Evaluation Report

Summary and Recommendations

of the
General Agreement Between the
Department of Agriculture
and the
Agency for International Development

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Final Revised Draft

March 28, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of AID/USDA Technicians Who Worked on Report

Part I - General

Part II - Training

Part III - PASAs

Part IV - TC&S

Attachments (In two separate sections)

AID/USDA Technicians Who Worked on this Report

1 - Evaluation Panel Members were:

Ralph E. Hansen	AID
Lee Herrick	AID
Boyd A. Ivory	AID
Will Kaiser	AID

2 - AID Steering Committee Members were:

Douglas D. Caton	WOH/ARDS
Donald D. Fiester	LA/SCD
Ralph N. Gleason	WOH/ARDS
Robert Hubbell	A/AID
Harry K. Lennon	WOH/PES
Richard R. Newberg	LA/PO

3 - USDA Steering Committee Members were:

Kenneth F. McDaniel	FAS
Frederick A. Prange	SCS
Lyle P. Schertz	IADS

4 - USDA Special Task Force Members were:

Roberta B. Clark	IADS/TRNG
Ellis Clough	IADS/TRNG
A. E. Duke	IADS/TRNG
Kenneth A. Haines	ARS
W. E. Harvey	IADS/TRNG
Edward H. Koenig	IADS/ ISG
Martin Kriesberg	IADS
Frederick A. Prange	SCS
George Waldman	IADS

5 - Others Contributing to this Report:

Joel Bernstein	A/AID
Edward Rawson	AID/PROC/PAS
John B. Stabler	AID/IT/PED
Norman M. Ward	WOH/ARDS

All AID/W Regional Agriculture and Rural Development Officers

All AID/IT/PD Agricultural Program Development Officers

All USDA/IADS Regional Coordinators and Program Analysts

Innumerable Professionals from USDA Agencies and AID/W

Members of the USDA Operations Subcommittee

PART I

Evaluation Report

I. General:

The General Agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development, signed February 15, 1966, has proven to be a sound document establishing a framework for cooperative relationships in carrying out the provisions of Section 632(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

The AID/USDA agreement established the principle of partnership between the two agencies in foreign assistance operations relating to agriculture. It renewed and brought up to date an agreement under which USDA handles virtually all training of foreign nationals studying agriculture in the U. S., created a mechanism under which USDA technicians could serve abroad under inter-agency agreements (PASAs), and arranged for AID financial support for headquarters functions performed by USDA in foreign assistance.

AID's annual volume of business under this agreement has amounted to about $9.6 million. Of this amount $7.2 million is for some 74 PASAs and the balance for backstop support of training activities and the other headquarters cost in USDA under TC&S. (See Attachment #1)

In USDA THE IADS has the responsibility for coordinating and giving leadership to programs supporting AID's efforts to improve food production and distribution in the LDCs. This responsibility covers not only activities in training and technical assistance but also working with AID in the formulation of agricultural policies and programs.

The evaluation committee considered the USDA fully competent to perform assigned activities and, therefore, has devoted its efforts

largely to seeking means by which the partnership operation can function better in assisting the LDCs and also to studying alternatives and to determining costs, quality and quantity of work performed.

The "Underlying Premises" section of the General Agreement between the USDA and AID recognizes that a vigorous technical assistance program is important to effective U. S. Economic assistance. It refers to the desire of AID "To Enlist as fully and effectively as possible, on a partnership basis, the pertinent resources of the Department in planning, executing and evaluating those portions of the foreign assistance development program in which it has special competence".

In evaluating USDA participation in a partnership with AID in the conduct of agricultural assistance programs, it is important to assess the resources of the Department which can be tapped for this work.

The resources of the Department are organized in 18 agencies such as the Agricultural Research Service and the Forest Service. These 18 agencies together have more than 27,000 scientists, technicians and policy personnel who carry out the Department's programs. (See attachments #2 and #3)

Each of the Department's agencies carries out a major area of work for which the Department is responsible. Many of these activities and the kinds of technicians employed by these services are directly related to the agricultural needs of low income countries. Although only a relatively small proportion of these 27,000 professional personnel have served overseas as technical consultants on resident and short-term assignments, they have begun to acquire an understanding of the special problems of development.

The work of two agencies having a special relationship to foreign assistance programs should be noted: the Foreign Agricultural Service and the Economic Research Service. The FAS has agricultural attaches stationed in principal countries around the world who funnel information back to USDA on agricultural developments in these countries. The information is compiled and analyzed by FAS regional and commodity people. The ERS economists, in turn, analyze year-to-year production and other data in order to develop long-term supply-demand projections. These kinds of data and other analyses are useful in appraising food aid and development assistance needs for the agricultural sector of AID countries. This material, procured without cost to AID, is part of the USDA/IADS input on country program reviews and similar program development efforts.

In addition to its technical Services, the Department has a number of staff offices concerned with agricultural information, and overall departmental operations. Personnel from these staff offices have served on overseas technical assistance assignments concerned with agricultural program planning and the organization and operation of agricultural ministries and related organizations.

Status of Partnership

The extent of involvement of the USDA in a partnership basis in planning, executing and evaluating AID programs varies widely. In many cases they are excluded completely; in others they are brought in at the final stages of program development. On occasion they are called upon to be the supplier of last resort in staffing technical assistance teams after all other sources of personnel have been unable to furnish the needed men; in still other cases, they are involved in a genuine partnership basis whereby AID and USDA joined and planned, executed, and evaluated the program.

The AID/USDA task force on PASAs has made an intensive analysis of country programs where there has been a partnership arrangement and others where the USDA input has been little and late. The intensive analysis indicates that in the partnership countries, the programs have been markedly more successful and the feelings about the PASA work have been better among both AID and USDA people concerned.

Points of Criticism between AID & USDA

Criticism was heard concerning each agency and while this ranged from very mild to very sharp, depending on who was interviewed and his own personal experiences, it is felt that what would appear to be the more valid complaints should be surfaced in an effort to further improve the effectiveness of the program.

Differences were noted, especially in the negotiating stages, because of the different viewpoint toward the joint effort. Basically these differences ranged from the desire of some personnel to have USDA assigned full responsibility for a designated segment of the program with accompanying authority to determine action, while AID personnel want a fully integrated program with action to be determined jointly by local Ministry of Agriculture, AID and PASA . Differences probably reflect the degree of concern re developing institutional capabilities vs obtaining operational results.

Although there was some evidence of this friction, it was not nearly so noticeable at the working level. To get a further insight into this situation it might be worthwhile to note the attitude or

opinion of some USDA personnel concerning AID and conversely that of some AID personnel concerning USDA. This should not be construed as meaning that all personnel of either agency share this opinion, but it is prevalent enough that it should not be ignored, and consideration of the items could well lead to improvements in both agencies.

USDA Concerning AID

1. Poorly organized and administered as regards to working relations with USDA.
2. Continuity is lacking -- personnel changes -- resulting in poor use of records and reports.
3. Many technicians --
   (a) Outdated Technically -- have "been away" to long.
   (b) Lackadaisical -- easygoing.
   (c) Do not press hard enough for LDC progress.
   (d) Too quick to accede to local government desires.
4. USDA not consulted on project cancellations.

AID Concerning USDA

1. Inclined to take full credit when other agencies are involved.
2. PASAs best adapted to special projects or surveys (short-term PASAs).
3. Technicians --
   (a) Well trained technically.
   (b) Inclined to use the hard sell -- not accepted in foreign countries.
   (c) Tend to be U.S. oriented -- operation role rather than advisory.
   (d) Try to transplant U. S. Programs.
4. Do not recognize importance of tying projects to institution building.

While items cited are existant, they may be tendencies or trends rather than widespread belief.

The criticism that many AID technicians are outdated because they

have been away too long would appear to have some validity when considered in the field of up-to-date technical competence. This is especially true with the "old-timers" who have been overseas from 10 to 15 years with no Stateside rotation. Although they may make every effort to keep up with modern practices, it is very difficult in our modern society where improvements come so fast and in so many areas. On the other hand these technicians often have acquired other professional skills which USDA personnel may lack; namely, a knowledge of cross-cultural dealings and institutional development.

General Recommendations

This evaluation study has found that the USDA/AID partnership, established by this agreement, has provided an effective mechanism for AID to utilize the resources of the Department in planning, executing and evaluating those portions of the foreign assistance program in which the Department possesses special competence. The study has discovered certain areas of the general agreement where improvements and changes are needed to provide better utilization of funds, manpower and resources. These areas will be identified in this evaluation report and recommendations made to bring about improvements.

The General Agreement, under III, A, states, "The Administrator of AID and the Secretary of Agriculture will each designate a senior officer to coordinate basic negotiations and matters of general policy under this agreement." This designation has not been made by AID and the void in overall coordinating leadership has created partnership problems as well as decreased the effectiveness of AID's performance under the agreement.

Examples of what went wrong in part because of there not being a central coordinating office in AID:

1) AID has not utilized fully all available resources of USDA.

2) New techniques and methods of increasing the effectiveness of AID/USDA operations have not been developed.

3) Continuous evaluation to assure that project objectives were met in a timely and efficient manner was not done.

4) Improvements and changes to provide better utilization of funds, resources and manpower have been identified but not implemented.

5) A working system of comprehensive reporting to enable AID to judge progress as well as to make earlier remedial decisions was never implemented.

6) Few recommendations were made or proposals considered for new fields of activity in the AID/USDA partnership.

7) There was a lack of understanding by both AID and USDA of the partnership agreement -- resulting in less than full cooperation.

8) There was no single office where AID and USDA personnel could take their problems for action -- especially true where questions of divided authority were concerned or where lines of responsibility were not clear. (PROC/PAS was in a position to hear all problems and endeavored to see that action was taken.)

9) Financial arrangements and services available were not well understood -- many AID personnel were critical of USDA when their access to the full facts could have resulted in better working relationships.

10) Budgets for TC&S and Training and for individual PASAs were developed late and often not signed until the FY was well advanced; e.g., this year, final agreement on TC&S and Training budgets have not been reached, as of Mar. 28.

11) USDA unable do forward planning without clear indication of program budget level or staff requirements.

Recommendation No. 1. The Administrator of AID should designate a senior officer to head an office of coordination which would be responsible for basic negotiations and matters of general policy under this agreement. This coordinating office and officer would serve as a counterpart to the Department's designated senior officer and coordinating agency, would provide USDA with a central point for negotiations and would be responsible for planning and evaluation of all AID/USDA partnership programs. This contact point in AID would deal with all major substantive issues and all financial arrangements between the two partners. The present AID regional and staff offices should continue their present day-to-day work assignments. (See attachment #4)

In the absence of a central coordinating office in AID, it has been difficult for USDA to do forward planning on program budget levels and staff requirements. This, in turn, has raised problems of conflict between domestic programs and foreign assistance responsibilities of USDA and at times delayed recruitment of USDA personnel for AID assignments.

Recommendation No. 2. AID and USDA should work together in projecting program levels and staff requirements in line with AID and USDA PPB requirements as set by BOB.

AID has a policy which calls for periodic rotation to AID/W of direct-hire technicians. This policy cannot become operational fully due to the non-availability in the U.S. of positions for rotatees. Presently three AID direct-hire agricultural technicians are on rotation assignments in USDA. This number should be increased to provide additional home base assignments which will result in updating agriculturists in their technical specialties. Rotation also will serve to give headquarters of the two agencies a better understanding of field operations and problems.

Recommendation No. 3. Arrangements should be sought for USDA to provide at least 20 positions under which AID personnel could rotate for two-year refresher courses and work assignments -- both field and Washington positions. A joint AID/USDA study group should explore the feasibility and mechanics of doing this.

Recommendation No. 4. Direct-hire agricultural technicians on home leave or rotation should be assigned to short TDY (one to two weeks) consultation with USDA in order to update their professional competence. These consultation assignments should be financed under the TC&S budget and schedules should be developed yearly based on home leave eligibility of technicians.

AID's agricultural program was aimed primarily at research, extension and production. As agriculture in developing countries moves from subsistence to commercial farming, the relevancy of USDA's experience in such areas as price policies, marketing, supply and demand studies, foreign trade analyses, utilization research, etc., becomes increasingly evident. Policy expertise in these areas is important in providing training for foreign agriculturists, supplying technical assistance and helping devise agricultural development strategy.

Recommendation No. 5. AID should utilize more fully USDA's expertise in such fields as price policies, marketing as related to local surpluses, and foreign trade and development of country agricultural strategy in the LDCs.

PART II

II. Participant Training

Appendix V to the general agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development deals with the training of foreign nationals. This appendix outlines responsibilities of the Department and AID in the planning and execution of technical cooperation training projects referred to the Department by AID. The carrying out of these responsibilities constitutes and effective contribution to the execution of the program of AID in and for the cooperating country involved.

The appendix outlines responsibilities of the Department and responsibilities of AID. How well these responsibilities have been carried out is detailed in Attachment #5 and 6. Attachment #5 shows nature, quantity, quality and cost of services provided. In summary, it can be stated that both the Department and AID have performed well in the development and implementation of training programs.

This excellent performance is substantiated by a study of PARs submitted from the field. For example the PAR for PASA project in Brazil on Establishment of Nationwide Market News Service stated: "Participants were satisfactority trained in the U. S. during the limited time available. Most all of the training was done by the same agency and by the same people which provided the benefits of cumulative experience. The trained participants upon their return were especially useful in assuming charge of new offices in Brazil and initiating the new service".

AID should continue to utilize the resources of USDA in programming all AID-UN agricultural participants. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Universities in 1950 officially requested that a division in the Department of Agriculture be established to organize and coordinate the training of foreign participants in the field of agriculture. This long-established partnership, combining academic and field training and involving the entire U. S. agricultural community, educational institutions, USDA, agri-business organizations, and farmers, provides an effective combination for quality training of foreign agriculturalists.

How Evaluation Made

This evaluation of the quality of training has been made through study of evaluation reports of participants (USDA); evaluation studies made by American University (DETRI); follow-up reports of Office of International Training; personal interviews of staff members of the technical bureaus (NESA, Africa, Latin America, and East Asia); and technicians returning from field assignments.

The general impression is that the training programs, technical and nontechnical, have been highly satisfactory and relevant to the needs of the less-developed countries.

While there may be some question of the real value of evaluations based on questionnaires of the participants themselves, a supporting measure of the high quality of the training received is indicated in the 418 follow-up reports (1968) showing that 83% of 69,696 participants are utilizing their training and only 5% are not utilizing their training.

It should be noted that this follow-up report covers all areas of participant activity.

In few instances in the interviews with staff members of the technical bureaus and with returning AID field technicians was there any question concerning the high quality of the participant training. In most cases there were positive statements of the highest regard for the fine quality of the training and specific cases cited to support these opinions.

Weakness at Mission Level

A consensus of opinions expressed in the interviews with AID field technicians, technical bureau staff members, and USDA training staff indicates that the greatest weakness in the total participant program is in the conception of the program and in the implementation of the Manual Orders (MOs 1380-90) relative to training at the mission level.

Examples of mission-level weaknesses are:

1. Status of the technical assistance project for which training is recommended -- the project may be well established, partly firm or only in a formative state.
2. Communication with and cooperation from the host government and the specific division or entity involved in the project.
3. Readiness and capability of host government releasing a potential participant.
4. Limitations of previous training -- candidates not qualified.
5. Vulnerability to less effective and even inappropriate selection (tribal or political).
6. Poorly prepared PIO/Ps.
7. Turnover in technicians and training officers in missions resulting in lack of continuity and follow through.

8. PAR for PASA project in Brazil on Agricultural Economic Planning and Analysis stated: "AID policy of allowing selection of trainees only from the Ministry of Agriculture (for this project), when qualified career agricultural economists in the Ministry of Agriculture are practically nil, has restricted the usefulness of the training program for long-range institutional building purposes".

Proposed FY 1969 USDA PASP Program

And Comparative FY 1968 Figures

AGENCY	FY 1968	TRAINING TARGET (Figures given Agency)	FY 1969 USDA Submission	AID Proposed Level
USDA	1,635.0 1/	1,465.0	1,471.4	1,416.0
ARS	172.3	158.0	170.2	159.2
ERS	56.5	31.6	31.6	31.6
FAS	95.0	97.4	97.4	88.9
FES	121.1	100.8	97.7	97.7
FS	136.6	100.2	106.1	100.0
FHA	131.5	121.2	103.4	103.4
IADS	682.0	626.8	626.8	595.0
SCS	111.7	103.0	110.4	112.4
SRS	43.0	44.0	44.0	44.0
Other (6 services)	85.5	82.4	83.8	83.8

1/Only $1,597,997 obligated

To Transfer Costs

Costs to AID of the training program appear to be fair and reasonable. (See Attachments #7 and #8). However, the AID/USDA training budget could be reduced by an estimated $300,000 per year if the recommendation immediately below is adopted. (This would place field service training costs on the USAID country missions where they properly should be).

Recommendation No. 6. The costs of training by USDA agencies, now financed in the AID/Washington budget, should be (a) determined as a separate item by USDA, (b) made available to USAID Missions, and (c) funded under the PIO/P in order to distribute costs to Missions in direct relation to the volume of participant training arranged and conducted. (Now being implemented.)

Graduate Level Training

Recommendation No. 7. AID/W and USDA should assume jointly the initiative to insure that thesis research, in training programs at the academic graduate level, should be focused on urgent home-country problems, starting with a few carefully selected pilot cases in order to assess the feasibility and comparative costs.

The development of theses based on U.S. data therefore should be discouraged and arrangements worked out to make it possible for participants to write thesis at home or on home-country data. Arrangements must provide either more travel funds for the participant or utilizing the land-grant college working in participant's home country or travel for the advisor or a combination of the above. (Ford Foundation work in Latin America could serve as a model. The possibilities of utilizing PL 480 research funds and of cooperating with worldwide research projects should be considered).

Benefits of such thesis studies include: greater involvement of the

home country in planning and accomplishing the training as well as in the problems needing solutions; demonstration of research techniques applicable to related home-country problems; and increased assurance that the U.S. training and participant will be utilized productively.

Staff for In-Country Training

Recommendation No. 8. USDA should make selected staff available to stimulate the establishment and implementation of intensive in-country training in fields having special significance for mission projects. Selected former participants would be fully utilized in planning and conducting such training and in follow-up. Benefits include: focus training more sharply on country needs and conditions and mission goals; reinforce former participants' multiplier efforts and prestige; provide vivid patterns for subsequent training programs; assist in identifying the more promising individuals who have the potential to profit from further training in the U.S.; and other benefits.

Suggested Improvements

Recommendation No. 9. AID/W should use sharper discernment and exercise stronger control than heretofore in approval of mission requests from some countries for training in some fields of agriculture. These mission selections often result from strict project-oriented training and could be corrected through shifting priorities in selecting participants and by better manpower planning. The combined inputs of USDA and literally hundreds of cooperators over more than 20 years, a significant proportion of which have served without pay, deserve in-depth studies in selected countries of (a) utilization of previous training, and (b) realistic needs for further training in the same fields. These studies of manpower needs should include availability of nationals who have gained U.S. or other country training in the same fields through non-AID sponsorships.

Recommendation No. 10. Action, such as pointed out below, should be taken to promote greater understanding and appreciation between missions on the one hand and OIT, USDA and training cooperators on the other of the different priorities, operating procedures and problems and other urgencies in co-operating countries and in the USA. Overcome shortcomings in communication regarding training between the field and USA through such means as: visits to cooperating countries by PDOs; more productive contacts with returning AID technicians; more emphasis on training and training problems in the orientation of outgoing mission directors; technicians (project advisers) and training officers; more productive mission conferences with returning participants; and more selective rotations or exchange of staff.

Recommendation No. 11. Under AID/IT leadership follow-up procedures should be strengthened. This should involve an annual reporting by participants for 5 years after return home on significant accomplishments, and how their U.S. training has been helpful. AID should also involve USDA and OIT personnel in on-the-spot follow-up studies of the effectiveness of U.S. training.

Recommendation No. 12. AID and USDA should give more effective interpretation of the relation between U.S. training and the many other inputs concerned with agricultural and rural development. Conduct two or more case studies of the correlation of successful and unsuccessful U.S. training with rates of progress in the AID-country projects which sponsored the training. Besides revealing the importance of participant selection, program design, and effective follow-up, these studies should

also produce criteria for more extensive studies on selection and utilization which USDA and cooperators feel must be made.

Recommendation No. 13. The USDA technical evaluation of participant training should be strengthened. This can be done through: (a) increased use of the trainer's report which is completed by trainer and sent to the participant's next training location; (b) mid-program reviews to point up omissions and needed experiences; (c) assistance needs to be given university contacts and the USDA field staff in conducting a useful evaluation at the conclusion of training in each training location.

Budget Support

Recommendation No. 14. Provide USDA with the budget support required to develop and carry out the volume and high quality of U.S training needed in accomplishing AID's technical assistance programs. This must include equitable training fees for cooperators, realistic staffing including continuous evaluation, and sufficient travel funds to assure the supervision and reinforcement of participants and cooperators in their accomplishment of training objectives prescribed by missions. (Travel funds in the USDA training budget should be increased to permit all USDA training staff to perform domestic travel a minimum of 30 days each year. Purpose of travel is to monitor training programs and increase effectiveness of training).

Recommendation No. 15. Missions should clearly identify participant(s), through informal communication,who are sponsored for justifiable reasons not strictly related to a specific technical project (e.g., special favor, political, etc.). Failure to do so has resulted in AID/W-USDA planning and conduct of U. S. experiences to which such participants cannot respond and almost certain dissatisfaction for both participant and training cooperators. The mission's true objective is not accomplished.

