progress and coordinate contractors, PVO's, or other AID intermediaries used in project work.

A 4 SUGGESTED TRAINING:

A 4.1 Project Management Survey Course (1 week course proposed for initiation in FY 1984)

The Project Management Survey Course is designed to provide new employees with a basic understanding of the processes of design, implementation, and evaluation. Topics will include: AID's budget cycle, basic documents (CDSS, ABS, CP, PID, PP, Project Authorization, Project/Loan Agreement, PIL, PIO, etc.), preparing/coordinating project analyses and evaluations, scheduling and budgeting, contracting, project and contract monitoring, and common implementation problems. Note: Since this course is for new-hires, employees with two or more years of AID service may wish to take the Project Implementation Course (see Section C 1, below).

A 4.2 AID Contracting for Non-Procurement Personnel (3 days - Offered in Washington).

This ongoing course covers various categories of contracts and grants, related rules and procedures, and the services available from the Office of Contracts Management (M/SER/CM). (Similar material is covered in the Project Implementation Course described in C 1.1, below.)

A 5. NEEDS: Awareness of special problems of living abroad (terrorism, school facilities for children, employment or professional development opportunities for spouse, cultural adjustment of family, health hazards, etc.)

A 5. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

A 5.1 Countering Terrorism - Employee and appropriate family members must complete the anti-terrorism course at FSI (1 day) and additional training at post.

A 5.2 Personal adjustment and health issues - These can be covered in the AID Basic Operations Course; AID special orientation sessions for spouses; FSI orientation sessions for employees/families; and self-study.

A 6. NEEDS: Foreign language proficiency required for assignment, promotion, and/or tenuring.

A 6. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

A 6. FSI or commercial language studies of 8-30+ weeks to meet requirements in AID Handbook #28 for tenuring, promotion, or position assignments. (Foreign Service Career Candidates must complete tenuring requirements within five years.)

A 7. NEEDS: Knowledge of country/regional culture, history, politics, economy, etc.

QV

A 7. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

A 7.1 If available for country of assignment, AID's country self-study module and related materials should be completed before departure for post. Where such modules are not available, the employee should contact the AID/STATE country desk officers, technical backstop officers, PM training staff, and recently returned staff to obtain information.

A 7.2 FSI Area studies program (two weeks) may be authorized where assignment merits it. FSI area studies usually focus on a region rather than particular countries. NOTE: FSI language training normally includes 1/2 day per week of "advanced" area studies.

A 8. NEEDS: Familiarity with offices/individuals in AID/W or other U.S. locations who will be backstopping or otherwise involved in the employee's activities at post (including contractor or PVO home office staffs).

A 8. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

A 8.1 Backstopping: Office Visits and Self-Study. The officer should try to meet with key AID/W or other agency people who will be providing general and technical backstopping or who will be reviewing program submissions, progress reports, etc. Where U.S. contractors, PVO,s, etc. will play a major role in the officer's program, a visit to the home office or campus might be included in the officer's travel orders if funds permit. This learning is arranged by officer in consultation with country desk and bureau backstop offices. NOTE: Some Regional Bureaus require more extensive on-the-job training in the Bureau before employees are sent to the field.

A 9. NEEDS: Proficiency in using English to: (1) prepare documents, reports, cables, correspondence, etc. and (2) make public or group oral presentations. This is a difficult area to address in a general training strategy, since the needs vary greatly. Consequently, we can provide only general suggestions on training or self-help options.

A 9. SUGGESTED TRAINING

A 9.1 Written skills. Writing courses are available at FSI and on an ad hoc basis in AID. Correspondence courses are also available from various universities and organizations (e.g. the American Management Association). Practice and feedback from others may be the only way to improve some writing skills. Consequently, the employee who has serious writing problems should regularly seek feedback from supervisors and colleagues on actual written work and ways of improving it.