Recommendation No. 16. AID should increase the insurance coverage required

for participants. The inadequacy of insurance coverage provided AID participants calls for broader and more liberal provisions than presently in effect. Numerous cases arise each year in which expenses incident to illnesses and injuries far exceed the maximum protection afforded by the present policy. The policy amount should be raised to at least $2,000 and should also contain provisions to protect cooperating employers (trainers) against injury suits which might be brought by participants.

Recommendation No. 17. AID should simplify budgetary process for USDA training funds whereby lengthy negotiations would be unnecessary. One suggested procedure would be to provide funds for the upcoming fiscal year on the basis of the cost of the work performed in the previous fiscal year or on the projected workload.

Recommendation No. 18. AID should provide a way to transfer balances in PIO/Ps from a given country to cover small deficits in other projects from the same country. Or, as an alternative, the USDA training budget should contain a line item which could be used for this purpose. Or AID should establish procedures which would permit USDA to utilize PIO/P surpluses to pay deficits -- on a worldwide basis.(This would eliminate the cost of going back to the mission for additional funds to cover small red balances, say $200 or less). USDA(FAS) should have authority to transfer funds and should notify the missions but would not require their prior approval.

RecommendationNo. 19. Procedures should be tightened up to reduce the number of participants arriving without adequate lead time for programming. A high percentage of AID participants arrive with less lead time than required for good programming. (It is generally conceded that a minimum of 90 days lead time is essential.)

Changes Requested

Recommendation No. 20. The professional society membership program financed by AID should be discontinued. The percentage of returned participants who drop their membership after the three-year expiration date is high. Mission advisors report lack of funds and interest as reasons for failure to renew.

Recommendation No. 21. AID should reduce the number of different perdiem rates for participants while in the United States. This would substantially decrease the workload and reduce confusion. (One suggestion is that only three rates be used -- one for travel status, one for nonacademic training for 30 days or more in one location, and a third rate for participants while enrolled in academic status.)

Recommendation No. 22. AID should place increased emphasis on selection of participants concerned with political, legislative and policy decisions, and with marketing. When political leaders and administrators participate in training programs tailored for them, it usually results in a better selection of participants from their countries in the technical field. Increased production of wheat, rice, and other agricultural products makes the need for marketing training more acute. The marketing training should include storage, insect and rodent control, and related fields.

Recommendation No. 23. AID should look into the possibility of providing funds for wives to accompany participants on programs of one year or more. This would apply largely to participants who are enrolled or stationed in one location. Many older, more influential participants who now decline U.S. training opportunities would be attracted under

this arrangement. The wife would also be a factor in the participant's understanding of the American way of life and its interpretation in the less-developed countries.

Suggestions for Alternate Training Sources

Some suggestions have been made for changes in procedures in the AID agricultural participant program such as:

a. Combine AID/IT and USDA/Foreign Training Division in one office; and

b. AID/IT should contract directly with universities for academic training.

The evaluation group has rejected both of these suggestions on the basis that they would neither reduce costs nor increase efficiency, and that "b" above would create a multitude of individual and separate administrative problems.

PART III

III. PASAs:

Participating Agency Service Agreements (PASAs) are the vehicle whereby AID draws upon USDA technical and scientific resources for resident and short-term advisors and for researchers to work with counterparts in developing countries. In fiscal year 1968 about 400 USDA specialists served on long- and short-term USDA/AID technical assistance assignments (see Attachment No. 20).[1/] The PASA approach enables AID to utilize the variety and depth of Department expertise in support of AID agricultural development programs (see Attachments Nos. 22 and 23).

The PASA is simply a form by which AID procures USDA services. Because the services are varied, many different PASA forms are used. However, large or small, the PASA approach permits the channeling of appropriate technicians and technical backstopping by the full resources of the Department.

The efforts and programs of these men were coordinated with approximately 475 direct hire and 475 university contract men who are currently working in agriculture in the various AID missions of the world (see Attachment No. 9).

The PASA approach enables AID to mobilize the vast variety and array of Department expertise, bringing them to bear on particular problems. Once in the field, USDA personnel receive technical backstopping from their respective agencies in Washington, such as ARS, SCS and FS, in the form of advice, short visits by agency specialists to deal with particular problems, and published materials.

[1/] 273 were resident technicians and 138 were short-term.

The task force on AID/USDA PASAs has tried to determine how effective PASAs have been in reaching established goals as well as how USDA's full resources can best be utilized in support of AID's International Agricultural Development program.

Evaluation Methods Employed

Reports of more than three years' experience were examined, PIO/Ts were studied, and dozens of men from both AID and USDA were interviewed. It was planned to use the PAR submissions from the various missions as a means to determine how well goals were met, adherence to time schedules, problems encountered, and other questions the steering committee felt should be explored. However, PARs have been slow coming in from the field, so more reliance had to be placed on other sources of information. Summary of PARs available for evaluation has been prepared showing effectiveness of PASA personnel in supporting AID programs (see Attachment No. 10).

Several countries were selected for in-depth study. These are thought to be fairly representative of a cross section of all PASAs as far as size, operation, effectiveness and such factors are concerned (see Attachments Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18).

The vast majority of material examined, as well as information gleaned from interviews, indicates that overall the PASAs have made a worthwhile contribution to the efforts of AID.

In most cases the objectives were understood, host government response was good, timetables were met to the extent reasonably to be expected, and relations of the two agencies were good. Examination of the reports of PASAs selected for in-depth study will bear this out.

However "soft spots" were noticed where improvements can be made. In areas where these improvements can readily be realized, recommendations are made which possibly could bring more effective operation of the program.

It should not be construed that all these points represent areas which would be rated as "unsatisfactory." This is definitely not the case since many of them deal with items where improvements as a result of three years' experience with the USDA/PASA program can be realized with a minimum of effort to make what may well be a satisfactory program even better.

PASA Personnel

Personnel selected have been quite satisfactory when considered across the board. Some men have done an outstanding job, others average, and a few less than satisfactory. The overall performance is considered to be on a par with direct-hire personnel.

Some difficulty was indicated in getting top-level men away from their jobs to take an overseas assignment on a regular tour. (USDA needs longer lead time in order to obtain better men for these positions.) AID feels that they have been more successful in securing such men on a special or short-term basis.

At least a part of those who did not do an acceptable job received unfavorable notice during orientation before they went overseas. Provisions might be considered to select out these men during orientation.

Some Regional offices indicated that recruiting by USDA from outside their own ranks results in less effective backstopping of the individual agency programs within the PASA. This type of recruitment

(done in a few instances) also provides less incentive to perform well since personnel are not being watched by men who will be their supervisors or working with them after the PASA assignment is completed.

USDA indicates that men who have completed their tours or for some other reason returned to the States have been placed to their mutual satisfaction.

Orientation (see Attachment No. 19) has been satisfactory although a few expressed the opinion that the program conducted in Florida for the Vietnam personnel was too basic and longer than necessary. This portion of the orientation program has now been shifted to Hawaii.

There appears to be divided opinion on the value of a longer language training period although nearly all of the trainees consider this to be useful.

There is a real need to discover a way to convey to the men a means of converting from the Stateside "operational" (doer) role to the "advisory" (developer) role performed overseas. As more and more USDA men gain overseas experience, time may very well solve this problem.

Key Elements of a Successful PASA

Each of the country PASAs studied in some depth demonstrated the value of this form of technical assistance in support of AID's agricultural development programs. Among the key elements of a successful PASA experience, as viewed by AID and USDA, are the following:

1. Initiation of the PASA by a joint effort of AID and USDA. This was done in Vietnam by involving the principals in

both agencies at the highest level; it was done in India and three Latin American countries by having USDA participate in AID-sponsored survey teams studying the agricultural development needs of each country.

2. Maintenance of a close working relationship between AID and USDA technicians and involving USDA personnel in AID program development for agricultural sector. This was done in Vietnam where the USDA Chief-of-Party also served as Deputy RDO in the Mission; in India, the SCS team and its leader fill the role of soils and water management branch in the Mission's agriculture division; in El Salvador and Paraguay the PASA team worked closely with RDO and other Mission personnel in country program development.

3. Include in the PIO/T a provision and a budget for handling TDYs from anywhere in USDA in support of the resident team. This was used effectively in Vietnam and in three Latin American countries. El Salvador, particularly, made valuable use of short-term specialists in support of agricultural research work there.

4. Continuity of effort on agreed-upon programs and projects. In Tunisia as well as Vietnam and the LA countries studied, the agricultural programs covered by the PASA have had a long enough time for effective program development and the building

of indigenous institutional capability. The work on agricultural credit in Brazil and on agricultural research in El Salvador are good examples of this.

5. Periodic program reviews jointly by AID and USDA with flexibility to shift program emphasis to meet changing conditions. In each of the countries studied, there have been periodic consultations on program emphasis with flexibility on USDA's part to phase down, phase up or phase out when changes occur in priorities or in local support.

6. In all of the more successful PASAs there seems to be some common ingredients or factors; namely, that all parties concerned were fully involved during the planning stages, that the Ministry of Agriculture in the host country wanted the PASA and was prepared to support it with budgets and counterparts, and USDA had a better idea of the aims and objectives in relation to the host country problems. Better cooperation and fewer problems are the end product.

PASA Recommendations

Recommendation No. 24. PARs were not prepared for AID/W/WOH research PASAs. Therefore these PASAs should be evaluated by a joint AID/USDA team to determine (a) whether they should continue in force, (b) be reduced or enlarged in scope, and/or (c) if they are on schedule and, if not, what steps are necessary to assure that goals and objectives

will be met. (The evaluation team was of the opinion that this type PASA required special appraisal due to the amounts of money and numbers of personnel involved as well as research subjects covered. Also, unlike mission PASAs, there are no Mission Directors, Program Officers or Rural Development Officers available for regular supervision, evaluation and monitoring.) (See Attachment No. 21)

Recommendation No. 25. The task force found evidence that there was inadequate monitoring of the research PASAs. Consideration should be given to ways of improving the necessary monitoring, including the question of staff for doing so.

Recommendation No. 26. Visits to PASA teams in the field, scheduled by USDA backstopping personnel, should be included as a line item in the PASA on an annual basis. (It is assumed that the specific purposes and content of these visits would be planned well in advance in order to make the trips as useful as possible. PASAs should provide for technical backstopping by TDY from any USDA agency in support of any resident team, i.e., a "draw account" on the Department's total resources.)

Recommendation No. 27. Items of work requiring either field or Washington time of USDA personnel (not covered in the PASA) should be charged to the PASA -- by required amendment and not charged to TC&S. However, PASAs should provide for minor changes in budget or program without requiring Mission approval of amendments (to avoid undue time and cost in making minor adjustments). (Time of regular full-time TC&S staff could be charged to TC&S or to the PASA -- of course there would be no double charge. Other USDA personnel specifically recruited for a PASA assignment should be charged to the PASA.)

Recommendation No. 28. The procedure established in the PA Handbook on making reports should be followed more scrupulously to provide comparability between PASAs and continuity over time. This would facilitate use of the

reports as a tool of evaluation.

Reproduction of worthy reports and distribution to other missions where they might have application are recommended. (It is not the intent of this recommendation to initiate any more reports than those required and those which will be used -- current reports, including the PAR, do not provide enough timely information to permit periodic evaluation reviews or progress reports.)

Recommendation No. 29. Many of the problems encountered in PASA operation appear to stem from lack of understanding of the procedures or regulations of each agency. The regulations are all in the AID Manual but it is a major operation to sort them out. It is recommended that those Manual Orders pertaining to PASAs be pulled out and consolidated into a handbook for ready reference for use of AID/W and AID Missions. (USDA has done this and their handbook could very well be used as a guide.) (Under active consideration by A/DSM.)

Recommendation No. 30. Some method or technique in orientation should be sought which will be more effective in preparing men who are new to overseas work for the advisory (developer) role in which they will find themselves as opposed to the operational (doer) role which they have been trained to play.

Recommendation No. 31. Funding should be provided and an agreement reached whereby AID direct hire and USDA PASA personnel receive the same backstopping from USDA, especially in the handling of materials sent to the field and requests for information coming from the field. Closer association of PASA personnel in the field with direct-hire

staff should be encouraged -- with the possibility of exchange of personnel for Washington and Mission assignments.

Recommendation No. 32. Goals for impact-type or short-term projects should be planned so that they will be integrated into the long-range, overall country program.

Recommendation No. 33. Greater effort should be made by AID and USDA field personnel to assure host country support of each program/project undertaken. (PIO/T funding for training counterparts of PASA technicians.)

Recommendation No. 34. AID and USDA should do more to assure continuity on each project or program. Better records and report keeping would provide continuity where changes of personnel have made this difficult. (Continuity is essential in building indigenous institutional capability in LDCs.)

Recommendation No. 35. To improve partnership relations:

1. USDA should have greater involvement in program development and program review at both Mission and Washington level, and
2. Joint training/retraining seminars should be initiated for USDA technicians and AID agricultural personnel returning from resident overseas assignments.

Recommendation No. 36. World-wide/or regional technical assistance PASAs should be developed to provide assistance at Mission as well as Washington level in programs of increasing importance (see Attachment No. 25):

1. Public policy and program administration in agriculture;
2. Marketing -- including new supply and demand problems; and
3. Agricultural sector program planning.

(See Attachment No. 24 for summary of existing research, short-term and world-wide PASAs.)

PART IV

IV. Technical Cooperation and Support

Background

The technical consultation and support activities are covered under the General Agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development. This agreement continues and clarifies the framework for cooperative relationships between the U. S. Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development.

Under this agreement TC&S is defined as follows: "Technical consultation support services cover any service in support of the foreign assistance program which cannot be characterized as a project or staff service and which is normally performed in the U. S. on a continuing basis. Such support services may include the furnishing of technical information and advice, backstopping of project services in the field, assistance in recruiting technical experts and the provision of training and procurement services in the fields of competence of the Department, in accordance with Appendices III, IV, and V of the Agreement."

The group, in carrying out its directive to study and evaluate TC&S activities, was guided by a series of questions focusing on the critical issues of this activity. They consider the definition as it appears above; the types of requests received from AID; the activities carried out by the USDA; the relationship of the latter two to the budget; and, finally, an evaluation of the services requested by AID and furnished by USDA. They also attempted to consider the USDA-AID partnership relationship called for under the agreement, and the role of TC&S in implementing the relationship. (See attachments No. 33 and No. 36.)

This study was made by referring the types of services furnished by USDA to the AID bureaus for comment, by internal discussions within USDA with the various services receiving funds, and meetings with representative USDA services. (See attachment #31.)

The resources of the Department are organized in 18 agencies which have more than 27,000 scientists, technicians and professional personnel who carry out the Department's programs. Under existing policies and directives, each of these Services and their employees is available to AID to provide technical consultative assistance. Many of these professionals are now serving, or have served, overseas as technical consultants on resident and short-term assignments.

Scope of Work

During FY 1968, TC&S services were provided by 12 agencies of the USDA. The largest increment was rendered by IADS, with ERS, ARS and FAS comprising other major contributors. Currently the relationship remains the same except for ARS, whose activities were mainly transferred from TC&S to project service financing. (See attachment No. 33.)

The diverse nature of the activities provided is grouped under the following sub-categories: (See attachment #37)

a. Professional PASA Support -- which covers the planning, recruiting and other supporting services undertaken prior to the actual initiation of the PASA, or subsequent to the termination of the project.

b. General Technical Inquiries -- which provides for the servicing of technical inquiries from AID/W personnel, AID/Missions, LDC representatives and other related foreign assistance program inquiries.

c. Reports, Publications and Special Services -- which covers the preparation of special reports, publications, and other material of a continuing nature. (Some of these activities meet the criteria of project services and might be considered for separate PASA funding.)

In addition to the above activities, IADS is performing the planning, evaluating and directing functions of the USDA/AID technical assistance program. The role is specifically prescribed in paragraph III of the General Agreement. However, functionally, it doesn't fit into the definition's sub-categories outlined above. During the past few years, this role has increased as a reflection of the growing departmental involvement in technical assistance which has more than doubled in the past decade.[1/] Planning for the increasing departmental resources committed to technical assistance, increasing participation in the review and evaluation of country and regional program proposals, and performing the departmental "self-help" responsibilities have all contributed to the increase of this TC&S activity. As the Department's role in foreign assistance increases, the need for forward planning grows commensurately so that USDA can make its expertise available without disrupting domestic programs and with fewer delays in assigning men overseas.

These above activities when added to the more typical Professional PASA Support role of the Regional Coordinators, information and publication role of the IADS Information Service Group result in IADS accounting for approximatley one-half of the Department's TC&S budget. (See attachment #34)

[1/] See Attachment No. 26.

The Economic Research Service (ERS) because of its activities dealing with foreign agricultural economies and trade policies, world production and distribution of farm products, and outlook for specific commodities is called upon to serve the foreign assistance program. Because of this competency, AID has requested them to undertake special and continuing studies dealing with agriculture and food production indicies in the LDCs, and to prepare supply utilization data for a number of commodities in developing countries. These two special reports account for more than half of the services it renders under TC&S. In most ways, these requests meet the criteria of specificity established for project services, as did similar activities which were transferred from TC&S financing during FY 1969 (ARS, Plant Material and Soil Salinity projects; IADS, Nutrition and High Protein Group). The remaining ERS activities cover PASA support, including economic intelligence briefing for departing technicians, PASA and direct-hire technicians, responding to ad hoc inquiries and a growing involvement in country program reviews.

FAS performs management support (budget, fiscal, procurement, personnel, etc.) servcices for IADS in its role as departmental coordinator of USDA/AID technical assistance program. In addition, TC&S finances certain departmental advisory and supporting services (travel arrangements, cable room facilities, arranging for medical clearances, etc.) for personnel assigned overseas under the AID programs. These activities were formerly financed by AID administrative funds which have been discontinued.

In the other USDA agencies, services provided involved minimum fixed staff, not exceeding the equivalent of two professionals. In most

instances, the same individuals serve the TC&S, Training and PASA program and their expenses are allocated accordingly.

Proposed FY 1969 USDA PASP Program and
Comparative FY 1968 Figures
(in thousands of dollars)

TC&S

AGENCY	FY 1968	TARGET (Figures Given Agency)	FY 1969 USDA Submission
USDA	965.0	765.0	762.0
ARS	141.0	23.5	23.5
ERS	131.7	135.0	135.0
FAS	74.7	76.5	76.5
FES	42.3	39.3	45.0
FS	34.1	34.4	34.9
FHA	8.4	8.6	8.6
IADS	479.6	392.7	392.3
SCS	22.8	23.4	16.0
SRS	25.0	25.6	25.6
Other (3 Services)	5.4	5.5	4.6

The $762,000 in the submitted FY 1969 budget for TC&S covers approximately 644 man months or about 53.5 man years. The allocation for man months is as follows:

135.3 for providing pre- and post-PASA support;

129.9 for general technical inquiries; and

378.4 for reports, publications and special services.

(See attachments Nos. 26, 27 and 28 for further breakdown.)

Approximately 52 percent of the budgeted man months is for support of IADS (TC&S, not including training).

AID is financing 97 positions in IADS -- 28.5 in IADS (TC&S), 20 supported by PASAs and 48.5 in training.

IADS Positions

	Number
Administrator's Office	
Administrator 1/	1 (vacant)
Deputy Administrator	1
Secretaries	3 (1 vacant)
Assistants to the Administrator	2
Secretaries	2
Information Group	
Information Specialists	2.5
Technical Information Assistant	1 (vacant)
Secretaries	2
Regional Coordinator Offices	
Africa	
Regional Coordinator	1
Program Analysts	2
Secretaries	2
Asia	
Regional Coordinator	1 (vacant)
Program Analysts	3 (1 vacant)
Secretaries	3 (1 vacant)
Latin America	
Regional Coordinator	1
Secretary	1
Total	28.5

1/ Acting Administrator

PASAs	Number	
Regional Coordinator's Office for Latin America		
Country Officers 1/	3	
Secretaries	2	
Nutrition and High Protein Group		
Food Scientists	2	
Program Analyst	1	
Secretaries	2	
Regional Coordinator's Office for Asia		
Country Officer	1	
Secretary	1	
Agriculture Economics PASA		
Agriculture Economists 2/	5	
Statistical Clerks	2	
Secretary	1	
Total		20
TRAINING		
Director	1	
Assistant Director	1	
Branch Chiefs	4	
Program Support Coordinator	1	
Program Specialists	12.5	
Evaluation Specialist	1	
Fiscal and Administrative Personnel	6	
Secretaries	22	
Total		48.5

Presently the Budget and Finance Office of USDA and the PROC/PAS Office of AID are working on the preparation of an FY 1969 budget for TC&S support. As part of its preparation USDA has submitted detailed work assignments for the 28.5 IADS positions.[3/] Until these are reviewed it might be unwise for the evaluation panel to make many specific recommendations.

1/ Carried as line items in various resident LA PASAs. Assist Regional Coordinator in carrying out functions of his office.

2/ Three in Vietnam; two in Washington.

3/ For resume of function of the various IADS professional positions see pages 6 thru 13 of attachment 34.

Numerous discussions have brought out AID criticisms of costs in IADS for such items as Technical Inquiries, Publications and Reports, and Self-help. The functional breakdown of TC&S financing is shown below -- to bring into sharper focus the budget figures and to show the relatively small amounts set aside for supporting these activities.

Functional Breakout of TC&S Financing
of
International Agricultural Development Service

PASA Support	$220,000
Technical Inquiries	25,000
Publications and Reports	20,000
Special Projects 1/	32,000
Policy and Program Direction	52,000
Self-help 2/	45,000
Total	$394,000 3/

1/ Examples of subjects of special projects carried out in support of USDA/AID programs (PASA, TC&S and Training) include:

Relating economic growth and imports of LDCs, training needs of LDCs, world rice market situation, legislative proposals, program memoranda review and miscellaneous papers.

Rough estimates indicate that on an average IADS professionals financed by TC&S are working a 50- to 55-hour week on all activities, including special projects.

2/ Total Self-help activity in IADS approximates $75,000. $30,000 of this level is financed by PASAs such as Latin America Country Officer line items.

3/ This figure is the amount requested.

IADS Evaluation Considerations

It would appear that the IADS TC&S role should be evaluated in the light of the following considerations:

a. Both USDA and AID were directed to establish "appropriate channels for contacts within their subdivisions." IADS performs this function for USDA. While lines of communication do exist there has been no formal designation by AID.

b. This aspect of IADS serves to coordinate and direct the entire USDA involvement in the foreign assistance (training, TC&S and PASAs), which has been increasing. Perhaps this general function should be considered as an overhead against the total USDA program of $9.6 million and not solely a TC&S activity. Effort should be made to identify that portion of its work related to PASAs and offsetting adjustments could be made in overhead charges and TC&S.

c. The USDA, and particularly IADS, has undertaken new and expanded roles in support of the foreign assistance programs. Questions have been raised with AID as to whether these activities should be charged to AID, or whether they should be financed by the USDA as part of its contribution to the foreign assistance activity. (This work has been concentrated particularly in self-help proposals required by PL 480. Determination of USDA role should be based on consideration of the legislative intent of Section 109 of PL 480 as amended.)

Recommendation No. 37. The man years allotted to training appear to be reasonable and should not be reduced as long as the participant workload

remains at the project FY 1969 level. (Workload can be found in attachments #5 and #8.)

Recommendation No. 38. The man years allotted to the Information Group should be removed from the TC&S budget and funded through a Washington PASA. (This would not result in any savings but would remove a service from TC&S which can be set up and controlled as a project so there can be better understanding of the work to be done. This work can be consistent with the definition of projects. The 1968 Work Report of the Information Services Group is included in this evaluation as (#29 and #30); this material could serve as the basis for job descriptions, fund allotment and other information needed to describe this activity as a project service (PASA) which can be specifically defined in terms of planned end results, estimated costs, location of implementation and duration.)

Recommendation No. 39. The four Country Officers, financed under PASAs, and the five program analysts, financed under TC&S, should be funded from one source. An in depth study on budget procedures should be initiated to study alternative methods of funding.

Recommendation No. 40. Because planning and implementing programs in a Foreign Country differs from programming for projects in the U. S., it is recommended that resident foreign service experience be considered in filling positions in IADS at policy making and administrative levels.

One aspect of TC&S service that has declined is the provision of refresher training to returning AID agricultural technicians on home leave. This service is highly valued by many AID technicians who can use this opportunity to update their specialty by visiting with their USDA

counterparts. If this service is to be reinstated on a regular basis, AID should advise USDA of the numbers and specialties to be involved for the forthcoming year.

Because of this changing complexion, it was felt that it would be extremely beneficial to circulate among AID staff a description of the USDA services, their roles and responsibilities under the foreign assistance program.

Recommendation No. 41. Periodically AID personnel should be informed of the services that are available in USDA.

Recommendation No. 42. To assure better service from TC&S, Missions and PASA teams should be informed that all technical inquiries should be more specific and in greater detail.

Recommendation No. 43. Certain definable activities currently performed under TC&S should be considered for project funding. Examples are ERS activities in Production Indices and Commodity-Supply-Utilization tables or bulletin preparation such as that now financed under TC&S for publications in Extension and Home Economics, and any other activity that can specifically be defined in terms of objectives and end results.

Increased Activity

Based on firsthand knowldege and discussions with USDA-AID personnel the task force concluded that the nature and volume of TC&S activities have changed. Prior to the disbandment of the ICA Food and Agricultural Division in 1961, most inquiries in USDA were received from members of that Division. They received most requests from Missions, local government people and others within the LDCs. These food and agricultural experts

were well acquainted with USDA competence and usually had contacts established in each of the various services.

With the number of AID agricultural specialists decreased and the increasing shift to PASAs, the character of TC&S has changed. Many of the inquiries previously channeled through the Food and Agricultural Division are now submitted directly to the USDA. The number of participants and LDC officials familiar with the Department and its resources has increased markedly. Much of the current TC&S workload is related to supporting PASA activity. (See Attachment #33) Specifically, this can include the efforts related to developing and recruiting PASAs prior to approval. In addition, USDA PASA employees are more prone to call upon the resources and experiences of the other elements of the Department; e.g., a credit man (FHA) may request assistance from range management specialists (SCS). Servicing these cross-agency requests has been charged to TC&S as envisioned under paragraph II, Appendix II to the General Agreement.

This increased activity, which bypasses AID personnel, has contributed to a decreasing awareness of the scope of service rendered.

Recommendation No. 44. USDA should follow the suggested program reporting system to identify the work being performed for AID focusing on significant items undertaken, with some indication of the scope and breadth of *ad hoc* inquiries. It should be USDA routine policy to circulate selected reports to AID Missions to keep them informed of services undertaken as a result of the AID/USDA partnership.

Lack of Understanding

Discussions with AID and USDA personnel show that there was a lack of mutual understanding of the nature and volume of TC&S services. This was

partly attributed to the fact that items chargeable to TC&S, by definition, were those not identified with a training, project or staff service. The USDA, through its Operations Subcommittee, has attempted to develop a common understanding of what should be a legitimate charge against TC&S. This has resulted in differentiating between international programs of the Department furthering the interests of domestic agriculture, and the foreign assistance program of AID, in which the USDA is involved. Some of the AID personnel contacted questioned whether certain activities being charged to TC&S were more properly the responsibilities of the Department. Assuming there was a common understanding at the time the General Agreement was signed; subsequent developments have tended to cloud the interpretation.

The TC&S definition in the General Agreement says that it includes "any service in support of the foreign assistance program which cannot be characterized as a project or staff service and which is normally performed in the U.S. on a continuing basis." This raises questions of intent. Is foreign assistance limited to ongoing AID programs? Shall it include requests from LDCs, former participants, organizations involved in technical assistance programs? The General Agreement, paragraph III, states that:

> "Joint arrangements may be made for: (1) Examining Country Development plans, total U.S. country assistance programs, and, as feasible, those of other entities participating in economic assistance, relevant to the activities the Department might be requested by AID to undertake."

Recommendation No. 45. A definition of TC&S should be agreed to which is fully understood by AID and USDA personnel. The term "foreign assistance program" implies interest in countries where AID programs and U.S.-financed multilateral programs are in operation and where voluntary organizations are

operating under AID financing.

Recommendation No. 46. Better utilization of USDA's information outlets (TV, radio, newspapers, etc.) should become routine policy. Returning agricultural personnel, both PASA and direct hire, should be scheduled for visits to IADs' information section where publicity material can be developed. (It is understood that IADS will carry out actions initiated by this recommendation through regular USDA channels.)

Requests for Technical Information

Requests under TC&S are received from many sources in many ways. Some of them are received in written form, some by telephone calls, and others by personal visits. Many of these requests can be satisfied relatively quickly, and USDA services do not consider them worthy of detailed record keeping. However, the cumulative time can be considerable, especially since they may be directed to any of the Department's professional and technical staff. The cost of necessary recording and recovery of data to substantiate these efforts would probably amount to more than the reimbursements received. There are, however, some requests that are substantial in nature and require days and even weeks to answer. The question then arises as to whether or not there should be a distinction made between the minutiae of small requests and those requiring a considerable amount of time.

Various devices have been suggested to provide a practical and relatively accurate report of workload involved with TC&S. Discussions with AID personnel emphasize the lack of understanding of this problem, with some feeling that services rendered required much less time than reported. A practical recording system supported by reasonable records on larger items requested would be helpful.

Conversely, it was felt that in many instances AID requests were initiated without the requester being aware of the cost of the assignment. This undoubtedly contributed to some of the doubts expressed concerning the time associated with some projects.

The requesting agency should be aware of the work involved in the assignment. Recognizing that it is impractical to "price out" every request it was agreed that a level of significance should be established. Any project that requires a USDA input exceeding this level would be submitted in writing.

An outgrowth of the communication difficulties was the contention that USDA was initiating assistance programs without consulting AID. USDA contended that with the increasing AID dependence on the Department for agricultural expertise, it was only natural for professionals to develop proposals for implementation of the foreign assistance programs. This role is envisioned under the partnership arrangement prescribed by the General Agreement. This is a significant part of the services rendered by any professional organization. AID was concerned that activities undertaken may not represent their assessment of critical program needs. This mutual misunderstanding of the respective roles accentuates the need for clarification of the partnership roles prescribed by the General Agreement.

Recommendation No. 47. Procedures for requesting information and consultation should be somewhat flexible as befits partnership relationship. Requests that are estimated to require a week or more to respond to should be submitted in writing to IADS, which in turn will determine the Service, or Services, within the Department to which they will be directed for action. Requests requiring less than a week of work can be submitted through

WOH/ARDS, IADS, direct to the Service, or to an individual within that Service. Channeling of requests should be encouraged but not made manadatory except in the instance of substantial requests (one week or more). Carbon copies of all replies should be sent to the AID Mission in the country involved. (Procedures to be followed are outlined in the December 15, 1967 letter from Lyle P. Schertz to Members of the Operations Subcommittee -- see Attachment #35.)

Recommendation No. 48. The office in WOH/ARDS (Ruth Lancetti) which records and handles technical inquiries should establish a file and numbering system which encompasses all inquiries -- regardless of who in AID or USDA receives the requests.[1] (This is necessary to provide AID with better statistics on the volume of work performed by TC&S in USDA.)

Partnership and Budget Problems

There may be a tendency on the part of the USDA to broadly interpret the foreign assistance criteria, and probably the reverse tendency on the part of AID personnel to narrow the scope of the activity. This area of indecision highlights a problem raised quite frequently in discussions concerned with AID-USDA organizational interrelationships. Namely, the lack of a central or focal entity within AID with whom program-wide problems and directions might be communicated and resolved. This unit would perform the job and function delineated in the General Agreement similar to those performed by IADS for the USDA.

From the operational aspect, requests are received from all echelons of the AID structure. No effort is made to evaluate or control requests, nor relate them to budgetary resources available.

Similarly, in matters of general policy or administration, it becomes

[1] Participating Agency Notice No. 44, March 12, 1968, on Volume and Source of Inquiries handled for AID, now requests quarterly reports.

extremely difficult to obtain a decision because of the numerous offices within AID that must be dealt with. This situation complicates orderly budgeting and programming, hinders the surfacing of the policy issues requiring decision, and results in multiple methods of dealing with similar issues.

Another problem area is the inclusion of activities under TC&S that are clearly identified with the development or completion of PASA projects. These should be borne by the activity generating the work.

USDA agencies in accordance with the definition have charged to TC&S activities not covered under PASAs. These included both pre- and post-costs. The former included charges for expenses incurred in developing and staffing a PASA prior to approval. In some instances these reflected efforts expended on projects that didn't materialize.

Many returning technicians have been requested to undertake additional work as a result of the specialty and experience gained on their PASA assignment. The activity performed has been charged to TC&S rather than going through the time-consuming experience of requesting an amended or new PASA. While this situation may be unusual, all too often a returning PASA technician finds that he is frequently called upon to act as a consultant while the mission studies or tries to implement recommendations submitted as a result of his assignment. The Department encourages this continuation of contact between returning technician and the mission. It should be recognized that PASA related work usually does not terminate when the USDA technician returns to his regular assignment.

The overhead charges of 7½ percent are insufficient to cover the administrative functions related to short-term PASAs. The costs are comparable to those performed under resident PASAs for which there is a 15 percent overhead charge. This situation results in charging expenses to TC&S that are covered in resident PASAs.

Recommendation No. 49. Overhead charges for short-term PASAs should be at the same rate as charges for resident PASAs.

Department problems in estimating resources needed for AID program activities have been considered. The nature of the activity and the present organizational arrangement make it extremely difficult to forecast the amount of service that will be required. USDA agencies earmark a certain level of man-years for TC&S work based on anticipated AID requests, reflecting previous year's experience. If the level is maintained, agencies do not face problems. However, if the level falls off, and agency cannot reallocate the reserved resources, they face the problems of staff reductions, or violating the intent of Congress, or only partial utilization of staff time. It is felt that AID should pay for resources programmed at the beginning of the year. Adjustments in workload should be reflected in subsequent year programming.

Recommendation No. 50. PASAs should be written to include pre- and post-PASA costs wherever possible. (It is recognized that certain charges cannot be included and should continue under TC&S. Consideration should be given to establishing a minimum amount to be included for

pre-PASA and post-PASA costs, recognizing that while pre-PASA costs are easy to identify at time PASA is signed the post-PASA costs are not.)

Recommendation No. 51. AID-USDA should identify minimum levels of service to be required of the various agencies. Commitments should be approved for the current year and adjusted in the subsequent year, based on actual workload.

Recommendation No. 52. The TC&S activity should be broadened to specifically identify the category of service rendered by IADS (and FAS) including the programming, planning and evaluating, or separate consideration should be given to financing this service as an overhead against the total USDA foreign assistance program. Inclusion under the TC&S categories distorts the entire activity as well as the nature of services provided by IADS.

(For indicators of IADS workload see page 4 of attachment No. 34.)

Self-Help

The USDA, particularly IADS, has undertaken new and expanded roles related to the foreign assistance programs. This work has been particularly concentrated in self-help related with PL 480. Questions have been raised within AID as to whether these activities should be charged to AID, or whether they should be financed by the USDA as part of its administration of PL 480 sales.

USDA undertakes and finances foreign programs such as market development and crop and pest research in foreign countries which are closely related to foreign assistance programs. However, the basic purpose of these programs is to further the objectives of domestic agriculture, and even though they contribute to the objectives of the foreign assistance program, they are departmental responsibility. But there are activities where the line of distinction is somewhat blurred. These activities should be considered in the light of the legislative intent. Questions have been raised as to whether the "self-help" responsibilities performed within the Department by IADS should be considered as a responsibility of USDA or AID or both. The legislative intent of this activity should be considered in establishing program responsibility.

By law, concessional sales agreements must include self-help clauses requiring recipient nations to increase their own contributions to internal development programs, thereby furthering the objectives of foreign assistance rather than domestic agriculture. Within USDA, IADS has been charged with responsibility for carrying out this activity. However, since they receive no appropriation directly, the costs have been borne by the AID activity financing the staff involved in rendering the service.

The proposal that USDA should participate in the government-wide effort in support of the U.S. foreign assistance program without charge was considered. The Department outlined the specific directives received from the Agricultural Appropriation Committees over the years concerning the financing of foreign assistance programs. These committees clearly expressed the view that they expect USDA agencies to receive a full reimbursement for services provided AID. Diversion of funds provided for domestic agricultural programs chould result in severe action by the committees. (See attachment #32)

Within the USDA, IADS was charged to carry out this activity. However they do not receive any dollar appropriation directly so therefore the work was automatically charged to AID/TC&S in that this funds IADS. (Self-help clauses are included in concessional sales agreements and require recipient nations to increase their own contributions to their internal development programs, thereby furthering the objectives of foreign assistance rather than domestic agriculture.)

Recommendation No. 53. An AID/USDA Committee should be established to study the responsibilities, duties and obligations of the partnership members in self-help related to PL 480. This committee should make an evaluation of the job which needs to be done, who should do it and how the costs should be financed.

Recommendation No. 54. A number of recommendations call for new or increased services to be performed by USDA on behalf of AID programs. It is recommended that a joint AID-USDA study group review these proposals in order to determine costs and to assess whether, on the basis of costs and benefits, AID wishes USDA to follow through on them.

General Conclusions

The TC&S type of activity has been beneficial to U.S. agricultural foreign assistance. The services provided by USDA were reasonably prompt, of good quality, and accurate. Some of the services could be obtained from other sources such as agricultural colleges, FAO and commercial concerns. However, the USDA is the most practical and convenient source of these services, and the working arrangements between USDA and AID should be continued. (See attachment #36)

In summary, the principle underlying the present agreement with AID and the USDA on TC&S is sound. This agreement makes available to AID the expertise of the USDA in the areas of agricultural technical advice and consultation. It furnishes a broad spectrum of competence that is available to AID and its personnel whether they are located in the U.S. or abroad. The USDA is, in the main, U.S.-oriented, although this is changing. Department personnel, in responding to requests, should take into consideration the geography, climate, and conditions of the locations where the information will be utilized. The U.S. technicians must further adapt skills and knowledge to the particular situation in the LDC where assigned.

ATTACHMENTS - SECTION I

To the Evaluation Report of the
General Agreement Between the
USDA and AID
March, 1969

Table of Contents

Copy of the General Agreement Between USDA and AID

Attachment	Number of Pages
No. 1 - Part USDA Plays in AID's Agricultural Operations	One
No. 2 - Functions Performed by Selected Agencies of USDA	Four
No. 3 - Selected Categories of USDA Professional Employees	One
No. 4 - Job Description for Proposed AID/USDA Coordinating Officer	Three
No. 5 - Discussion of Major Issues - Training	Thirty-two
No. 6 - Evaluation of Performance Under General Agreement - Training	Sixty-three
No. 7 - FY 1969 PASP Primary Participant Cost Analysis	One
No. 8 - Participant Workload Data for FY 68 and FY 69	Two
No. 9 - Numbers of Direct Hire, Contract and PASA Agricultural Technicians	One
No. 10- Evaluation of PARs Submitted by USAIDs	Eleven
No. 11- Summary Statement of Nigeria PASA	Six
No. 12- Summary Statement of India PASA	Seven
No. 13- Summary Statement of Tunisia PASA	Nineteen
No. 14- Summary Statement of Vietnam PASA	Eleven
No. 15- Summary Statement of Major Cereals in Africa PASA	Five

GENERAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

I. Purpose

This Agreement establishes the framework for cooperative relationships between the Department of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the Department) and the Agency for International Development (hereinafter referred to as A.I.D.) in carrying out the provisions of Section 632(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

II. Underlying Premises

The building of the human and institutional resources essential to sustained national development of the less developed societies is a long-term, complex and exacting process. Effective U.S. assistance to this process requires a vigorous technical assistance program, demanding the use of the best professional skills and institutional resources available in the United States. The U.S. has a vital interest in the attitudes, skills, motivation and well-being of the people of the developing countries, and in the characteristics of the institutions they build, for these are the factors which ultimately determine the nature of their developing societies.

A.I.D. recognizes the unique personnel resources, capabilities and experience of the Department relevant to this task; it seeks through this agreement, therefore, to enlist as fully and effectively as possible, on a partnership basis, the pertinent resources of the Department in planning, executing and evaluating those portions of the foreign assistance program in which it has special competence.1/

In furtherance of broad U.S. objectives, the Department recognizes its responsibility, within its authority, to contribute toward U.S. foreign policy by participation in foreign assistance programs.

III. Planning, Coordination and Consultation

Effective cooperation between A.I.D. and the Department requires adequate arrangements for joint planning, coordination and consultation. These arrangements may include, but are not limited to the following:

1/ These underlying premises, as expressed in AID Policy Directive 23, Mobilizing U.S. Government Resources in Support of Foreign Assistance, are stated in greater detail in A.I.D. Manual Order Series 240 issued August 27, 1964.

A. The Administrator of A.I.D. and the Secretary of Agriculture will each designate a senior officer to coordinate basic negotiations and matters of general policy under this Agreement. The Department and A.I.D. will similarly designate appropriate channels for contacts on operations within their subdivisions.

B. Joint arrangements may be made for: (1) examining country development plans, total U.S. country assistance programs and, as feasible, those of other U.S. government or U.S. private organizations, foreign government and other entities participating in economic assistance programs, relevant to the activities the Department might be requested by A.I.D. to undertake; (2) reviewing activities proposed by A.I.D. for the Department's consideration, including participation in field surveys and (3) evaluating the effectiveness of current and completed Departmental activities on behalf of A.I.D., including operating procedures.

C. In order to facilitate the Department's planning, A.I.D. will give the Department the maximum possible advance notice of projected A.I.D. requirements for services. The Department will advise A.I.D. as early as feasible as to its ability to provide these services.

D. In providing services under this Agreement the Department may use private sources with the concurrence of A.I.D.

IV. Participating Agency Service Agreements (PASAS)

Services which are rendered by the Department either in the U.S. or overseas will be governed by individual Service Agreements except as outlined in Section V.B. below and Appendix III. A Service Agreement will define the scope, location and duration of the service, the personnel requirements, costs, method of financing, and special implementation conditions not otherwise stipulated in this Agreement or required by A.I.D. regulations. Arrangements covering Service Agreements and personnel serving under such agreements are contained in Appendices I and II to this Agreement. PASA's may be signed by properly authorized officers of each agency.

V. Types of Assistance

The types of assistance which the Department agrees to provide A.I.D., upon its request, may involve but are not confined to the following:

A. Project Services

A project service can be specifically defined in terms of planned end result, estimated cost, location of implementation and duration.

A project may range from a short feasibility survey to the assumption of a world-wide service over a period of years subject to the availability of resources. It may involve the assignment or temporary detail of a group of technicians or in some instances of a single expert. In providing such a service either in the U.S. or overseas, the Department will assume operating responsibility for the project, which may involve staffing, supervising, budgeting, backstopping, procurement, inspecting, evaulation and reporting.