A 9.2 Oral Presentation Skills. Most AID officers need to be able to give good public talks and present clear and cogent briefings to host country counterparts, supervisors, program review panels, etc. This ability must often be acquired through sheer hard work and practice (even though this may sometimes place stress on both the officer and his/her audience). The employee may have to pursue a combination of self-improvement and more structured studies. Public speaking programs of the International Toastmasters or similar organizations can be useful. The officer can also take advantage of opportunities at post to practice and improve speaking skills: in project committee review meetings, speeches/discussions sponsored by the USIS (U.S. Information Service), teaching or speaking at local universities or before professional groups. It may also be desirable to include sessions on "Effective Oral Presentations" in the Basic Operations Course.

A 10. NEEDS: All officers need to be familiar with the dramatic technological and related changes which are taking place in the area of information and automatic data processing and utilization. Staff should obtain a basic understanding of AID's automated information systems (Wang word processors and mainframe or large computers) and microcomputers (IBM PC, WANG PC, Apple II/e, or similar system). Following are some general suggestions for training in this area.

A 10. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

A 10.1 Basic Microcomputer Training (ongoing--1 to 3 days).

See AID announcements for specific microcomputer courses now offered inhouse. The AID officer should learn how a microcomputer operates, how to put data into the machine and retrieve it, and how to use 2 or 3 software or instructional packages relevant to AID. Currently available AID software cover such areas as budgeting, accounting, financial analysis, data base management, graphics, statistics, and word processing (e.g., Lotus 1-2-3, Supercalc 2, dBase II, Microstat, and Wordstar, which are approved software packages).

Software should be available soon to cover other Project Management skills, such as scheduling or PERT/CPM. The officer should also learn how microcomputers are already being used for project/program management tasks within AID. A staffed microcomputer laboratory is now open on the 4th floor of SA 14 (Plaza West) for training and practice.

A 10.2 Office Information Systems (OIS) Overview (Ad hoc, 1-2 days). This training normally covers: (1) the Agency's policies, plans, and current progress for office

94

information and processing systems, (2) the equipment (hardware) and the programs (software) now being used (e.g., the Wang Systems), (3) types of information available in the AID computer system, and (4) the use of data systems to improve field operations. This training would not normally teach officers how to access the mainframe computers, although such skills training could be added if there is a need.

A 10.3 Basic Word Processing Skills (Ongoing--Time varies) Several courses on the Wang Word Processor are now offered in AID/W. (See the current issue of AID Training News on "Wang Training".) Classes range from 1/2 day sessions (for overview of the Wang or to simply access information) to five half-day sessions to provide basic skills. Most employees at least need entry level training so they can put information into the Word Processor and retrieve it for modification and/or printing. Advanced courses are also available. Similar training is provided at some overseas posts.

B. New Officers--Arrival at Post

B 1. NEEDS:

B 1.1 As feasible, reinforce or fill gaps of knowledge/skills listed in Section A.

B 1.2 Knowledge of USAID Mission organization, procedures, traditions, personalities, etc. Specific job tasks and routines. Ability to prepare work plans and to relate work plan progress to AID's Employee Evaluation Reporting system.

B 1.3 Knowledge of how USAID Mission works with other U.S. Mission units (Embassy, USIA, Attaches, et. al.), other donors, and host country governmental and private sectors.

B 1.4 Indepth knowledge of how employee's host country counterparts operate and how they feel about the AID-supported projects. Skills in serving as a go-between or mediator among the many groups (host country, USAID, etc.) which may be involved in implementation of projects or programs of concern to the officer.

B 1.1 - B 1.4 SUGGESTED TRAINING:

Most training must be obtained: (a) on the job, (b) via U.S. Mission/USAID orientation programs, (c) in Post Language Training Program, and (d) by courses at local schools. Some officers may be able to attend the Project Implementation Course or other courses held in the field.

95

C. Officers who have completed 1-3 tours

GENERAL COMMENT: The employee should try to fill in any important training gaps left from those suggested above and consider the following types of training:

C 1. NEEDS: Broader knowledge of Project Management.