B. Technical Consultation Support Services

Technical consultation support services cover any service, in support of the foreign assistance program which cannot be characterized as a project or staff service and which is normally performed in the U.S. on a continuing basis. Such support services may include the furnishing of technical information and advice, backstopping of project services in the field, assistance in recruiting technical experts and the provision of training and procurement services, in the fields of competence of the Department, in accordance with Appendices III, IV, and V to this Agreement.

C. Staff Services

A staff service involves the detail or assignment of an individual Department employee to fill an A.I.D. staff position overseas. Persons detailed or assigned for staff duty with A.I.D. will be entirely under the supervision and direction of A.I.D. However, questions concerning an individual's status as an employee of the Department will be dealt with directly between the Department and the employee concerned.

Arrangements covering the assignment or detail of Departmental personnel to A.I.D. are outlined in Appendix II to this Agreement.

VI. Professional Development

The Department considers foreign service for its employees of such importance that it will assure that such service will be fully recognized in their career development and promotion within the Department. A.I.D. will encourage such professional development activities as attendance at appropriate professional meetings, professional publications, research appropriate to their assignments and full utilization of their professional advice and counsel in Agency program planning. To the extent appropriate and feasible, the Department will participate in orientation and other personnel development functions of A.I.D.

VII. Operating Relationships

A. In the United States

General technical and project services provided in the United

States will be carried out by the Department in accordance with its established procedures.

B. Overseas

1. Department personnel assigned overseas as members of an A.I.D. Mission under this Agreement will receive support, benefits and privileges on the same terms as they are provided to A.I.D. direct-hire personnel and as permitted under legal and A.I.D. regulatory requirements.

2. Unless mutually agreed otherwise, the Department will utilize personnel on its rolls insofar as possible in providing services under this Agreement.

3. Personnel of the Department detailed or assigned for duty overseas with A.I.D. under this Agreement will be administratively responsible to the U.S. A.I.D. Director or his designee on matters of personal conduct, public relations and general program and policy direction. Disciplinary action, if called for, must be taken by the Department. It is the responsibility of A.I.D. to notify the Department promptly of development which might require such action.

4. With respect to project services, official communications on technical, professional and personnel matters may be direct or through A.I.D. channels at the option of the Department, provided that copies of communications sent directly will be simultaneously provided to A.I.D. Mission and AID/Washington headquarters. Official communications dealing with A.I.D. program and policy matters will be transmitted through regular A.I.D. channels. With respect to staff services, all communications are through A.I.D. channels.

5. Problems that arise in the operation of service agreements will be resolved between the U.S. AID Director or his designee and the Department's senior officer at the Mission. In the absence of a mutually satisfactory solution the U.S. AID Director may, if he deems it necessary, direct that his views be followed pending decision on the matter in Washington.

VIII. Reporting and Evaluation

In order to facilitate evaluation of the foreign assistance program, the Department agrees to provide A.I.D. with project progress and administrative reports as required in A.I.D. Manual Orders on the Participating Agency Service Agreement (PASA) or as otherwise agreed and to assist A.I.D. in making periodic reviews of costs and performance.

The US AID Director has a responsibility for continuing evaluation through observation and reports of all projects and programs under his direction.

IX. Termination of Services

If A.I.D. or the Department finds it necessary to cancel in whole or in part any project or service under this Agreement, A.I.D. agrees to reimburse the Department for appropriate costs which are mutually agreed in writing.

X. Financing

A.I.D. will provide the Department with timely forecasts of general requirements in each category of service for its guidance and planning.

On the basis of such forecasts, the Department and A.I.D. will enter into an annual budget agreement to cover the Department's annual costs for domestic program support services.

A.I.D. will reimburse the Department for its project or staff services at monthly or other agreed upon intervals on the basis of bills presented on Standard Form 1080 or 1081 to the AID/Washington Controller.

A.I.D. will provide financial support to the Department for its project, staff and other services in accordance with the specific agreement set forth in the A.I.D. Controller's letter of November 4, 1965 and the U.S.D.A. Budget and Finance acceptance of November 15, 1965, or such other arrangements as may be mutually agreed in writing between the above parties.

XI. Termination or Amendment of Agreement and Appendices

The Agreement and its Appendices will continue in force until termination by either party upon giving ninety days written notice to the other party; provided that its continuation shall be subject to Congressional action. Either party to this Agreement may propose amendments to the Agreement. Subsequent amendments to the Appendices of the Agreement based on changes in operating procedures or due to legislative requirements will be executed by the Assistant Secretary of the Department charged with the international affairs of the Department or his authorized representative and the Assistant Administrator, Office of Technical Cooperation and Research or his authorized representative.

Not more than three years after the signing of this Agreement, the Department and A.I.D. will conduct a joint review of activities under the Agreement to determine whether it will remain in force, or in what respects if any, it should be modified.

XII. Effective Date

The effective date of this General Agreement and its Appendices shall be the latest date affixed below.

APPROVED:

John A. Schmittler
Acting Secretary
Department of Agriculture

FEB 15 1966
Date

APPROVED:

William R. Gaud
Administrator
Agency for International Development

19 JAN 1966
Date

Appendix I

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT

APPENDIX I
TO
GENERAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBJECT: Participating Agency Service Agreements

The participation of the Department in various aspects of the foreign assistance program, other than technical support, training and procurement services rendered in the U.S., is covered by Participating Agency Service Agreements (PASAs) entered into under the basic terms of the General Agreement between the Department and A.I.D. The following provisions apply generally to all PASAs:

I. Form and Content

A PASA will usually consist of (a) a face sheet, (b) a Budget Plan and (c) a Project Implementation Order/Technical Services (PIO/T (which includes a statement of Scope of Work which is sufficiently detailed to provide all information necessary to plan and effect the service, and which provides the basis for evaluation of performance). If the PASA covers services which are to be rendered beyond the fiscal year in which the agreement is entered into, the PIO/T includes a summary Scope of Work covering the entire service, as well as an annual Scope of Work. The initial Budget Plan also covers both the estimated total cost of the service and the first fiscal year of operations. Each fiscal year a new PIO/T will be issued to provide additional funds, and as required, a new Scope of Work and Budget Plan will be issued.

II. Duration

The PASA includes the duration of a given project or service.

A specific date for the projected termination of the service covered by a PASA is always stated. This date may be extended by amendment to the PASA.

III. Effective Date

A PASA is effective as of the date of the last A.I.D. or Department signature on the agreement, unless another date is specified.

IV. Amendment and Termination of Agreement

PASAs should be appropriately amended, by mutual agreement.

In the event that circumstances are such that A.I.D. or the Department deems it necessary or desirable to terminate a service agreement before completion of the services to be provided, A.I.D. and the Department will consult in advance on such termination and, insofar as possible, will fix a termination date sufficiently in advance so that the parties may make personnel and other adjustments in their operations in the light of such termination. The establishment of a termination date is documented in a format prescribed by A.I.D. for signature by the Department and the A.I.D. official (or their successors) who signed the original Service Agreement.

If A.I.D. or the Department finds it necessary to cancel in whole or in part any project or service, A.I.D. reimburses the Department for its liabilities relating to termination.

V. Progress Evaluation

In order to facilitate the evaluation of specific services, the Department will prepare periodic reports on implementation progress, including any problems encountered in rendering those services. Such reports will be submitted to: (a) the US AID Director or his designee, and the appropriate AID/W office--for services on behalf of a US AID, (b) the appropriate AID/W office--for services on behalf of AID/W or of a regional or interregional nature.

Unless specified otherwise in an individual PASA, either directly or by reference to an A.I.D. issuance, the frequency of such reports will be (a) upon request of A.I.D.--for services of less than one year; or (b) quarterly for services of one year or more. Where a completion of service report is required, the Department will make such a submission, where feasible, not later than 60 days after the service or project is completed.

Where the format, number of copies required, and content of progress reports for specific types of services are not stipulated in A.I.D. issuances, they will be mutually agreed upon at the time the agreement is entered into so as to meet the operating requirements of both the Department and A.I.D. The Department may, in addition to A.I.D.'s reporting requirements, establish other reporting requirements from its personnel to satisfy its own supervisory responsibility.

VI. Contracting Under a Service Agreement

When a contract with a private, international or other non-U. S. Government organization is necessary to implement a particular project, A.I.D. normally enters directly into such an arrangement. However, under the terms of a PASA, A.I.D. may authorize the Department to enter into a contract to implement a specific phase of a project. If such a contract involves the performance of services outside the U. S. by U. S. citizens, the Department will take appropriate action to assure compliance with the loyalty and security investigation requirements of Section III of the Foreign Aid and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-273) and any successor legislation, and implementing AID regulations relating thereto. The certification of security clearance will be made by the Department. A.I.D. will reimburse the Department for the cost of such investigations.

VII. Maintenance and Disposition of Records

Records and files accumulated and maintained by Department personnel in connection with overseas activities undertaken pursuant to a Service Agreement will be the property of the Department, which will be responsible for their maintenance and will determine and effect their final disposition. If requested and authorized in writing by the Department, A.I.D. personnel in the field will arrange for the destruction without screening of those records which have been determined by the Department to be eligible for destruction. However, property records required to validate the inventory paid for from A.I.D. funds will be retained and turned over to A.I.D.

VIII. Disposition of Property

All property, including vehicles, equipment, and supplies purchased by the Department relative to and financed under a PASA covering an overseas activity will be turned over to and will become the property of A.I.D. upon completion of that activity, unless the PASA specifically provides otherwise. The Department will maintain itemized property records on all non-expendable items costing more than $50 each, showing description, date acquired and from whom, cost and location.

Appendix II

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT

APPENDIX II
TO
GENERAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBJECT: Personnel Arrangements

I. General

As used in this agreement, and subsequent implementing documents and related correspondence--(a) the overseas "assignment" of Department personnel is understood to entail the establishment of an overseas position and the assignment or appointment of an employee to that position for a tour of duty, with the employee remaining on the Department's payroll, (b) the overseas "detail" of Department personnel to the A.I.D. program to provide either project or staff services is understood to entail temporary duty (reimbursable or non-reimbursable detail) with a US AID with no change in the individual's employment status with the Department.

The implementation of Participating Agency Service Agreements (PASAs) may entail the utilization of Department personnel resources in a variety of ways depending on the nature and magnitude of the services to be rendered. In providing personnel services under this agreement the Department may --

A. For Project Services:

(A given project may require any one or a combination of these staffing arrangements):

1. Assign or appoint employees to fill positions established to implement project service PASAs in the U.S.

2. Detail employees for temporary duty overseas.

3. Assign employees overseas for a tour of duty in an overseas position specifically established by the Department pursuant to a PASA.

B. For Staff Services:

Assign employees to A.I.D. staff positions overseas.

II. Arrangements Applicable to Service in the U. S.

Department personnel appointed or assigned by the Department to duties in the U. S. relating to the foreign assistance program, either for technical support services (including training and related services) under a General Agreement or project services under a PASA, are governed wholly by the Department's rules and regulations.

Under certain circumstances, A.I.D. may request and the Department may agree to provide the services of a Department employee to occupy an A.I.D. staff position in the U. S. on a detail basis. Such a detail is not considered as constituting technical services and is not covered by a PASA.

III. Arrangements Applicable to Overseas Service

The following basic arrangements are applicable, prima facie, to the overseas detail or assignment of Department personnel in the foreign assistance program. Specific guidance and requirements are provided in A.I.D. manual orders.1/ They apply uniformly to all Federal Government employees engaged in any phase of the foreign assistance program overseas and are designed to insure that such employees are treated equitably while on such duty, that the basic requirements for such duty are equally applicable to A.I.D. and Department personnel and that to insure effectiveness and economy of operations, the principle of coordinated programming and management is carried out in both the planning and implementation phases of the foreign assistance program.

In the event the Department is to provide services in a country where there is no US AID, AID/W will make appropriate arrangements to have the functions and responsibilities of a US AID as outlined herein, assumed by the Chief of the Diplomatic Mission, or his designee, or will make other appropriate arrangements.

A. All Overseas Service

1. Security

The Department will arrange for the necessary investigation and certify the security clearance. An employee may not depart for an overseas post until such clearance is obtained. 2/

1/ Manual Order 416.6 - Participating Agency Appointments and Employment.

2/ Manual Order 244.1 as amended - Procedure for Assigning Participating Agency Personnel Overseas Under a Participating Agency Service Agreement.

2. Standards of Conduct

The conduct, both official and social, of Department personnel (and dependents) assigned to US AIDs must at all times be acceptable to A.I.D. and the cooperating country. Discipline of such personnel is a responsibility of the Department--in collaboration with A.I.D., as appropriate. However, A.I.D. may have occasion to request that an employee be relieved of his duty. In such an instance, the Department will arrange for the prompt withdrawal of the employee from the US AID. A.I.D. will provide the Department with information concerning the circumstances of the case, and such other information concerning the conduct of the employee, as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the Department. In an emergency situation, as determined by the US AID Director, the US AID may issue travel orders and arrange for travel pending administrative action by the Department.

3. Mission Clearance

Each Department employee proposed for an overseas assignment is nominated to the US AID for the purpose of obtaining US AID and cooperating country concurrence, as appropriate. This nomination is prepared by the Department and approved and transmitted by A.I.D. Such clearance must be obtained before the employee may be authorized to depart for an overseas post.

4. Administrative Support

A.I.D., through the US AID, will provide Department personnel with adequate common supporting services including ordinary supplies and equipment and administrative support comparable to services provided A.I.D. direct-hire technical assistance personnel, e.g., office supplies, official transportation, office space and equipment and administrative assistance except in cases where the PASA specifies that the Department or the cooperating country will provide any one or all of such support services.

5. Briefing and De-Briefing

A.I.D. general orientation and program briefing will be given, in addition to briefing required by the Department, unless mutually agreed otherwise in specific instances. Personnel returning from duty overseas will be available to A.I.D. for consultation and de-briefing.

B. Overseas Details

1. Departmental personnel detailed overseas for temporary duty under a PASA under authority of Section 632(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, continue to occupy their position in the Department. Such details are normally not in excess of 6 months.

2. The Department authorizes, arranges and pays for the employee's international travel, and per diem for such travel, as prescribed in Standardized Government Travel Regulations or Joint Travel Regulations (governing the Uniformed Services), as appropriate. The Department and A.I.D. recognize that maximum use is to be made of local currencies in accordance with Bureau of the Budget Bulletin #65-5, September 15, 1964, and subsequent Department of State and A.I.D. notices. In those instances when local currencies are available in countries listed in Bureau of the Budget Bulletin #65-5 and subsequent additions the PASA will specify when U.S. dollar or local currency expenditures are to be authorized and include necessary procedural guidance.

3. All travel authorizations will remind the traveler to use designated A.I.D. or Embassy cashiers for exchanging U.S. dollar checks in accordance with the prescribed regulations of the post. This is applicable to both official and personal checks.

C. Overseas Assignments

1. Assignment Authority

The employment or assignment of Department personnel for overseas duty in the foreign assistance program may be authorized by A.I.D. pursuant to Section 625(d) (1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

2. Tour of Duty

The normal period of service in an overseas position is a two-year tour from date of arrival in the country of assignment. This period may be more or less than two years depending on the requirements of the project. 3/

3. Establishment of Position

An assignment to a project pursuant to Section 625(d)(1) involves the establishment of an overseas position by the Department. An assignment to a staff position involves a position established or maintained by A.I.D.

Based on information concerning the job to be done, as outlined in the PASA, the Department will prepare a position description and classify it in accordance with Civil Service standards. The General Schedule classification is converted to the appropriate class in the Foreign Compensation (FC) schedule. Two copies of this position description are provided A.I.D.

3/ Exceptions to the A.I.D. criteria applicable to overseas tours of duty are to be processed under the provisions of A.I.D. Manual Order 416.6.

4. Qualifications and Suitability

The Department is responsible for determining the technical qualifications of employees it selects for assignment to overseas positions in the aid program.

Successful performance in an overseas assignment requires also special personal qualifications. Therefore, to the maximum extent possible, the Department will follow the guidelines established by A.I.D. for determining the suitability of an individual for overseas service and will also obtain necessary information from appropriate sources about those members of the candidate's family who will accompany him overseas. It will provide A.I.D. with a certification that such an investigation has been made with satisfactory results.

5. Training

If a project or service requires that the incumbent of a particular position have proficiency in the language of the country of assignment, the Department will insure that the candidate selected meets this requirement. If necessary, arrangements will be made with A.I.D. for appropriate language training prior to departure overseas. Language training provided at the overseas post is available to Department personnel on the same basis as A.I.D. personnel. Orientation training by A.I.D. in Washington, supplemented at the Mission, is normally required. Other training may be made available by A.I.D. Departmental personnel assigned to A.I.D. programs overseas may qualify for within-grade step increases, for having attained proficiency in an esoteric language if such language is the primary or primary-alternate of the post of assignment. 4/

6. Medical Clearance

Medical clearance for the employee and those of his dependents who will accompany him overseas will be obtained by the Department from the Medical Division, Department of State. Such clearance is a prerequisite for authorization of the employee's departure from the U. S.

7. Assignment Documentation

The assignment or appointment of a Department employee to a position in the foreign assistance program is documented on a Standard Form 50, or comparable official document. Two copies of such documentation will be forwarded to A.I.D. not later than 15 days after the effective date of the action.

4/ Manual Order 462.9 - Foreign Language Training.

8. Compensation and Benefits

While assigned to an overseas position established under the terms of this agreement, Department employees are entitled to compensation and benefits provided under Section 625(d)(1) P.L. 87-195, including medical benefits, allowances, differentials, and leave, on the same basis as applicable to A.I.D. foreign service personnel.

9. Leave

Before termination of an A.I.D. assignment a Department employee is entitled to take whatever annual leave has been accumulated during that assignment. However, if the employee's employment with the Department is to be terminated in conjunction with the termination of his A.I.D. assignment, he may only take that amount of annual leave which is in excess of his leave ceiling and the balance of annual leave must be paid to him in accordance with the Lump Sum Leave Act. A.I.D. will reimburse the Department for that portion of the lump sum leave payment earned during the employee's assignment to A.I.D. An employee may be granted home leave in accordance with applicable regulations if he has completed the required continuous service abroad and it is contemplated that he will return to services abroad (including service under PL 85-795) under an overseas program entitled to home leave benefits provided under the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, as amended.

10. Initial Rate of Pay

Department employees are compensated in accordance with the class of the position to which they are assigned. 5/

11. Payment of Salary and Differential

The Department will authorize and pay its employees basic salary and the applicable hardship differential.

12. Allowances

Allowances for post (cost of living), quarters, temporary lodging, education, local travel and transfer, as well as local travel per diem, Standardized Regulations (Government Civilians, Foreign Areas) and A.I.D. regulations and orders, will be paid directly to the employee by the US AID, unless otherwise specified in the PASA. Such allowances are normally paid in local currency, except that education and transfer allowances may in certain cases at the discretion of the US AID, be payable in dollars. Transfer allowances are authorized for payment by the Department when the

5/ Rates of pay in excess of norms prescribed in M.O. 416.6 - Participating Agency Employment require the written approval of an authorized official of A.I.D. and the Department.

transfer is to another bona fide overseas program and when such transfer otherwise meets the eligibility requirements for transfer allowances as set forth in the Standardized Regulations (Government Civilian, and Foreign Areas).

The Department will certify an employee's eligibility for separation allowance in accordance with Standardized Regulations and will pay this allowance directly to the employee.

13. Promotions

The promotion by the Department of an employee assigned to the A.I.D. program is based on the reclassification of his position or his reassignment to a higher level position, provided he has served for one year in his present grade and has demonstrated ability to perform the duties of the higher level position.

14. Performance Evaluation

To assure that Department personnel receive full recognition for their contributions in the foreign assistance program, the US AID will furnish AID/W and the Department, if it so desires, with copies of performance evaluations, 6/ or any other document (e.g., letter of commendation) which in any way evaluates the accomplishments of performance of the Department's employees assigned to the US AID.

If the US AID Director determines that an employee's performance is not sufficiently effective in a given work situation, he may request the Department to terminate the employee's assignment.

15. Travel and Transportation

A.I.D. regulations and the Standardized Regulations (Government Civilians, Foreign Areas) govern the travel and transportation of all Department personnel (and dependents) assigned overseas for a tour of duty pursuant to Section 625(d)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended.

a. The Department authorizes, arranges for, and reimburses such employees for:

(1) Travel within the U.S. and between the U.S. and the overseas post.

6/ See M. O. 416.6 - Participating Agency Appointments and Employment.

(2) Costs involved in the transportation and/or storage of household goods, personal effects and a privately owned motor vehicle on the same basis as A.I.D. employees at the same Mission.

The Department consults with A.I.D. as to the availability of local currency for such expenditures and the procedure for its utilization.

b. The US AID authorizes, arranges for, and reimburses Department personnel for:

(1) Other international travel which the Department has approved or concurred in.

(2) Local travel within the country of assignment.

(3) Travel for rest and recuperation in countries where such travel is authorized.

(4) Education travel.

16. Termination

The US AID will furnish a Completion of Assignment Report, in accordance with A.I.D. requirements, for all Department personnel, as well as A.I.D. employees.

When a Department employee is returned to the U.S. for completion of assignment and is not to be reassigned to another position in the A.I.D. program, the Department will ordinarily effect the termination action not later than the next regular pay period ending after the employee's return to the U.S., unless medical clearance requires a delay, and will provide A.I.D. with the appropriate documentation of such action.

Should final medical clearance for a Department employee, or his dependents, not be received within two weeks after return to the U. S., the termination date will be extended in consultation with A.I.D. In such cases, if the employee is on active duty with the Department after a 60-day period, A.I.D. will terminate reimbursement of the employee's salary. Medical benefits will be forfeited if arrangements for medical examinations are not made within 30 days and completed within 60 days after the employee or his dependents depart from post. 7/

17. Recruitment Status Reports

The Department will provide AID/W with a monthly report on the status of recruitment to fill positions established under PASAs.

7/ Detailed procedures governing the medical and health program are contained in M. O. 454.1.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT

APPENDIX III
TO
GENERAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBJECT: Technical Consultation Support Services

I. General

This appendix outlines the types of technical services, which the Department agrees to perform upon request, on behalf of the Agency for International Development, in support of the foreign assistance program.

A.I.D. will furnish the Department with copies of reports and communications relating to programs, projects and questions on which A.I.D. may request assistance.

II. Types of Support

Services provided by the Department to A.I.D. may include but are not limited to:

A. Providing consultation and advice in connection with program planning, review and coordination.

B. Reviewing and evaluating proposed programs, activities or projects concerning which there is need for special technical advice.

C. Advising on technical resources available within the Department or other government or private agencies.

D. Discussing and advising on technical problems with AID/W personnel or individuals referred to the Department by AID/W.

E. Answering technical inquiries made by AID/W or sent in from the field and referred by AID/W in writing to the Department.

F. Providing general technical backstopping for projects being implemented by the Department either in the U.S. or overseas.

G. Upon A.I.D.'s written request, suggesting names of personnel or sources of recruitment for A.I.D. overseas positions in certain technical fields; and commenting on the technical competence of personnel under consideration for A.I.D. overseas positions.

H. Training of foreign nationals 1/.

I. Performing procurement services 2/.

III. Financial Arrangements

The funding of costs involved in providing project, staff, procurement and participant training services will be covered by Project Implementation Orders (PIOs).

1/ See Appendix V
2/ See Appendix IV

Appendix IV

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT

APPENDIX IV
TO
GENERAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND THE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBJECT: Procurement of Commodities Incidental to the Furnishing of Services

I. General

This appendix outlines commodity procurement services which the Department agrees to provide A.I.D. -- in cases mutually agreed to by the Department.

II. Procurement Services

Upon receipt of an acceptable authorizing document from A.I.D. the participating agency performs the following services in behalf of A.I.D. or for a borrower/grantee on behalf of A.I.D. 1/

A. Procures commodities or services specified in the authorizing documents.

B. Renders advice and assistance in selecting commodities or service organizations best suited to accomplish a particular purpose.

C. Prepares requisitions or other listings for the approval of A.I.D. or for a borrower/grantee on behalf of A.I.D.

D. Prepares commodity specifications and arranges necessary inspections.

E. Arranges transportation, including packing, inland and ocean transportation, licensing and, where appropriate, marine insurance.

F. Maintain records and prepares reports required by A.I.D.

1/ Detailed requirements and procedures governing procurement in A.I.D. programs are contained Manual Order 1430, "U.S. Government Agency Procurement, Commodities."

III. Financial Arrangements

Funds from which A.I.D. will pay for procurement costs are provided in Project Implementation Orders/Commodities (PIO/Cs) or Procurement Authorization/Purchase Requisitions (PA/PRs).

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENT - TYPE ONE

APPENDIX V

TO THE GENERAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SUBJECT: Training of Foreign Nationals

I. General

This appendix outlines the responsiblities of the Department and A.I.D. in the planning and execution of technical cooperation training projects referred to the Department by A.I.D. The carrying out of these responsibilities constitutes an effective contribution to the execution of the program of A.I.D. in and for the cooperating country involved.

II. Responsibilities of the Department

At the request of and in consultation with A.I.D., the Department will

A. Develop and administer training programs for foreign nationals who are brought to the United States by A.I.D. for training in the field of agriculture and related subjects, and provide the technical competency needed in carrying out these programs.

B. In the development of training programs

1. Determine which services of the Department, private business, academic or other groups can best assist in the development and implementation of desirable training programs.

2. Prepare and submit to A.I.D. for review and concurrence a proposed training program, and such revisions as may be required, including essential cost elements needed to fund approved programs.

3. Provide A.I.D. with copies of all reports prepared by or about participants which discuss the participants' programs, progress, or problems.

4. Provide news releases about participants indicating A.I.D. sponsorship and the objectives of the study program(s).

5. In consultation with A.I.D., develop alternative procedures when extraordinary circumstances render the above procedures infeasible.

C. In the implementation of the training program,

1. Orient the participants regarding their programs.

2. Arrange with organizations, industries, educational institutions, or other groups for assistance in implementing the training program.

3. Evaluate the program effectiveness by appropriate methods as mutually agreed upon by the Department and A.I.D.

4. Inform A.I.D. of illnesses, conduct prejudicial to the program, or other emergencies arising during the period of the participant's visit. Assist in making the necessary arrangements for medical care or treatment pursuant to the provisions of the insurance; provided, however, that the Department shall not be responsible for the performance of any medical, legal, professional, or other services of a private nature.

5. Prepare quarterly reports on the numbers of participants trained during the quarter and submit these on the standardized A.I.D. report form not later than the 10th day of the month following the quarterly reporting period.

6. Provide in accordance with A.I.D. Manual Orders, the necessary implementation of the training programs by:

a. Obtaining as authorized by A.I.D., the services of technical leaders and processing documents for payment of salaries and other expenses for the same.

b. Paying in advance, participants' maintenance allowances at the A.I.D. approved rates.

c. Providing assistance and funds to participants for purchase of books, training aids, and equipment.

d. Providing the necessary program travel for the participants.

e. Processing documents for A.I.D. use in payments of tuition and training fees in connection with programs in institutions or firms, or paying tuition and training fees as agreed upon by the Department and A.I.D.

f. Paying travel expenses for interpreters as authorized.

g. Assisting as required in the shipment of the participant's books, and printed program related training materials to the Mission.

h. Mutual consultation regarding the participant(s) scheduled departure date at least 30 days in advance.

i. Whenever possible, collecting all overpayments to the participants prior to departure.

j. Distributing and forwarding mail to participants.

k. Arranging, when appropriate, for the participant's membership in an A.I.D. approved American Professional society.

III. Responsibilities of A.I.D.

A. In the development of training programs, A.I.D. will

1. In consultation with the Department assist in the development of all programs, reviewing and approving them prior to implementation.

2. Furnish the Department appropriate information relating to requested training for each foreign national for whom training has been approved, such as;

a. Major problems and needs in the cooperating country toward which training should be directed.

b. Type of training desired by the Mission and the cooperating country.

c. An evaluation of training, education, experience, and ability of the participant.

d. Particulars as to the present position of the participant and the position that he is expected to occupy upon his return to the cooperating country after training.

e. Official transcripts of scholastic records, if available, when academic training is indicated.

f. General proficiency of each participant in the English language.

3. Communicate with Mission to obtain information on program changes, extensions, funding, etc.

4. Transmit the programs to the Mission.

5. Arrange arrival dates in line with the dates shown in the proposed program and inform the Department of those dates.

6. Make appropriate public announcements regarding the training program giving credit therein to the participation of the Department.

7. Obtain systematic information from the Missions on the extent to which the participants' training in the United States is being utilized and furnish information of a significant nature to the Department. Information of this type received by the Department directly is furnished to A.I.D.

B. In the implementation of the training program

1. Arrange for reception services at Ports of Entry and in Washington except as mutually arranged otherwise.

2. Provide initial administrative orientation to participants.

3. Collect insurance premium payments from independently financed participants.

4. Arrange for contractual services to cover medical insurance for participants; and forwarding services for shipment of participants' publications and printed training aids.

5. Arrange for renewal of participants' visas as required.

6. Conduct a final conference, where possible, with the participant(s) for the purpose of evaluating the program and its effectiveness.

7. As agreed upon, arrange international return travel for participants upon receipt of scheduled departure dates from the Department, informing the Department of these arrangements in order that the Department can complete all fiscal transactions prior to departure.

8. Arrange for interpreters when needed.

9. Obtain the security clearance for Technical Leaders as required.

Attachment No. 1

Part USDA plays in AID's Agricultural Operations

In fiscal year 1968 AID obligated about $98 million for agricultural technical assistance and $519 million in the total agricultural sector (all agricultural related investments).

During FY 68 AID direct payments to USDA totaled about $9.6 million as follows:

All PASAs	–	$7,212,000
Training	–	1,598,000
TC&S	–	776,000
		$9,586,000 (9.6 million).

(The above excludes subsistence payments to foreign trainees.)

Payments to universities active in the agriculture field totaled $13 million. (This is not a hard figure, but it is derived by the rough computation of average annual payments under the life of all active multi-year university contracts and, as such, serves as a standard of comparison.)

Above figures show that USDA provides nearly 10% of the total services performed under AID agricultural technical assistance projects. Furthermore, it is estimated that USDA influenced program investments approximating 25% of the total agricultural economic assistance activity of AID.

Universities, on the other hand, provide about 13% of the total services performed under AID agricultural technical assistance projects.

A brief statement of the functions performed by selected agencies of USDA follows:

International Agricultural Development Service

IADS coordinates and administers the Department's programs on international agricultural development. It carries on, in cooperation with AID and the constituent agencies of USDA, specific technical assistance activities to improve agriculture in developing countries. It plans and coordinates training of foreign agriculturalists coming to the United States. It provides for USDA participation in formulating country plans for technical assistance in agricultural development. IADS also represents the Department in its work with AID, FAO, land grant institutions and international organizations concerned with assistance to developing countries.

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

ASCS is responsible for helping to stabilize the nation's agricultural economy. It's principal activities are associated with commodity price support loans and purchases (where production of basic commodities exceeds market demand at support price levels). The agency is also involved in commodity storage programs, the management of commodity inventories, and land retirement and conservation programs associated with commodity stabilization programs.

Agricultural Research Service

ARS conducts research on the production and marketing of agricultural products. It also performs nutrition and consumer use research, as well as studies on the possible industrial utilization of farm commodities. The agency carried out Federal programs to control and eradicate plant and animal pests and diseases. ARS also has responsibility for administering research programs in foreign countries under provisions of the Food for Freedom legislation and the foreign currencies derived therefrom. (Thus, it has an intimate knowledge of agricultural research activities and capabilities in low income countries.)

Cooperative State Research Service

CSRS administers the programs of research grants from Federal government to state experiment stations. It provides leadership and coordination of research between the stations and the Department of Agriculture. The agency also provides technical assistance to the stations in planning cooperative regional research activities.

Consumer and Marketing Service

C&MS administers programs to achieve orderly and efficient marketing, consumer protection and wider distribution of the nation's farm output. Among its principal activities are: meat and poultry inspection and other consumer protection programs; establishment of standards and the grading of agricultural commodities and animal products. The agency provides market information for producers, distributers and consumers, and studies ways in which the data can be best secured and disseminated. C&MS also carries on regulatory functions concerned with fair trading practices. C&MS is also responsible for administering special food distribution programs, including school lunch and special milk programs and commodity distributions to needy people throughout the nation.

Economic Research Service

ERS carries out research programs in the following broad areas: Agricultural outlook for specific commodities and for agriculture as a whole; marketing analysis and the development of new markets for farm products; foreign agricultural economics and foreign trade policy analyses; analyses of world production and distribution of farm products and the development of world food programs. ERS also conducts research on the economics of production and of marketing activities. Its reports and analyses are used in formulating and executing agricultural policies and programs.

Farmers Home (supervised credit) Administration

FHA provides credit and management assistance to family farmers. The agency provides credit to assist farm families carry on their year-to-year production activities; helps them build and repair homes; develop rural community water systems and to form cooperatives servicing rural low-income families.

Farmer Cooperative Service

FCS helps farmers organize and operate self-help cooperative organizations. The agency is concerned with furthering knowledge in cooperative principles and practices. It provides technical assistance in organizing and managing cooperatives and solving specific problems of ongoing co-op organizations for producing and marketing agricultural commodities.

Federal Crop Insurance Corporation

The FCIC provides insurance protection to farmers on a voluntary basis to protect them against unanticipated crop losses. Insurance policies provide against hazards arising from drought, plant disease, floods, hurricanes, insects, etc.

Federal Extension Service

The FES serves as the coordinating agency of the state extension services throughout the country. It works through county agricultural agents, 4-H groups and state and area specialists to apply to the local community knowledge of research on production and marketing of farm commodities. FES also helps the local organizations plan self-help programs for rural people.

Forest Service

The FS conducts research in forest range and watershed management and manages the National Forests. It provides technical assistance to states and private owners in the development and sound use of forest lands. FS also conducts research on control of forest fires and of insects and diseases that attack forests. The agency also conducts research on forest product utilization.

National Agricultural Library

The NAL acquires, classifies and preserves books, reports and other forms of information concerning agriculture. It performs reference services and makes institutional loans of materials in its collection. It prepares and issues bibliographies of agriculture and coordinates the Department's technical information activities.

Rural Electrification Administration

REA helps rural people obtain electric and telephone services by making long-term loans to farmers, cooperatives and other suppliers to build rural electric systems. It provides loans and technical assistance to independent companies and cooperatives to extend and improve rural telephone services.

Soil Conservation Service

SCS conducts programs to conserve soil and water resources by providing technical assistance to farmers, ranchers and others on appropriate soil conservation methods. It provides technical and financial assistance for watershed protection and flood prevention. SCS also is concerned with soil conservation and resource conservation to increase overall economic opportunities of rural people.

Statistical Reporting Service

SRS is the primary data collecting agency for agriculture. It conducts continuing studies to provide national and state forecasts on food and agriculture, and conducts special sample surveys related to the marketing of agricultural products. SRS conducts research in statistical methodology and provides technical assistance on the application of data processing systems.

Staff Offices

In addition to the above program services, the Department has a number of staff offices concerned with agricultural information, program planning and development, management appraisal and improvement, and others concerned with overall Departmental operations. Personnel from these staff offices have served on overseas technical assistance assignments concerned with overall agricultural program planning and the organization and operation of agricultural ministries and related organizations.

Attachment No. 3

THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SELECTED CATEGORIES OF PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

WORK SPECIALIZATION	TOTAL	GS 12-16
Agricultural Engineers	566	166
Agricultural Marketing	518	337
Agricultural Market Reporting	204	51
Economists	887	583
Biologists	215	137
Crop Insurance Administration	220	67
Management Analysts	200	141
Microbiologists	179	104
Agricultural Extension	98	96
Zoologists	8	5
Parasitologists	35	25
Physiologists	22	19
Entomologists	604	384
Plant Pathologists	287	227
Plant Physiologists	197	161
Geneticists	130	107
Range Conservationists	474	112
Soil Conservationists	4,690	729
Soil Scientists	1,659	397
Agronomists	256	195
Farm Management	3,148	396
Animal Husbandry	76	43
Veterinarians	2,171	1,145
Forest Products Technicians	128	67
Agricultural Commodity Grading	2,405	209
Foresters and Forestry Technicians	8,204	1,703
TOTALS	27,581	6,606

Attachment No. 4

Job Description for Proposed AID/USDA Coordinating Officer

Under the provisions of the General Agreement between the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development, effective February 15, 1966, duties of the Coordinating Officer will be:

1. To assure that the partnership between AID and USDA is an effective mechanism utilizing the full resources of the Department in planning, executing, managing and evaluating foreign assistance programs in which the Department possesses and makes available to AID its special competence.
2. To coordinate basic agreements and matters of general policy under the partnership agreement.
3. To provide overall coordinating leadership to maximize the effectiveness of AID's performance under the agreement.
4. To seek out areas of the General Agreement where improvements and changes are needed to provide better utilization of funds, resources and manpower.
5. To serve as a counterpart to the Department's senior officer and to provide USDA a central contact and action point to deal with major substantive issues and financial arrangements between the two partners.
6. To develop new techniques and methods which will increase the effectiveness of AID/USDA operations in Training, PASA, Technical Consultation and Services, and other program implementation processes.

7. To conduct continuous evaluation both at planning and project implementation stages not only to improve working relations and to assure that project objectives are met in a timely and efficient manner but also to make determinations of the need, priority, and value of proposed programs and projects.

8. To review existing PASAs, budgets and other partnership arrangements with USDA for the purposes of (a) improvement, (b) amendments, (c) cancellations and/or (d) providing new scopes of work, goals and objectives.

9. To work with AA/A in establishing fiscal and budget supervision and to assess cost factors and determine cost-benefit ratios.

10. To instigate a complete and comprehensive report system which will enable AID to judge progress as well as to make earlier decisions on needed changes in scopes of work.

11. To work closely with all AID regional and staff offices as they continue their present day-to-day work assignments in implementing the AID/USDA partnership agreement.

12. To advise the Agency for International Development on:

    a. Continuing in force the General Agreement;

    b. Proposing amendments to the General Agreement;

    c. Recommending changes in the supplementary agreements contained in Appendices I, II, III, IV and V of the General Agreement; and

d. Exploring the feasibility of converting USDA aid operations under PL 480, Section 406 into activities which could be patterned after those now conducted under the General USDA/AID Agreement.

13. To recommend new fields of activity for AID/USDA cooperation in carrying out the provisions of Section 632(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1960, as amended.

14. To review proposed agricultural projects, to advise and consult with AID regional and staff offices responsible for programming; to make recommendations in the areas of program planning, project implementation and funding levels; and to work with USDA in the development and execution of projects where their services are to be utilized.

Attachment No. 5

Discussion of Major Issues--Training

A. Introduction and Overview

B. Nature of Services Provided

C. Quantity of Services Provided

D. Quality of Services Provided

E. Costs of Services Provided

F. Administrative Arrangements

G. Follow-Up Arrangements

A. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

These pages present an evaluative review of the performance by USDA and AID of their respective "responsibilities. . . .in the planning and execution of technical cooperation training projects" which AID refers to the Department. These functions are described clearly in Supplementary Agreement Appendix V to the General Agreement between the two agencies dated February 15, 1966.

In that document, "AID recognizes the unique personnel resources, capabilities and experience of the Department. . . ; it seeks through this agreement, therefore, to enlist as fully and effectively as possible, on a partnership basis, the pertinent resources of the Department in planning, executing and evaluating those portions of the foreign assistance program in which it has special competence." The Agreement also proclaims that "effective cooperation between AID and the Department requires adequate arrangements for joint planning, coordination and consultation." (Copy of the Agreement is on file in USDA and AID/W.)

Partnership Nineteen Years Old--Unlike the other two phases covered by the overall report, the partnership of AID and its predecessor agencies with USDA has been in effect since 1950 under earlier agreements.

But the Department's role in international training goes back even further. During 1942-49, USDA pioneered in developing and

conducting such training with the original Interdepartmental committee on Technical Cooperation (Department of State), the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and later with the Marshall Plan and Aid to Greece programs.

Need for U.S. Training--America's record of agricultural productivity plus its vast educational resources make the training of selected nationals a vital, natural component of USAID's agricultural technical assistance to any country.

Significant improvement in a region's agriculture and rural life waits on the timely combining of many favorable elements. But the key factor is indigenous personnel capable of identifying and interpreting needs for change, mobilizing and unifying initiatives and resources which usually are limited, and step-by-step planning over the years. Development is accomplished only by people--working with their leaders through existing governmental-institutional structures and new agencies created to meet development goals.

Surveys, new policies, planning, pilot projects, initial capital, material, technicians from outside--these are instruments through which the people of a nation bring about change.

Our definition of training is the effective transfer to strategic nationals of knowledge, techniques and understandings needed to initiate and reinforce specific development efforts. There is the assumption that these persons will in turn multiply this training

by teaching and influencing their co-workers and others.

Significant training is accomplished by USAID Mission personnel on the scene. But the overall training task is too vast for them, while the lack of training and educational facilities in the home country hardly needs documenting.

Overriding all the problems which arise from transporting men and women so many miles away to study a different agriculture in the midst of a different culture are these reasons for U.S. training--

1. Seeing is believing--if one nation can do it, it must be an achievable goal for mankind.
2. The scientific method or rational approach employed in U.S. agriculture--indispensable for solving problems universally.
3. The use of institutions and cooperative endeavor to achieve agriculture productivity in the U.S.
4. The American faith in and emphasis on the individual (also indispensable to development)--hard to really absorb without being at least temporarily part of this society.
5. The mental stimulation and creativity induced by a new environment, especially when that environment is characterized by achievement and creativity.

Training Needs Not Static--The ensuing pages record an international agricultural training program of great magnitude and scope

over nearly two decades. It describes training of various kinds for nearly 14,000 foreign agriculturists from more than 60 developing countries.

But what of the future? The sobering facts are that the manpower training needs of the developing world have hardly been scratched. The situation varies according to country, but agricultural development cries for thousands more technicians, educators and government officials with modern agricultural skills and knowledge.

Furthermore, the development process itself creates new needs for manpower--and changing needs. For example, the new wheat and rice yields resulting from real development achievements also demand new training in storing, marketing, grading and pricing. Expanding institutions and governmental services within the developing nations are constantly changing manpower needs. The return of trained participants and their re-entry into their own society is bound to create new manpower needs.

Hence the significance of this evaluation--with vast future needs for training, we must know how well we have done the job until now. Much analysis on this follows but urgent attention is requested for Part II (Evaluation Report--Summary and Recommendations) which lists 18 recommendations for improving the joint training operation.

Implementing these 18 recommendations will not alone produce an ideal foreign agricultural training program. But it is high time

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

they be taken seriously. Many of these are not new. As too often happens to evaluation studies of this kind, it would be tragic if their fate is the file.

B. NATURE OF SERVICES PROVIDED

Before describing services provided to accomplish training, it would be well to list types of training provided:

1. Short term field observation-- training for individuals, country teams and multi-country groups ranging in length from three to four weeks to three to four months.