C 1. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

C 1.1 Project Implementation Course (2 weeks--Ongoing). The Project Implementation (PI) Course is designed for AID Project Officers and other Mission personnel with significant project implementation duties. The first priority target group is Project Officers with 2-5 years experience. Candidates must have at least one year of AID project experience. The PI Course covers the basic policies, procedures, and experience required for successful AID project implementation. The course modules include: Project Documentation and Monitoring, Contracting for Services, Commodity Procurement, Financial Management, and Participant Training.

C 2. NEED: Updating knowledge on developments in employee's professional or technical field. This includes: (a) general "state of the arts" knowledge and (b) information on recent policy and program trends and lessons learned within AID. The Foreign Assistance Act: (a) describes the important linkage between technical problem solving capacities and the alleviation of critical development problems (e.g., food production, small farm agriculture, health and population, education, and energy) and (b) provides for concentration of AID's technical efforts on such problems.

C 2. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

C 2.1 Technical & Sectoral Updating Training (2 weeks-new) The appropriate AID Sector Councils, bureau staffs, and Training Division staff need to cooperate in the design and implementation of new technically oriented courses of about 2 weeks duration covering "state of the arts" updating and AID policy and experience. These would be regular courses geared to needs of officers in a given sector to provide a technical update at least every 5-7 years. These courses should start with the economic sectors of major concern to the Agency: Food & Agriculture and Health, Population, & Nutrition.

Each course could cover:

- (1) AID Policies and Goals for the Sector,
- (2) Current State of Technology and Research in the Sector, (What is available to transfer/adapt?),
- (3) Current AID Resources and Plans,

96

(4) Assessment of AID Experience (Good and Bad--To avoid discussions of "paper successes," only completed projects should be assessed?), and

(5) Preparation of an action/application plan by each participant in the training. (How will each participant apply "lessons learned" in the field?).

Treatment of technology transfer/adaptation or other technical issues should also reflect the Agency's concern for the following means of implementing assistance programs: (1) policy dialogue and reform, (2) institutional development, and (3) greater use of the private sector.

Such inhouse group training would supplement Agency efforts to provide specific individuals with needed outside training or development opportunities (e.g., at NIH, USDA, international research centers, or universities).

C 3. NEEDS: Management or supervisory skills. Employees who are responsible for getting results through and with other people will need to develop or sharpen their management and interpersonal skills (e.g., goal-setting, problem-solving communications, leadership, and organizational change). This is true whether they are moving into supervisory positions or into senior technical positions which require increased and more responsible interactions with contractors and host country counterparts.

C 3. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

C 3.1 Management Skills Workshop (1 weeks - Proposed). This new course is being designed in FY 1984 and will be offered in FY 1985. The training will focus on such skills as goal setting, problem solving, communicating, small group leadership, improving staff performance, and organizational change.

C 3.2 The Supervisor's Role in Personnel Management (1 week - ongoing).

This course is directed toward GS/FS employees assigned to supervisory positions in AID/W. It covers such topics as selected GS and FS Personnel Management regulations and procedures, employee and union relations, and equal employment opportunities.

C 4. NEEDS: At this point, the officer may want to assess her/his general career progress and training needs. This review could address specific performance problems or training needs revealed during previous assignments. The employee might also need to acquire new knowledge and skills to prepare for a change in job, career track, or geographical assignment.

C 4. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

C 4.1 An employee assigned to AID/Washington on rotation may need to catch up on current Agency developments by taking selected parts of the new Basic Operations Course. Other special needs might have to be addressed via individual work or research assignments, external training courses, counseling, and/or self-study. Other training alternatives listed in Section D, below, may also be relevant.

Some officers at the FS-3 or FS-4 or equivalent levels may wish to consider the FSI Mid-level Officer Professional Development Course (22 weeks). The course covers professional training within State Department personnel Cones (administrative, economic, political), management and Washington bureaucratic skills, global policy issues, and elective foreign relations subjects.