2. Work training--in-service, on-the-job training for individuals ranging from one or two to six months.

3. Academic training--ranging from one to three and occasionally four years, leading to the bachelor's or perhaps master's degree (in rare instances the Ph.D.). But academic training is not always degree-oriented.

4. Combinations of these three types--ideally, academic training needs always to be supplemented by field observations and/or work training. The most common type of training is the combination of these types. Sample Programs and Itineraries on all types are on file at USDA.

The type or types of training finally selected in each training

situation are chiefly determined by the request of USAID Missions. But much discretion is left to the joint program planning process of AID and USDA. Mission needs and U.S. training facilities need careful balancing.

In the joint process of accomplishing the training, the natural division of labor between the two arms of Government would be expertise on the home-country situation and Mission training requirements furnished by AID and the expertise on U.S. training facilities and procedures furnished by USDA. Current operations aim at this but the partnership is creaky in some of its joints. In practice, both AID and USDA sometimes seek to determine the location and details of U.S. training and a wide chasm exists on information from overseas which would more intelligently guide this decision-making.

Given the present situation--all too often only sketchy background on training needs in the Project Implementation Order/Participant (PIO/P), AID could help immensely by further research and communications with the Mission. The AID contribution ought also to include an understanding of cultural aspects in the home country which could influence the training plan advantageously.

The services provided by USDA can be summed up as follows: (1) identification of training fields available; (2) tapping of training resources within the U.S. drawing on an immense reservoir of USDA contacts; (3) program planning; (4) implementing of training including

orientation; (5) supervision; (6) support service such as travel and maintenance; and (7) evaluating.

How these services are carried out is dealt with in detail in Attachment #6 of this report. But here we might briefly assess the relative success of some of these functions or highlight certain aspects.

One of the rich resources USDA brings to the contractual arrangement with AID is its historic and cordial relationship with the agricultural colleges within the land-grant university system. This genuine partnership is itself revealing to the foreign observer of American agriculture and results in ties with the American people that almost no other U.S. Government agency can duplicate. It has worked nobly to draw in the extension, research and teaching personnel in agriculture throughout the country.

The cordialty remains today despite some disillusionment stemming from problem cases in training, in selected cases premature acceptance of large numbers of foreign visitors before the community was prepared, the inevitable gap in communications and information when working at such long distance, and the lack of feedback from overseas as to what the foreign training effort is really achieving.

In program planning, some controversy on training location smoulders among program planning personnel. The point--a most valid one--is relevancy of training. Some hold that it can only be

relevant when the local crop and climatic situation are closest to those in the home country, but there are also arguments that the right training personnel and facilities can obviate the need for study in a similar agricultural environment. These aspects are getting considerable current attention from program planners.

In the areas of supervision, the current lack of travel funds is a serious hindrance. It also affects adversely USDA's close relationship with the universities and other field cooperators. Actual firsthand observance of all training cannot be a requisite in such a vast operation, but being on hand personally for selected occasions is one of the indispensable tools of the Federal Government for assuring quality performance. The continued absence of Federal personnel is easy to interpret in faraway prairie or delta country as lack of importance of the project.

Support services still are dealing with a somewhat chronic problem that may in future weeks be solved by use of a computer for processing participant maintenance checks. The problem is late and sometimes inaccurate delivery of checks. Far more checks arrive on time and in good order than those which are tardy or misaddressed--but nothing causes the foreign visitor more anxiety than temporary lack of funds. If the reaction has sometimes been intemperate, Americans need only wonder what they would do when out of money thousands of miles from home. The Department's reputation

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

for efficiency with cooperating U.S. institutions is also at stake, and so, much rides on the success of the new computer operation.

Evaluation is covered in detail elsewhere. But it might be well to point out here that USDA's current responsibilities for evaluation and follow-up stop too short, if genuine research findings are to be available for further refining of the training. USDA has the personnel, the resources and the will for deeper involvement in the evaluation process--which is most important within the home country--and such involvement would undoubtedly result in better training.

Enrichment and Personal Attentions--Although included in the seven areas listed above, no discussion of the nature of services provided should omit three areas of keen concern to the programming staff at USDA and AID.

(1) Enrichment of the technical training to give both professional breadth and a more intelligent view of the American scene demanding services of considerable maturity in the sociology and economics of American agriculture, in educational psychology and in current political affairs;

(2) Individual tailoring of training programs--fitting no preconceived pattern simply because other participants had previously required similar training; and

(3) Personal attentions to participant's personal problems when and if these affect the quality of training--which is often. These

matters--such as health, companionship and personal relationships, crises at home, academic problems and consequent discouragement, and financial problems--must be met or the entire training effort is often wasted. Services which help ameliorate the problem or comfort the participant are frequently provided, seldom recorded, not always appreciated, usually time-consuming and nearly always rewarding in the final analysis of training effectiveness.

C. QUANTITY OF SERVICES PERFORMED

No one measurement can tell the story on "quantity." The figures do not at all lie, but they are simply inadequate to explain the work-load or the performance because of many other variables involved.

Figures below are the best barometer we have. Figures are shown for the past three years for the purposes of comparison.

NUMBER OF AID-UN PARTICIPANTS PROGRAMMED AND SERVICED

	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968
AID	2,436	2,148	1,701
UN	195	228	292
Total	2,631	2,376	1,993

NUMBER OF AID-UN PRIMARY ARRIVALS

	FY 1966	FY 1967	FY 1968
AID	1,183	854	707
UN	89	100	129
Total	1,272	954	836

NUMBER OF AID-UN MAN/MONTHS TRAINING PROVIDED

AID & UN	13,153	12,299	10,588

NUMBER AID-UN FINAL & AMENDED PROGRAMS PREPARED

AID & UN	1,507	1,557	1,553

NUMBER OF SPECIAL GROUP TRAINING SITUATIONS

AID & UN	97	85	65

Special note should be given to the number of final and amended programs prepared. While there has been a decrease in the number of participants during the three-year period, the number of different programs prepared has acually increased. This reflects the increase in the number of participants who must be trained on an individual basis--note the decline in the number of groups.

Quantity of services provided also includes the following fiscal and logistical services provided for 1,500 - 2,000 AID primary participants who are annually programmed and serviced.

1. Arrangement of travel schedules and ticketing

2. Payment of maintenance allowances

3. Arrangement for professional society membership

4. Disbursement of book allowances

5. Payments for typing of theses

6. Miscellaneous reimbursements

To this can be added the validation, review and payment of vouchers covering tuition and other programming fees to the 75 land-grant and other cooperating universities--1,847 handled in fiscal year '68.

The disbursements made total from three to four million dollars per year. The actual figure for FY '68 was $3,699,423.86.

D. QUALITY OF SERVICES PROVIDED

This story falls in two parts:

(1) A measurement of the quality of performance, and

(2) the efforts of USDA, AID and training cooperators to continually improve training quality.

In preparing for this evaluation report, an AID representative made his own investigation of the quality of training USDA is providing through a review of evaluation reports of participants (USDA); evaluation studies made by American University (DETRI); follow-up reports of the Office of International Training (AID); personal interviews with AID's Regional Technical Bureau staff members; and interviews

with technicians returning from field assignments.

His finding: "highly satisfactory" training programs in both technical and non-technical areas. He also calls the training "relevant" to the needs of developing countries.

During the interviews with staff members and returning technicians referred to above, there was no instance of downgrading or questions concerning the high quality of participant training in agriculture. In most cases there were positive statements of the highest regard for the training with specific instances quoted.

Participant use of training is another way to judge effectiveness. A recent AID study of 418 follow-up reports (1968) shows that 83 percent of the overall 69,696 participants back in their home countries are utilizing their training and only 5 percent not making use of it.

Some other evidences which either document or point to high quality performance in USDA training might be added:

1. Individual success stories from USAID Missions, especially ones regarding the rise to high positions of former participants or achievements in research or program building.
2. Letters from participants to USDA and university training personnel praising their training and thanking those responsible.
3. Certain successes in agricultural development which can never alone be attributed to returned participants but reflect their involvement--such as the current widening use of new rice and

wheat varieties in areas where scores of U.S.-trained officials are involved in extension and communications programs.

4. USDA's acknowledged reputation with training personnel in other Federal Government agencies and within AID itself for leadership and innovation in foreign training. AID gives USDA the credit for initiating such program enrichment ideas (subsequently adopted program-wide by AID) as Christmas season seminars, communications training for participants in all subject-matter disciplines, the distribution of prospectuses on training to Missions, etc.

5. The extent to which the evaluation process is built into USDA's operations through its personnel set-up and program for evaluation at many stages of training. Although the evaluation is internal and necessarily largely subjective, it emphasizes quality performance and elimination of past errors all along the way. No other participating agency in Washington has done more self-evaluation than USDA.

Under number 5, some of USDA's tools and techniques for evaluation and program improvement have included:

Mid-Program Evaluation: At mid-point in a program it is important to assess progress toward achieving objectives in order to utilize the remaining training time as efficiently as possible. This procedure makes it possible to emphasize needed experiences before the participant's

program is completed. Sample questionnaires for mid-program reviews for groups and individual programs are available. A "Mid-Program Review" form is on file at USDA.

Also, the Soil Conservation Service has cooperated in a pilot project whereby a trainer completes a report regarding a participant's training and sends a copy to the next training location for their guidance in arranging the most productive experiences for the participant. This evaluation process is proving effective and is under consideration for use by other agencies in conducting practical field training. An evaluation of the preparation and use of this form by the Soil Conservation Service was exceptionally favorable. A "Trainers Report on Foreign Participant Training" is on file at USDA.

Exit Interviews: During FY 1967, 101 in-depth interviews were conducted, involving 333 randomly selected participants or 30 percent of those departing during this period. In 1968 interviews involved 318 participants or 29.4% of those departing during this period. This written technically-oriented interview is distributed to AID training cooperators and the program planning committee. It is designed to help all who assisted with the training to improve the quality of future programs in a similar field. This includes program specialists, agency committees, AID representatives and trainers in the agencies, universities, industry and others.

The exit interview provides an opportunity for the evaluator to

explore with the participant in some detail the degree of his satisfaction with the training program and the reasons why the program was or was not a success from his point of view. The interview is also beneficial for the participant -- providing him with the opportunity to review his accomplishments and to discuss how he plans to make use of his training when he returns home.

Exit Questionnaire: Participant reaction following the completion of training is a good indication--if not a complete proof--of the quality of training. In FY 1967, 96% of the participants who completed an exit questionnaire (USDA) 41% indicated their achievement of objectives as outstanding and 55% as satisfactory. An "Exit Questionnaire" is on file at USDA.

USAID Extension Advisors Offer Suggestions for Participant Training: A sample survey of 18 overseas extension advisers from the four areas of the world was made in 1967 to obtain suggestions on how to improve the quality and effectiveness of U.S. extension training experiences. Since 1954 some 1,900 extension workers from less-developed countries, sponsored by AID and FAO, had completed extension training in the United States.

The eighteen advisors completing the questionnaire had worked with 180 returned participants in their present assignments and 354 participants in previous country assignments. Five advisers called the training excellent. Ten rated it satisfactory and one said it was poor. One rated it "from excellent to good" and another marked it

"excellent to satisfactory." The final report called "USAID Extension Advisors Offer Suggestions on Participant Training" is on file at USDA.

Publication on "Ideal Training Program": This publication called "Guidelines Leading to the Ideal Training Program" was designed to stimulate improvement of training programs for foreign nationals. It deals with the three principal phases of training, (1) Preparation for training; (2) The training experience; and (3) Application and evaluation of training. A committee comprising land-grant university contacts, agency representatives, and program specialists developed the report. The publication is on file at USDA.

Evaluation of Orientation Program: The two-day formal orientation program for newly-arrived participants was recently evaluated as a part of the continuous effort to orient participants effectively to their upcoming training experiences in the U.S. Copies of the orientation program and the evaluation form are on file in USDA.

The questionnaire was completed by 100 participants. Discussion leaders received a rating of (4) or (5) on a scale of 1 to 5 in both content and presentation by 85% of the participants.

Case Studies: Case studies, a recognized method of analyzing past procedures by recording them in complete detail and thus revealing successful or defective actions, have been prepared on two training situations concerning agricultural participants. Copies of the case studies are made available to agencies, universities and USDA training

personnel for the benefits which can be derived by repeating successes and avoiding errors.

Enrichment Programs

In another special effort to improve the quality of training, the Foreign Training Division has worked with its cooperators to develop a series of special core training situations of short duration. Many but not all participants take part. The purpose of these special training situations is to broaden and deepen both the professional and technical experience of the participant and widen the visitor's understanding of the American environment, recognizing that these opportunities often must be created rather than assuming they are automatic for the alien living temporarily in our society. These special programs include:

1. Keys to Agricultural Development--A special two-week program conducted by two universities during the summer of 1968 and five universities in 1967. These seminars deal largely with agricultural development at the local level. The seminars, with rural area locale, were especially designed to supplement classroom-laboratory on-campus experience for enrolled participants.

2. Mid-Winter Leadership Seminars--Four seminars were sponsored by USDA during the Christmas holidays in 1968. The programs emphasized urban community problems and community action, visits to farms and

farm families, action of civil rights, operation of city government and local institutions, and Yuletide-season home hospitality.

3. Agricultural Development Seminars--This program, which is scheduled for two days during the terminal week in Washington prior to the participant's return home, is conducted once each month. The discussions include:

a. Acceleration and development of agriculture and rural industry in developing countries.

b. Factors responsible for agricultural development.

c. Changes in agricultural development and productivity of developing countries.

d. Priorities in accelerating future agricultural development.

4. Management Workshop--Included in the two-day orientation program for incoming participants is a two-and-a-half hour seminar stressing the vital role of modern management techniques in productivity and development. This discussion is designed to develop an interest in management whereby the participant will be alert to management techniques in evidence during his study and observation of U.S. agriculture.

Later in the participant's program (if scheduling permits), a full-fledged three-day management seminar is conducted for participants completing their U.S. training. Here they study in greater depth the concepts of modern management as tools in agricultural development. As part of the training, each participant prepares a plan of action

which he plans to follow when he resumes his work at home for special analysis of its management components.

Communications Seminars--Deserving much fuller treatment here because of the integral importance of this sociological-psychological approach to the central idea of technical assistance--i.e., the effective communication of ideas--these seminars were developed originally by USDA in 1956 as the result of their successful employment by the Kellogg Foundation-sponsored National Project in Agricultural Communications located on the Michigan State University campus. MSU's College of Communications Arts cooperated with NPAC in seminars for American agricultural extension personnel across the country.

The result has been take-over of the seminar by AID itself (in 1958) under a contract with MSU which features some 30 one-week seminars annually. Thus the seminars are available to AID participants in all subject-matter fields, with USDA using the seminars heavily. USDA also continues to sponsor a few selected one-week seminars in this field on land-grant university campuses. The trend is toward increasing use of the AID-MSU seminar because of its convenient and frequent scheduling.

Unique Types of In-Service Training--Quality in international training implies special efforts in making training relevant. This gets done many ways. Some examples: Florida-based field training for animal husbandrymen from sub-tropical African countries in basic livestock management; summer experience or vocational-type training in

elementary farm mechanization practices for enrolled participants in soils and related fields; in-laboratory training with USDA research scientists in the veterinary field for learning research techniques; visual aids workshops featuring group workshop production of visuals to support teaching and public campaigns; on-the-scene experience with forest rangers for foresters from developing countries including the tropical forests of Puerto Rico; in-service assignments with Soil Conservation Service to practice digging irrigation structures, mapping, surveying, etc.

The Problem of Quality--An evaluation of efforts to do quality training must of necessity point to failures or omissions. When training is especially pertinent, especially memorable and especially valuable to the international participant--it is often because some American in the programming planning process or even more importantly on the scene at a university of field training location performs beyond the call of duty. It certainly stems from dedication on the part of program planning personnel and trainers.

When quality training doesn't occur, it is too often because the training is done perfunctorily or the training request is carried out "within the letter of the law." Fortunately the agricultural fraternity in the U.S.--the vast army of civil servants, university personnel, agri-businessmen and farmers themselves--includes many exceptional people with a high sense of duty. But there are exceptions.

Meanwhile, there are elements which weigh against quality--the priority which domestic programs get in many governmental and educational institutions, the absence of a lobby for international affairs in legislative halls which would support more attention to international affairs; the emphasis in universities on publishing rather than teaching which takes major professors away from the training process; the crying need for overseas experience for training personel throughout the program despite efforts to use returned AID personnel where possible; the emphasis on academic degrees which though justified by facts of life in home countries de-emphasizes essential training experiences; the vast distances and communications problems involved between USAID's, Washington, and training locations here in the U.S.; and all the cultural and language gaps that produce misunderstandings. These are some of the reasons quality training does not always occur.

The stellar fact is that training has been as effective as it has been despite these handicaps.

E. COSTS

The costs of training supplied by the Department is represented by the annually negotiated budget. Because of the changing composition of the training load from year to year, it is difficult to identify cost trends in a meaningful way. Changing responsibilities assigned

to the Department by AID also influence costs.

The budget assigned to the Department is intended to cover costs of developing, implementing, supervising, supporting and evaluating the training. Included are funds to reimburse the Department for the actual training provided as well as funds for the supportive services.

The actual obligations for USDA training for the past 5 years are:

1964 - $1,515,130	1967 - $1,631,559
1965 - $1,642,263	1968 - $1,597,997
1966 - $1,619,290	1969 - ($1,450,000 - estimated)

Costs based on man-months of training supplied

The man-months of training supplied through USDA planned and supervised programs is shown in the table below. Shown also is the total cost per man-month of training provided; this figure includes all costs covered by the administrative support budget--staff, travel, printing, communication, support services, etc.

Fiscal Year	Man-Months of Training Provided	Cost per Man-Month of Trg.
1964	11,105	$136.43
1965	12,591	$130.43
1966	13,153	$123.11
1967	12,299	$132.65
1968	10,588	$150.92

It will be noted that the costs have been reasonably stable, but trending upward since 1966. This stems from several factors--chief of which are increased pay costs and a reduction in the number of academic participants.

Costs based on man-hours of staff time

The number of man-hours of USDA staff time (all purposes) devoted to training is shown in the following table. Shown also is a "cost per man-hours" figure which is derived by dividing total man-hours into the total obligations. Thus the "cost per man-hour" figure includes not only salary and benefits but all obligations in all other object classes. During the past 3 years an average of 89.8% of the total obligations was attributed to salary and benefits. The adjusted column below reflects this breakdown and more accurately reflects the actual costs for staff alone.

Fiscal Year	Total Number Man-Hours Staff (all purposes)	Cost Per Man-Hour Staff Time Provided	Adjusted
1964	296,700	$5.10	$4.58
1965	306,252	$5.36	$4.81
1966	291,756	$5.55	$4.98
1967	284,832	$5.72	$5.13
1968	281,196	$5.68	$5.10

F. AID-USDA ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS AND COORDINATION

Certain basic understandings and relationships between AID/USDA partners concerning program administration, finance and coordination undergird the planning and accomplishment of each individual training project and of the total overall training program.

Program policy and agreement on components of training are jointly developed, implemented and reviewed. AID defines the needs and justification for training, selects the participants and provides financing. USDA plans, arranges and conducts the training including supervision and reporting, utilizing the resources of agencies within the Department and a great number and variety of non-USDA institutions and groups.

Evaluation, program analysis and reporting both as to quality and volume are carried on continuously, with USDA assuming the major responsibility.

AID reimburses USDA in full for planning and providing the training, including the servicing of participants and the evaluation, supervision and reporting of programs. Tuition and other training fees to non-USDA cooperators, participant allowances and travel are disbursed by USDA from allocations from individual PIO/P funds. All other USDA costs including training conducted within the Department are paid from an annually negotiated budget supplied by AID.

Development of this budget always has been a complicated, long drawn out process because of such factors as the wide range of subject matter fields in which training is offered, differences in the amounts and levels of training in those fields which may be requested, variations in the cost of staff people who would conduct training at different levels in different fields, and AID/W-USDA inabilities to anticipate and project the number and types of Mission requests for training. A contributing factor is the continuing uncertainty of the level of the congressional overall appropriations to AID and the allocation of these funds country by country. As of March 1, 1969, for example, a firm budget figure had not been established for USDA's fiscal year 1969 operations under IADS.

Under such conditions, important decisions and planning are perforce delayed. Some functions and services have to be postponed, reduced or abandoned. While the difficulties are inherent in budget-making everywhere, they become especially serious to the AID-USDA joint operation because of the involvement of so many agencies and people who are independent of USDA. (See training recommendations #14, #17 and #18 on the need for adopting more simplified budgeting and financing procedures.)

AID Responsibilities

AID/W's many wide-ranging functions in the overall administration,

financing, and coordination of U.S. training are centered in the Office of International Training (OIT). This is composed of appropriate divisions 1) for training in Education, Public Health and Sanitation, Labor and other subject matter fields as well as in Agriculture; and 2) for providing services needed in all training fields such as evaluation and follow-up, budget and finance, international travel, visa problems, interpreter service, and special counselling assistance in participant emergencies.

In essence, OIT is the vital link and liaison between AID Missions and cooperating U.S. training agencies. The policies, interrelationships and procedures to be followed in the total overall program are defined in specific Manual Orders developed and implemented by OIT. These are continuously reviewed and modified as circumstances require.

Within OIT, the responsibilities for training in agriculture are borne by program development officers (PDO's) one for each geographic area, with appropriate professional training and experience in Agriculture or a closely related field. The areas are (1) Latin America and Caribbean, (2) Near East and South Asia, (3) Southeast Asia and Pacific, (4) Africa, and (5) Viet Nam. These PDOs, with small administrative and clerical staffs, carry the load of all programming relationships with USDA. Subject matter specialists of AID's Regional Technical Bureaus are drawn into program planning, review, and evaluation

so far as their other heavy workloads permit.

USDA Responsibilities

In USDA, liaison with AID and the responsibilities of overall administration, program planning, implementation, evaluation, and general coordination are centered in the Foreign Training Division (FTD) of the International Agricultural Development Service (IADS). Personnel, budget and finance, and travel services are provided by relevant units of the Foreign Agricultural Service. The Foreign Training Division is composed of the Office of the Director, four "subject matter" branches, the Evaluation Unit, the Records and Reports Unit, and the Program Services Unit.

Two consultants are employed on a part-time basis to direct weekly participant seminars in "Agricultural Development" and "Scientific Management."

The key persons in FTD are the 14 Program Specialists with more or less specific subject matter assignments within the four Branches. These professionally-trained and broadly-experienced persons coordinate the vital functions involved in the planning of individual and group training programs and in the implementation and continuous evaluation and refinement of those programs. They are directly responsible for program relationships with AID/W, participants and training cooperators whether within or outside USDA.

The other key persons in USDA are the agency representatives designated by each of the "Services" within the Department. These are highly-qualified specialists within their respective fields and serve four vital functions:

1) representing their agencies on Program Planning Committees;
2) arranging, coordinating and supervising training conducted by their agencies both in Washington and in the field;
3) arranging and directing the special technical orientation such participants need; and
4) assisting in the evaluation of training, both during and at termination of programs.

In addition, they often provide other needed reinforcement to Program Specialists, AID's PDOs,non-USDA cooperators and participants as circumstances require.

University Role

USDA's relations with cooperating universities are conducted by the Foreign Training Division through the "Contact Officer" designated by the president of the institution. These officials in turn coordinate the university's review of training requests, the response given, training activities arranged for participants within or outside the academic program, periodic evaluation reports of participant progress, the handling of tuition or other training fees, solution of ordinary partic-

ipant problems and other institutionally related matters. These "Contact" persons and other university staff appreciate and make effective use of the flexibility and responsibility which USDA grants to them as they become full partners in a training project.

Training relations with independent non-university cooperators are initiated and crystallized by FTD, usually by letter followed up by telephone or other informal communication. Previous satisfactory relationships facilitate considerable cooperation in new projects. These cooperators also are given considerable flexibility with responsibility in arranging and conducting training segments.

The program interrelationships outlined briefly above are discussed in full detail in the next major sections of this paper, see Attachment #6.

G. FOLLOW-UP ARRANGEMENTS

The ultimate evaluation of the quality and value of the training provided foreign nationals in the United States is in the performance after they return home. This is difficult to assess for many reasons--long distances from the U.S., scattered and isolated assignments of participants in the home country, and shifting of personnel within USAID Missions.

There is much to document the urgent need for better follow-up

procedures. Cooperating training institutions, mostly the universities, make chronic pleas along this line. Like all educators, they have valid reasons for needing to measure what they have accomplished. For morale reasons alone, they ought to know if they are achieving anything.

There is also evidence of great disappointment among participants when Americans appear to drop their concern for their welfare once they have "disappeared" into their own societies. The fact that many Americans may continue to care is lost on the participant who receives no attentions from USAID and virtually no correspondence from the U.S. His enthusiasm and motivation can cool quickly under such conditions.

Fortunately, such is not always the case. Many American technicians and other training personnel carry on useful professional and even personal correspondence with returned agricultural participants. USDA's Federal Extension Service and the Office of Information, among others, retain mailing lists and distribute news letters to returned participants. Some universities have similar methods of keeping in touch.

AID assigns the major responsibility for follow-up to OIT in AID. The present "follow-up" AID Manual Order suggests ways USAID employees can assist and continue the training of returned participants. A "Returned Participant's Follow-up Activities Report" form

is furnished for the Mission's convenience. Some tangible results are obtained but much more is needed.

AID's worldwide evaluation survey was a major effort not only to report to Americans but to reinforce foreign national understandings of the importance of the training endeavor. But cooperating agricultural personnel need far more specific information and feedback.

Without specific responsibilities but with major concern for the importance of follow-up, USDA's Foreign Training Division has taken certain steps to assure some types of follow-up. One of these is a detailed statement in each participant's Program and Itinerary suggesting regular reports back to the U.S. in addition to specific USAID Mission contacts.

The USDA, under a PASA arrangement, sent a specialist to Sudan and Turkey to assist returned participants in conducting training seminars with their own ministry employees. This has been limited to "Agricultural Administration", but could be extended to include scores of other fields. (See Sudan Report which is on file in USDA.)

The USDA has also prepared a sample letter and questionnaire which could be distributed by the program specialist to returned participants. These are presently being considered by AID/Washington.

Attachment Number 6

EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE UNDER GENERAL AGREEMENT, APPENDIX V -- TRAINING

I. Responsibilities of USDA

A. COMPONENTS OF A TRAINING PROGRAM

Earlier Training was defined in the AID-USDA context as "the effective transfer to strategic nationals of knowledge, techniques and understanding needed to initiate and reinforce specific development efforts." Thus the training to be planned and conducted must be in direct response to 1) country needs and 2) to the participant's abilities to identify, learn and absorb during training and to apply his learning in his work in development back home.

This in turn dictates that only strong participants be selected and that the PIO/P information be clear, specific and complete as to the country's needs for training, the participant's present capacities and how his new competencies will be utilized. Lacking this, fully effective training cannot be either planned or accomplished.

The components of effective training and thus of a strong training program are:

1. Project aims and objectives. These are derived and developed from PIO/P information and other reliable sources and are in accord with the country situation, the Mission's assistance goals and the participant's present capacities and future career

responsibilities. These are phrased to define the subject-matter involved and to give trainers and the participant maximum guidance in performing their respective roles.

2. Orientation and counselling. Participant orientation involves a group program described in Attachment #5 under "Quality of Training." Individual orientation goes on throughout the training. The program specialist counsels the participant regarding his opportunity and responsibility as well as giving him the assurance of a center to write or call if a special problem of any nature may arise.

3. The kinds and level of training content provided need also to be in accord with project objectives and the capabilities of the participant. So far as practicable, these are also applicable or readily adaptable to home country conditions and to the uses the participant and his fellow nationals will make of them.

Some related content beyond the special field of training is provided to promote understanding of how different subject disciplines complement and reinforce each other, enhance the "multiplier" effects and his opportunities for career advancement. This includes acquiring some appreciation of the true nature and processes of development and the roles and techniques of research, extension, training of others, "communication" of ideas, leadership, attitudes of public service, administrative management, public relations, and "institution building" in general.

4. Training methods, materials and facilities are selected and adjusted to fit the training content being conveyed or transferred and the participant's specific and changing needs during training. Efforts are made to demonstrate how these methods and materials may be adapted and applied in the participant's training of and influences on others back home. The training methods employed involve the participant in several ways--i.e. reading and study, discussion, observation and actual physical activity or practice and possibly on-the-job training.

Through arrangements made by trainers or on their own initiative participants pursue many types of activities to broaden, intensify and enrich the total learning adapting experience. Examples of this are: seminars, conferences, informal discussion groups, professional society meetings, fairs and exhibits, field observation tours, preparation of work plans and materials for use back home. "Non-technical" activities are pursued, such as visits to farm families, schools, cooperatives and other community groups and services to enable interchange of ideas with leaders and others and to gain better understanding of the influences of agricultural technology on general economic and social development.

5. Training locations; environment. Training segments are conducted in environments (type of activity, climate and season, geography, level of technology, etc.) which can make maximum contribution to the training-learning-absorbing process. The program may

include repetitive activities in varied locations to demonstrate the application or adaptation of the same technology or programming to different situations.

6. The sequence and pace of training segments are carefully arranged to facilitate the orderly accomplishment and accumulation of learning; each segment contributes its values to preceding as well as subsequent segments. Trainers in each location are aware of what has gone before and what is yet to come.

7. The training program is periodically reviewed and refined as needed. This is accomplished through timely and effective communication between USDA planners, the participant and his local training supervisor. The latter two join in submitting formal and/or informal reports of progress and any problems. The responsible USDA persons study such reports and initiate actions needed.

If warranted and feasible, the Department representative will arrange a supervisory visit as part of a larger field trip so that all three parties can review and resolve problems in conference. Routine problems are resolved on the ground by the trainer and participant under the discretion and responsibility granted to each by the USDA program planning committee.

8. At termination time, the participant, the program specialist and other pertinent committee members join in a final review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the total training program and the participant's accomplishment of project objectives. This is

accomplished through conferences, the participant's preparation of the Predeparture Report to AID, his completion of USDA's "technical" Exit Questionnaire and AID's "attitudinal" DETRI Questionnaire, and a final conference with the AID PDO. The participant also may engage in an Exit Interview conducted by FTD's Evaluation Unit.

Throughout these terminal activities some emphasis is given to the utilization of the training gained in the career situation back home. Vivid interpretation of these "Components of Effective Training" will be found in "Guidelines to the Ideal Training Program" prepared by a joint AID-USDA Committee. Further discussion is provided in detailed case studies of two actual training projects. Another useful publication is "GUIDELINES - USDA's Responsibilities in Foreign Agricultural Training." These are all on file at USDA.

B. IN DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. Determining the agencies, organizations and institutions from whom assistance is needed.

This determination must be made for each training program, using the guidelines provided in each PIO/P. The selection of needed "cooperators" is the more complicated by the range and variety of USDA's own far-flung activities and facilities and its myriad direct and indirect relationships with other federal departments, regional and state institutions and private entities.

This selection is one of the early priority functions of the joint AID-USDA program planning committee developed and coordinated by the specific program specialist to whom the project has been assigned. Criteria and procedures for selection of cooperators have become refined and well established over the years. Principal criteria are: agency's or institition's interests, attitudes and experience in the overall technical assistance program and/or in development of the specific home country; its effectiveness in conducting training for previous participants; its ability to conduct training of the geographic-climatic character and technology level desired in the current project; length and seasonal aspects of the segments desired; the direct cost of training fees to be charged, if any. The committee may be comprised of two or three members or as many as 10 or 12 representatives of USDA agencies, other federal departments and Washington-based representatives of private firms or entities.

The actual recruitment approach and subsequent relations with selected cooperators are treated in later sections.

Timeliness in identifying cooperators desired is of crucial importance, leading to an orderly development and multiplication of the Proposed Program and its submission 1) through AID/W to the Mission for review and reaction, and use in the predeparture

orientation for the participant and 2) through proper channels to the proposed cooperators for their review and response. This timing must be such as to enable the program planning committee to develop alternative training segments and dates, if needed, prior to or concurrent with the participant's U.S. arrival.

Full effectiveness in determining needed cooperators may be limited by a) insufficient lead time between USDA's receipt of the PIO/P and Mission's requested starting date; b) lack of PIO/P flexibility in duration of training and seasonal beginning of training period; c) inadequate description in PIO/P of the home country situation or types and levels of training needed (objectives) or the participant's background, present competencies including English proficiency, and future responsibilities; and d) too great reliance by some committees on a few frequently-used cooperators to provide the variety and blend of training activities needed to accomplish project objectives.

Suggestions for improvement: Deficiencies a), b) and c) are traceable to internal Mission problems or shortcomings; d) is due largely to expediency considerations in the face of short lead time and/or heavy work loads; d) also reflects lack of full appreciation of the contributions some less frequently-used cooperators may be capable of making to a specific training program.

2. Preparing a proposed training program for AID review and concurrence.

When properly developed and used the Proposed Program's utility value in arranging and accomplishing the training needed is very high. The concept of the "Proposed" Program was pioneered by USDA in 1951 and has been adopted by several other agencies and institutions which provide foreign training in co-operation with AID and other technical assistance groups. USDA's measure of its importance is shown by the fact that during FY 1968 Proposed Programs were prepared for 95.4% of the projects (see later comments on effectiveness with which these are used). Its contributions to training can be summarized as:

a. Identifying the several cooperators hopefully to be mobilized for the program and their specific training responsibility.

b. Interpreting to these cooperators the country situation, overall training objectives and participant's background, present capabilities and future responsibilities.

c. Providing clear evidence to AID/W and Mission of 1) the Department's degree of understanding of the training request (PIO/P) and 2) the kind of responsibilities the Department and other cooperators propose to assume in accomplishing the training. This facilitates Mission review and concurrence or proposal of alternatives.

d. Providing an effective instrument which Mission staff and others can use in providing effective predeparture orientation.

e. Enabling the participant and other country representatives to join in reviewing in advance the proposed plan and in suggesting changes if needed. Assisting the participant in reconciling possibly conflicting personal desires with the official project objectives and in preparing himself physically, technically and emotionally to enter upon and perform his central role in the project. The World-wide Evaluation of Participant Training shows that the more active the role of the participant and his supervisor in the pre-departure planning of the program, the greater the utilization of the training on return home.

f. Providing AID/W and USDA staff with relatively precise information for planning their respective functions in reception, orientation, training and fiscal operations--especially in budgeting the training project. Projects initiated without a Proposed Program are usually characterized by kinds of uncertainty and misunderstanding which effects the morale and thus the performance of the many parties in the project and especially those of the participant.

Obviously the timing of the preparation and distribution of the Proposed Program are vital in its usefulness. During FY 1968 a significant number of such programs prepared did not reach Missions and participants in time for effective use before departure for the U.S. Factors affecting timeliness of preparation include: amount of lead

time between USDA's receipt of the PIO/P and the proposed starting date; lack of flexibility in the PIO/P concerning length of training period and best seasonal starting date; prestige level of the participant - i.e. the higher the rank, the later the PIO/P is received and greater care and time is used in preparing the proposed program; and heavy work loads (especially at peak training seasons) of USDA and AID/W training staff people.

3. Providing AID with reports concerning participants.

Because this function is of the nature of "evaluation" it is treated elsewhere (under C. In the Implementation of Training Programs).

The information accumulated from "reports" and other evaluation of previous programs are useful in the program planning process. However, there is wide variation among USDA and AID/W staff in the use of such information.

4. Developing alternative training programs as needed.

Most "Proposed Programs" must be refined in some, perhaps several, of their elements as the program specialist and committee accumulate additional information about the home country situation, the training desired (objectives), the participant's arrival "on schedule", his abilities and needs, and the abilities of "proposed" cooperators to provide training experiences requested of them. Some programs may require significant adjustment and "tailoring" to make them conform to the numerous factors controlling the situation.

Initial refinements are woven into the green Final Program which is prepared soon after the participant has arrived and entered upon his training. Such later changes as are needed are spelled out in one or more "Amendments." Copies are on file in USDA. During FY 1968, 1082 amendments were prepared.

Obviously, any change made must be within the framework of the official PIO/P or an amendment to that document initiated by the Mission. But need for alterations in the training plan are often justified--as participants mature and trainers get better acquainted with training needs.

Principal virtues of the firm Program and the amendments are that they provide virtual agreements between AID/W, USDA, the participant and each cooperator to begin and carry forward their respective responsibilities as described; the firm base needed for budgeting project funds, planning the participant's travel and disbursing of participant allowances and of training fees if any to cooperators; the descriptive frame for continuous evaluation during training and at termination and; a permanent record for all parties concerned.

Needs for developing alternative training (i.e. different from that described in the Proposed Program) arise mainly from such circumstances as:

a. Inadequate or misleading information in the PIO/P concerning the country situation, types and levels of training desired by the Mission or the participant's capabilities.

b. The participant's performance during initial training at a lower or higher level than that originally expected thus dictating changes in 1) types of activities he could and should pursue; 2) number and duration of specific segments; and 3) possibly the length of the total training period. His potentials for growth during training and for "multiplier" effects on return home may justify the blending in of new segments which could not be foreseen. Conversely, his lack of such potentials may dictate reducing the variety of experiences to enable greater concentration on the segments he can master.

c. Changes by Mission in duration of training, starting date and even in the identity of the participant (not anticipated by AID/W and USDA).

d. Inability of one or more originally proposed cooperators to assist in the program exactly as requested.

Shortcomings in USDA's performance of this function of developing alternative training are few and stem mainly from expediency under circumstances of limited time or heavy workloads. The principal shortcomings are:

a. The program specialist and committee may fail to request AID/W and Missions to supplement or correct obviously inadequate PIO/P information; the Mission may not respond to such a request in a timely or effective manner.

b. The program specialist and appropriate committee members may not have counselled sufficiently with the participant during his initial Washington period to become aware of deficiencies in PIO/P information.

c. Communication and response beyond the standard written reports between the participant-cooperator-program specialist or agency representative during training may be inadequate.

d. Poor timing in the actual preparation and standard distribution of the firm Program and amendments may keep several parties off balance (the participant himself, the cooperators, and fiscal management and travel unit people). AID/W may be unable to convey significant information to Mission in a fully effective way.

C. IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

Once planned, the high potential yield of each "tailor-made" training program rests on timely, discerning "implementation" of the varied initiatives and commitments involved--from the project's inception in the home country, through the training to the participant's return to and adjustment in a career situation back home.

USDA's implementation responsibilities center principally on enabling the participants and the training cooperators to function at their best.

1. Arranging with institutional and organizational entities to provide the training.

During FY 1968, more than 3500 segments of training for more than 700 AID primary participants were conducted; more than half of these were in non-USDA institutions or entities; 197 segments were with private firms or organizations, somewhat lower than in the immediately preceding years. USDA assumes the rather formidable responsibility of making contacts to set up all of these training segments and does so satisfactorily as evidenced by these facts:

a. With relatively few exceptions during FY 1968, and previous years, nearly all the cooperators identified in the Proposed Programs provided training which adhered closely to that requested.

b. A firm plan (Proposed Program wherein training arrangements are already confirmed with U.S. institutions) for at least the early segments was ready and waiting for practically 100% of participants on their arrival in USA. In a substantial number of cases, this plan had arrived in home countries before participant departures.

c. Most of the 1082 amendments prepared in FY 1968 were refinements of duration or dates of segments or described periods with additional cooperators; relatively few amendments dealt with

substitutions for cooperators who were unable to assist. This ignores one special problem on purely academic training segments--admissions to universities as a full-fledged student. Turn-downs can be frequent when grades and background are weak and when admissions offices govern acceptances.

d. Practically all FY 1968 cooperators had provided training in FY 1967, and previous years, thus signifying interest in and support of the overall program and confidence and satisfaction in their previous training relations with USDA and AID/W.

e. Ninety-six percent of the FY 1967 participants completing the USDA Exit Questionnaire indicated their achievement of objectives as "outstanding" (41%) or "Satisfactory" (55%), - a clear evidence that USDA arrangements with cooperators had been effective. Further evidence of this is found in the high value rating which these participants gave to non-technical activities arranged by many cooperators--such as visits to farms and homes, schools, cooperatives, and other community groups.

USDA's effective relations with cooperators stem from many things--among them the longtime kinship of the Department with agricultural people and the land-grant universities throughout the Nation and the flexibility given these training cooperators in determining the training pattern.

However, <u>not all arrangements with cooperators are productive and satisfying</u> for all parties concerned. These difficulties arise mainly from such circumstances as:

a. Unwise initial selection of cooperators.

b. Tardy or otherwise ineffective communication of training goals.

c. Too little or too much responsibility and discretion given to cooperator.

d. Poor timing of segments.

e. Inaccurate estimation of participant's capacities.

f. Participant's arrival for segment "off schedule."

g. Cooperator's unsatisfactory experience with previous participants.

h. Lack of response, evaluation, "supervision" and recognition from USDA in the current or previous projects.

2. <u>Providing Orientation Information and Activities</u>

Obviously the participant and the "program" are the most important ingredients in any training project. Hopefully, the two are compatible. Only through favorable emotional, intellectual and technical adjustment to his new and often overwhelming living and learning environment can the participant effectively perform his very difficult and crucial role.

The three types of orientation provided by USDA and discussed below are intended to blend with and compliment the Mission's "predeparture" orientation, AID/W's "Administrative Orientation" and the Washington International Center's five-day broad "Introduction to the United States." The WIC program is on file at USDA. Also, most academic degree participants attend a two-week "Pre-University Workshop" in late August.

a. USDA's weekly three-day Group Orientation (copy of the program is on file at USDA) provides generally appropriate information relating to the history, geographic and economic aspects of U.S. agriculture, farm life and rural institutions; the role of research, technological trends, organization and functions of USDA; administrative management as a tool in agricultural development; procedures and relationships used in planning participant's training programs and fiscal arrangements affecting these projects.

The program provides films, other visual materials and reference handouts. The latter includes a manual of instructions on participant allowances, travel, etc. and fiscal regulations which is continuously revised as needed. The manual is on file at USDA. The program also includes a one-day tour of research facilities at Beltsville.

b. Special group orientation sessions of several hours duration are provided in certain "technical" subject matter areas. Examples:

Soil and Water Conservation, Statistics, Cooperatives, Marketing, Home Economics and Human Nutrition, Extension Information and Forestry.

c. Individual orientation and counselling

The most vital orientation the participant acquires is that provided through counselling and guidance by his program specialist and the committee members most involved in planning, directing and coordinating his training activities. Participants' needs for individual counselling and special orientation vary widely because of such factors as 1) the nature of the training to be pursued, i.e. field observation or in-service training versus academic study; 2) maturity, experience and sophistication; 3) proficiency in English; 4) whether or not the Proposed Program reached him before departing the home country; 5) the adequacy of "predeparture" orientation; and 6) whether or not his personal interests and objectives have become reconciled with the official project objectives and the program to be followed.