D. "Mid Career" Officers (4 or more tours)

D 1. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL NEEDS:

D 1.1 Indepth knowledge and skills in managing one or more USAID projects, preferably in different economic sectors or subsectors (thus being able to work on a broader basis).

D 1.2 Knowledge and skills in working effectively with people--in supervisory capacity and/or as a technician/project officer working with USAID/USG colleagues, contractors, and host country personnel.

D 1.3 Ability to design and implement organizational and program innovations and improvements on a regular basis.

D 1.4 Well developed knowledge and skills for conducting and reporting on studies of an economic sector--with particular attention on identifying critical sector needs and alternatives for addressing some of those needs (e.g., being able to identify alternative project possibilities and know when AID should or should not get involved in particular areas).

D 1.5 Familiarity with current trends, concepts, and techniques in ones particular professional or technical area.

D 1.6 Understanding of current development assistance trends and problems (including U.S. domestic constraints), alternative theories of development, and general trends in the "developing" world.

D 1. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

General Note: It is assumed that training and development at this career phase should provide the officer with more

indepth knowledge and skills in some areas, while introducing her/him to new or broader areas of Agency concern. The training should thus be oriented toward: (1) more advanced studies of concepts and action techniques in socio-economic development, foreign policy, and foreign assistance and (2) improved skills in organizational innovation, improvement of program management and office/division leadership.

D 1.1 Development Studies Program (DSP A and DSP B - 4 weeks each)

Revamped in May 1983, the new DSP course is conducted in two 4-week segments: DSP (A) and DSP (B) (taken with a tour of duty in between). The course is currently targeted toward FS-2 and GS-14 employees. DSP (A) is now being offered and DSP (B) is scheduled for initiation in the Fall of 1984. DSP (A) covers National Development Strategies and includes such topics as: development in a changing, interdependent world, elements of national strategy, policy dialogue, and AID approaches to development. DSP (B) covers Analytical Skills for Planning and Implementing Successful Development Projects and includes such topics as: the context of U.S. aid, current issues in selected AID sectors, and analytical techniques for project planning and implementation. More details on content are contained in each course announcement or can be provided by the DSP staff in M/PM/TD/PCT.

D 1.2 Management Skills Workshop (1 week - Proposed). This is a new course proposed for FY1985 (also discussed in C 3, above). The training will focus on basic skills needed for management problem-solving and goal-setting, communicating, group leadership, and organizational change.

D 1.3 Technical and Sectoral Updating (See C2 above)

D 1.4 Other Training Subject to the availability of funding and of slots in a particular training program, other training might include: the FSI Economic/Commercial Studies Course (26 weeks); FSI Foreign Affairs Interdepartmental Seminar (2 weeks); management training (at the Federal Executive Institute, USDA Graduate School, U.S. Office of Personnel Management, American Management Association, or local university); or specialized university training.

E. Senior Officers (FS-1 and SFS)

E 1. KNOWLEDGE AND SKILL NEEDS:

1. Experience, knowledge, and skills for successfully managing an Mission, Office or Division in the field or equivalent unit

99

in AID/W. (Assumes that even a technically-oriented officer would have moved into some type of supervisory role within the Mission.)

2. Advanced or more specialized knowledge and skills in employee's area of interest: (1) expertise in one or more of AID's priority functional areas (for senior technicians), (2) managerial and leadership ability (for those oriented toward management) or (3) professional skills (for others--such as process specialists, desk officers, controllers, et. al.).

3. Knowledge of domestic (U.S.) trends and problems and the impact of these on U.S. foreign policy (including foreign aid policies and constraints).

4. Broad but rather intensive knowledge of AID programs, policies, priorities, and problems--at the global, regional, and bilateral level.

5. Indepth knowledge of the cultural, political, and economic problems of at least one developing country and general familiarity with at least one additional country.

6. Current proficiency in at least one foreign language at the S-3 or higher level.

E 1. SUGGESTED TRAINING:

E 1. AID Senior Seminar (4-5 weeks - Proposed). This course will be designed to help provide some of the basic knowledge and skills needed by senior Mission managers. Topic coverage will probably include: assessing external opportunities and constraints on Mission operations, setting long-medium-short term organizational and program goals, organizational and program innovation, linking staff performance to Mission implementation goals, leadership modes and effectiveness, staff development, and communications and reporting. Current plans call for the course to be designed in late FY1984 and offered in FY1985.

E 2. Individual Training Programs or Assignments. In addition to inhouse training and development activities, individual officers will continue to be assigned to the War College, FSI Executive Seminar, universities, etc. for management, technical, or professional training appropriate to their careers and Agency priorities. Hopefully, increased use of special career development assignments within AID or other agencies may also be used as an important way to prepare officers for increased responsibilities.

#9 PROJECT MONITORING/REPORTING/COMMUNICATION
1:30-2:40 Wednesday, January 30, 1985

Issue: Extensive redelegations from the Bureau to missions have given new importance to questions of information exchange between AID/W and the field.

Objective: To review the current information and reporting system between the Washington and field and make suggestions for improving it and making it more relevant and more useful to both Bureau leadership and mission management.

Talking Points: Semi-annual project implementation reports (PIRs), monthly/quarterly mission project reports, flow of written correspondence and cables (in both directions), the ASIA/PD Newsletter adopted in 1983 after the 1983 Workshop, field trip reports of AID/W personnel visiting field mission, telephone calls.

Panel: Leroy Purifoy (Chair), Robert Resseguie, G. P. Varshenya

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

#10 COMPUTERS AND WORD PROCESSORS

2:40-4:00 p.m. Wednesday, January 30, 1985

Issue: The use of word processors and small and micro-computers is now widespread in AID/W and in most, if not all, Asia field missions. These tools have potential for improving project design, project management, reporting, and generally enhancing our ability to do more with less.

Objective: To learn how to employ computers and word processors better through a professional presentation on the subject and through exchanging experiences and ideas.

Talking Points: Automation in Asia missions, present and future uses of word processors and/or microcomputers, analytical uses, routine uses, information exchange through transfer of software, experience with project-finance computer hardware and software, staff training needs.

Panel: Robert Cunningham (Chair and Presentation),
John Pinney, M. N. Wahi

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

102

Thursday January 31, 1985

8:00-10:15	Panels finish their reports - breakout rooms (10 panels)
10:15-10:30	Coffee break
10:30-12:00	First 3 panels report
12:00-1:30	Lunch
1:30-3:30	Next 4 panels report
3:30-3:45	Coffee break
3:45-5:15	Last 3 panels report

Friday February 1, 1985

8:00-10:00	Feedback and recommendations/final revisions of workshop report
10:00-10:15	Coffee break
10:15-12:00	Workshop oral feedback and written evaluation
12:30-2:00	Closing luncheon
2:30	Bus departs for Bangkok

PANEL REPORTS

10:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Thursday, January 31, 1985

Objective: To give panels an opportunity to present their synthesized findings and follow-up action plans to the full group for reaction, revision, and validation.

Process: A spokesperson for each panel will make a brief presentation, respond to question and check for agreement, suggestions for improving clarity, etc.

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

PRESENTATION OF CONSOLIDATED RECOMMENDATIONS

8:00-10:00 a.m. Friday, February 1, 1985

Objective: To gain participant concurrence in Workshop recommendations.

Process: The participants as a group will go over the draft report and make final refinements before adopting it.

NOTES, REFLECTIONS, REACTIONS

WORKSHOP ORAL FEEDBACK AND WRITTEN EVALUATION

10:15 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Friday, February 1, 1985

Objective: To examine both the Workshop process, content and management. Based on this examination both oral and written evaluation will be conducted.

Process: First, participants will discuss the Workshop, how it has been planned and conducted, the appropriateness of its recommendations, etc., in an oral session with the goal of leaving behind a record of how better to plan and implement the next workshop. Next, a written evaluation form will be filled by each participant.

NOTES. REFLECTIONS REACTIONS