The benefits of counselling can be summarized as follows: the participant gets an understanding of the why, when and where of his training segments; the PIO/P background can be verified and augmented; conflicting project objectives and those of a personal nature are reconciled; fears, misunderstandings and possible prejudices hopefully are revealed and corrected; the participant

learns of USDA's relations and training agreement with cooperators, their resources, their expectations of the participant, and the responsibility and flexibility USDA has given them as partners in the program. Friendship, mutual understanding and other rapport are developed, serving to reinforce the participant far from home and family and facilitating informal communication.

3. Evaluating program effectiveness by appropriate methods

The needs for specific training in U.S. and the inputs into each training project by the AID sponsor, the participant himself, USDA and other training cooperators dictate that special and continuing efforts be made to review and assess the effectiveness of a) planning and conducting the training; b) the participant's performance and progress during training; and c) his accomplishment of the total program. Similarly, the needs of AID and cooperating countries for future training in U.S. for some years at least require that continuing review and evaluation be made of the appropriateness and effectiveness of the total overall training program.

The Department's efforts at evaluating overall program effectiveness and employing these findings to provide continuing high-quality training are mostly covered in attachment #5, section D, on "Quality of the Services Provided." Some supplementary aspects of evaluation are included here.

Evaluation, i.e. review and appraisal, actually begins in conferences which program specialists and committee members hold with the participant on his arrival in USDA to begin training. Assessment is made of (1) the participant's capabilities and attitudes to enter upon and accomplish the program and (2) the appropriateness of the types and levels of activities he can pursue. Needed adjustments are incorporated into the green Firm Program.

Interviews are conducted with participants and trainers during USDA staff's field supervisory visits.

Interviews are conducted by Technical Leaders with participants and cooperators in team projects during training and between the leader and project planners at project's termination.

Interviews are conducted by the Program Specialist, other members of the Committee or others in USDA with participants and teams at project termination time.

The official Exit Interview is conducted by FTD's Evaluation Specialist with all teams (if terminating in Washington) and a varying proportion of individual participants, depending on case load and other circumstances. Approximately 30% of participants departing USA during FY 1968 were interviewed. Percentages for recent years are similar or a little higher.

To date, "sampling" has not been on a strict percentage or "scientific" basis because the informal procedures used and free responses obtained do not lend themselves to statistical analysis. It is felt, however, that open slow-paced yet systematic questioning in an informal atmosphere yields fully reliable information, probably more so than under more prescribed formalized procedures. Most individual interviews are tape-recorded; those with teams are transcribed from an assistant's shorthand notes.

Those interviews having some special values or significance are recorded in full; others are summarized. Copies of interviews are on file at USDA. These reports are distributed widely and as promptly as possible to all interested persons. The focus of interviews tends to be on "technical" aspects rather than the "attitudinal." The latter is covered in the DETRI exit questionnaire administered and summarized by the American University under contract with AID.

Major problems concerning exit interviews are that the results or findings 1) may not be conveyed to AID/W and Missions in timely and systematic ways and 2) are not fully utilized by program specialists and committee members in planning and conducting future programs.

Some degree of overall review and evaluation is present in each of the following regular activities or special "projects":

a) Formation of the program planning committee for each training project and the committee's collaborative work in project planning meetings.

b) Contacts with USDA field staff and non-USDA cooperators during "supervisory" field trips made by program specialists and agency representatives (for budgetary reasons virtually not being done at present.)

c) "Orientation" of a few or several days each conducted in Washington by FTD for newly-designated university "Contact Officers." This is usually on an individual basis.

d) Occasional planned or unplanned conferences in Washington with representatives of private entities.

e) The monthly "Contact" meetings jointly planned and conducted for USDA agency representatives, AID's PDOs and FTD staff.

f) The weekly meetings of FTD staff which are attended by FTD professional staff and at least one and usually more AID PDOs. These are focused on review and strengthening of different aspects of the overall program.

g) FTD representation at AID-sponsored meetings such as the periodic "Inter-Agency Meeting."

h) The "Annual Conference on Foreign Agricultural Affairs" attended by University "contact officers," USDA training staff,

representatives of several non-USDA and non-academic cooperators and AID/W staff. A copy of the program for the 1965 conference is on file at USDA. These meetings have been suspended during recent years due to the shortage of AID funds to support them.

i) Systematic evaluation of the effectiveness and value to participants of special short-term courses in: Communications Seminars, "Keys to Development" seminars, and Christmas programs (Midwinter Leadership Seminars).

j) Preparation and use of periodic statistical reports to AID, especially the Annual Summary of the program through FY 1966 replaced since by the Annual Statistical Summary due to reduced AID funds and increased FTD workloads. Examples of these summaries are on file at USDA.

k) News stories or press releases on participants' activities during training or after return home. While these are of a public information and promotional character, they are partly evaluative in their preparation and use.

l) Case studies of selected training projects (copies of two studies are on file at USDA) to analyze, interpret and "highlight" priorities, processes and interrelationships in the planning, conducting and evaluation of training and its subsequent utilization in the home country.

m) The planning, preparation and use of "Guidelines Leading to the Ideal Training Program"--joint USDA-AID committee effort published in January 1968.

n) "GUIDELINES - USDA's Responsibilities in Foreign Agricultural Training"--prepared by a USDA committee. (Copy on file at USDA.)

o) A Picture Story Series "And the Answers Came from His U.S. Training"--one of a pictorial leaflet series issued by USDA's Office of Information. This one highlights success stories of returned participants. (Copy on file at USDA.)

p) "USAID Extension Advisors Offer Suggestions on Participant Training"--a joint 1967 USDA-AID evaluation survey of the views of 18 overseas Extension specialists on how to improve U.S. training of foreign nationals in Extension work. The major initiative and work was supplied by the Department's Federal Extension Service and the IADS Foreign Training Division. (Copy on file at USDA.)

Evaluation of a special sort--emphasizing an accurate response to Mission objectives in training--comes about through the "Academic Enrollment/Term Reports" submitted by participants via their university contact or faculty adviser and then to USDA and AID/W. This aspect of reporting to AID has worked exceedingly well and has proved to be one of the most useful supervisory tools for both USDA program

specialists and AID PDOs. It has helped curb some former abuses in the way of too-small course loads and switching of major subject-matter fields. The reports, which include grades, are also vital in providing documentation for approving or disapproving extensions.

Getting 100 percent of these reports in at the ends of quarters and semesters has encountered some difficulties. Universities have to be constantly reminded. AID PDOs have exhibited special alertness in this regard, catching gaps in this reporting system.

Pre-departure reports prepared by participants, submitted to USDA and forwarded on to AID and the Missions too often have been haphazardly written--with notable exceptions. Useful when well-done, they sometimes contain eloquent testimonies to the value of training. USDA forwards them promptly but processing them in AID has proven a back-breaking job--copies for distributing to those involved in training sometimes do not arrive back at USDA until six months after training is completed.

General laxity concerning the pre-departure reports may explain their frequent lack of substantive import. Participants may well sense that neither AID nor USDA regards them very seriously (except in scattered instances). Other factors affecting their quality adversely--the haste and concentration on departure details marking the terminal week for most participants, English-language deficiencies, and the lack of a quiet place for preparing the report. These reports could be a better training tool than they presently are.

Team reports are often better than individual ones, partly because the technical leader oversees preparation. Also, participants in a group rightly use the opportunity to focus together on the significance of their U.S. experience.

4. Assistance to AID Participants and Training Cooperators in Emergencies

Types of emergencies: accident or illness requiring prolonged medical-hospital care, possibly surgery; mental breakdown; recalls to home country because of family or political crises; participant performance or other behavior prejudicial to the project and to the overall AID-USDA program; loss of tickets, significant sums of money, valuable luggage, etc.

Although participants are more vulnerable than others to these and other difficulties, happily these emergencies occur rarely. Most of these result from causes beyond the control of AID/W, USDA and Cooperators. USDA's responsibilities are in the nature of; a) receiving and evaluating the information and reporting essentials to AID/W; b) communicating and interpreting AID/W's policies, regulations and decisions to participants, cooperators, and possibly others; and c) providing reinforcement and follow-through services to all parties as needed to resolve the crisis. AID/W's appropriate resources for and responses in emergencies are discussed later under "AID Responsibilities."

USDA's performance, channeled through the specific Program Specialist, has been timely and otherwise effective because

of: a) the program specialist's and cooperator's sensitivity, discernment and discretion developed through previous experience; b) the program specialist's familiarity with AID policies, regulations and resources; c) his rapport and effective communication developed through other operations with participants, cooperators and AID which facilitates prompt and appropriate responses; d) his command of supporting and follow-through services (e.g., emergency travel)which are centered in FTD and IADS; e) available alternative training resources if quick change in training level or location is necessary.

5. USDA provides through the Foreign Training Division of IADS periodic statistical reports and some of the analyses which AID needs for its continuing review and administration of the overall program. Such reporting is also vital to training cooperators and facilitates joint review needed as in budgeting, accounting, staffing and public relations. Certain reports include information on the numbers and origins of non-AID participants and the numbers of foreign agricultural "visitors" programmed or "assisted" by USDA and its cooperators.

The design, frequency and utilization of the statistical reports is examined and modified as needed to meet new requirements, including the recent computerizing of some data in AID.

6. Arranging Technical Leader Services for Team Projects

The selection and functioning of an effective program and justifying the investment of funds and effort. The technical leader is far more than a "tour manager." In brief the technical leader's primary functions are to:

a) Assist participants to understand and adjust to the program and to prepare for and utilize opportunities to increase the yield of each segment.

b) Develop unity and strong support within the team and between the team and the leader himself.

c) Assist each training cooperator to know participant's capabilities and hopes.

d) Alert each subsequent cooperator on essential points about the team and its response to prior program segments, learn of pre-planned activities and propose refinements as needed.

e) Arrange feasible non-technical activities to enable participants to pursue personal interests and to understand better the U.S. society, economy, and institutions.

f) Manage logistics of the tour to conserve funds and the team's energy and to assure timely arrivals.

g) Maintain effective communication with program specialist and appropriate committee members including recommended changes

in overall program as needed.

h) At termination, advise team in the preparation of its official report to AID in the home country and assist team, program committee, and AID in evaluating all segments of the program.

i) Prepare and submit the leader's evaluative report (a copy of such a report is on file at USDA) giving special emphasis to the potentials of each participant, the strengths and weaknesses of each program segment, and the strengths and weaknesses of USDA's planning and implementation of the overall program. Help draft letters which USDA should send to cooperators expressing appreciation.

A "Handbook for Technical Leaders" is on file at USDA.

Leaders Recruited and Hired by USDA:

FY	Leaders	Average Service	Average Monthly Salary
1967	45	3.5 months	$980
1968	51	3.5 months	$1,000

Each program specialist and committee have responsibility for selection, orientation, travel (logistics) backstopping and reports. Selections of leaders are subject to review and approval by AID's PDO and/or technician for the project. Appointments higher than GS-13 must be approved by the Office of the Secretary.

FTD handles personnel actions through FAS Personnel; FTD's Participant Service Unit handles disbursement of salary and per diem, travel vouchers and other reimbursable items. Six of the 31 FY 1968 leaders were drawn from current USDA staff, twenty-five of the total were recruited, usually on a reimbursable basis, from the universities which provided a major portion of the training programs involved. All of these leaders had had some or considerable foreign experience and/or significant experience in training foreign nationals in the United States.

The techniques and procedures for selection, orientation and servicing have been strengthened and refined over many years and are strongly endorsed by AID/W, USDA itself, training cooperators and the selected leaders themselves. Poor selections have been minimal. Most have been outstandingly successful. The policies and procedures now in effect should be continued with constant appraisal of effectiveness and refinements made as needed. There is a continuing need to recruit younger technical leaders but the best resource pool tends to be among the retired.

7. Disbursement of Participant Allowances

a. Maintenance is paid monthly in advance to cover costs of lodging, food, local travel, tips and laundry. Daily rates

are reviewed periodically to assure adequacy. During FY 1968, the Program Services Unit disbursed approximately 7,400 checks to 1,800 participants, totalling slightly over 2 million dollars.

Because daily maintenance rates vary with participants' work situations (i.e., travel status versus academic in-residence), and variations in cost of living in residence locations, the calculation of check amounts in advance is a constant and demanding task. Individual "pay patterns" which keep participants and others fully informed, are based on the Firm Program and Amendments. A sample copy is on file at USDA. Principal problems in disbursment stem from time lag in informing fiscal staff of needed changes in these patterns. Under- or over-payments must be calculated and corrected in subsequent checks or at project termination.

Procedures have been continuously refined over many years and enable the Foreign Training Division to perform this function well, considering the inherent difficulties involved. For morale purposes where participants are concerned and the overall smooth flow of training, prompt and accurate delivery of maintenance checks is far more important than its apparent routine nature indicates.

b. Total allowances for "books and training aids" are based

on length of the training period and the nature of activities pursued; academically enrolled participants receive larger allowances than others. Payment is made in advance, annually for those here as long as a year. Expenditures exceeding the maximum are borne by the participant unless these are described in detail and approved jointly by the Program Specialist and the PDO. These maximums are periodically reviewed for adequacy. Recent changes in participants' reporting of expenditures have reduced the fiscal work required.

c. An advance of funds to cover typing and related costs of graduate theses is made at an appropriate time up to the maximum of $150 for the Master's degree and $400 for the Ph.D. Payment of a portion or the total of this advance is initiated by the program specialist after receiving a request from the participant and evidence that requirements for the degree will be met before termination of the training period. At the proper time the participant submits a detailed accounting of expenditures supported by receipts. Any unexpended balance must be refunded before departure for the home country. Expenditures over the maximum are borne by the participant.

There are no serious problems involved in this procedure. The maximum rates of the allowance are reviewed periodically. Those indicated above have been in effect since August 19, 1968.

8. There are no basic shortcomings in USDA's arrangements of participants' U.S. transportation or its handling of related travel problems. Difficulties which occur are minimal and of individual nature and are inherent in a program of such magnitude and complexity. USDA's Foreign Travel Section has performed with unusual efficiency over the years.

An average of about 9% of each PIO/P's funds are spent for transportation. Air travel is at Economy Class rate. Train or bus travel is used when convenient.

Timeliness of travel arrangements is essential to the smooth accomplishment of program objectives. Off-schedule arrivals introduce serious complications for both the participants and cooperators and may endanger the friendly working relationships so vital to effective training. This applies especially to closely-timed field activities provided by independent agencies and private firms.

The program specialist initiates all requests for travel, whether from Washington or between training locations and return to Washington. Requests serviced by the FAS Travel Section shows 1,729 requests serviced during calendar year 1968. Travellers from Washington are provided with tickets, reservations and a firm time-routing schedule. When travel from other locations is needed, T/R's and a recommended time-routing schedule are sent to the participant and he secures his own

tickets and reservations. Cooperators assist him as needed. Participants are authorized to purchase transportation needed within segments and for short trips between training locations and claim reimbursement. A typical travel schedule is on file at USDA.

9. Relationships and procedures in the payment of tuition or training fees to cooperating universities and other insitutions are continuously reviewed, and strengthened where possible. Until July 1966 tuition was paid by AID/W from Inter-Regional Funds: since then it has been paid by USDA from PIO/P funds allocated by AID. Since 1966 USDA has also paid state universities the daily fees in lieu of tuition (formerly paid by AID) for non-academic training activities they arrange and conduct within the university itself or with non-Federal agencies or private groups in their states.

During FY 1968, USDA paid tuition and fee vouchers totalling approximately $1,397,000 -- an average of about $700 each. Checks were issued usually within two to four weeks after receipt of vouchers. USDA also pays training fees to other Government departments, such as Department of Interior. The Department pays fees to non-land grant universities and sometimes to private firms under a Letter of Agreement. All such fees must be budgeted and paid out of the individual PIO/P funds allocated by AID/W.

The most serious problem in this area is the persisting complaint of the universities that; 1) out-of-state tuition does not cover the costs of special attention given AID-sponsored students as compared with regular foreign students and; 2) the daily fee paid for non-academic training ($15 per day up to 15 days and $10 per day for periods of more than 15 days) falls far short of paying the real costs of time and other services contributed by staff, especially in the light of todays high salary scales. The fact that these institutions continue to accept and provide effective training for AID participants reflects their faith in the overall AID technical assistance program and their feelings of partnership with AID and USDA in accomplishing it.

Another problem with varying significance according to the institution involved is internal at the universities. This one bears on diversion of AID fees, once paid to the institutions, to the individual departments who actually do the training. Many departments never see any of this money, which is often channeled into general university funds.

Suggestion: AID-USDA should study seriously the feasibility of increasing fee rates; they have not been adjusted for many years. AID-USDA have no jurisdiction over the appropriation of funds within universities but some policy changes along this line

might boost the cooperation of certain university departments.

10. Travel for interpreters is arranged and paid for by USDA out of the PIO/P fund for single country team projects and paid for out of the Technical Leader funds if it is a multi-country project. Salary and per diem are paid by AID's Interpreter Service Office under its contract arrangements with interpreters. There are no problems except the occasional difficulty of adjusting the timing of the interpreter's travel to Washington to off-schedule arrivals of teams.

11. USDA's assistance in the shipment of books and training aids through the AID-contracted forwarding company takes the form of : a) supplying participants with additional shipping labels and "Declaration of Contents" forms as needed; b) insuring that these completed forms reach AID in the proper manner; and c) facilitating the final selection and packaging of USDA publications during the terminal period in Washington. There are no significant problems, except the occasional puzzlement of high-level participants who find the wrapping and packaging of their own materials a menial chore and wonder why such services are not provided for them.

12. USDA's Foreign Training Division provides AID with a monthly "Departure Date" schedule to facilitate the work of PDO's and the AID Travel Unit in anticipating and arranging

participants' home-bound travel (Copy of the schedule is on file in USDA). This schedule is compiled in advance from information provided by individual program specialists. The only problems involved stem from last-minute changes in program termination dates, necessitating amendments to the overall "Departure Date" schedule.

13. USDA's Participant Service Unit collects any overpayments of allowances from participants, usually during their terminal period in Washington. Most overpayments of maintenance are adjusted in monthly checks during the training period. Those remaining unsettled near departure time are usually due to: 1) earlier departure than expected; 2) unexpended book allowance; or 3) unexpended thesis advance. Of a sample of 220 such overpayment situations, all but 26 were adjusted before departure. In these cases, participants must refund the overpayment to the AID Mission on arrival home. In such cases, USDA requests AID/W to alert the Mission on the matter.

14. Distribution and forwarding of mail--No serious problems exist in USDA's performance in this area so vital to participant morale. Mail arriving in USDA goes to the program specialist who forwards it to the participant. An unwritten standard procedure calls for forwarding on the day received or the following day. More care must be exercised for participants or teams on schedules with short-term segments.

The listing of a "contact" with full address on participant programs facilitates the forwarding of mail which is regularly sent in care of the "contact." Participants are oriented to check on their mail at that address. Clerical alertness and efficiency in this department is more important than it may appear. Late or lost mail, although rare, directly affects participant attention to the training at hand.

Mail reaching the program specialist after the participant's departure for home is returned to the sender.

15. Arranging participants' membership in professional societies--The policy of encouraging participants to seek membership, at AID's expense, in the professional society most closely related to their field of training has been in effect for many years. If secured, the membership begins after the participant returns home. The primary aim has been to encourage and facilitate continuing contacts with U.S. developments in the participant's professional field through use of the society's periodic journal and reports of society meetings. Hopefully, the continuing contact will strengthen the participant's resolve for further professional growth, his contacts with colleagues in his own country, and reinforce other "multiplier" effects.

This membership privilege has been open to those persons whose training period exceeds 30 days, are proficient in English and can meet the society's qualification standards. For participants who occasionally gain membership, they may and usually do use the allowance to subscribe to the journal as non-members. The maximum period of AID-financed membership or subscription is three years.

The major operational problem occurs when participants do not contact the societies far enough in advance of their departure for home. This results in fiscal complications at termination time. Although specific written instructions are provided on participants' arrival in the U.S., some do not follow them.

Consideration is being given to discontinuing this professional society privilege. Evidence from Missions is accumulating that the membership and journal are not promoting the desired effects noted above and that many participants do not continue membership or journal subscription after the AID-financed period has expired.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES OF AID

Major responsibility for the several vital functions discussed below is centered in five AID/W Program Development Officers (PDO's), each representing a geographic region, operating within the Office of International Training (OIT). Subject matter technicians in AID's regional bureaus assist in the planning and evaluation of programs to the extent their other heavy duties permit.

The nature and volume of the PDO's workload requires experience and competence in agriculture and rural life and special discernment in developing and implementing collaborative relationships. In essence, the PDO is the vital link and liaison between Missions on one hand and USDA on the other. A strong rapport with USDA has always prevailed; this has been developed by the PDO and Program Specialist working closely together on many phases of the training operation. Much of the liaison is of necessity by telephone and memorandum, but there is also frequent personal contact.

The responsibilities of agricultural PDO's can be summarized as follows:

A. PROVIDE USDA WITH APPROPRIATE INFORMATION FOR EACH PROJECT ON:

1. Major problems and needs in the cooperating country towards which training should be directed.

2. Types and levels of training needed (project objectives).

3. The level and competence of the participant, his present and future job responsibilities, and English language proficiency.

4. Transcripts of previous studies - for academic-type programs.

In the AID-USDA context, Training must be specific; Education can be more general and abstract. Thus timely receipt of accurate, complete information is vital to effective planning and implementation of training programs.

Any deficiency in information in the PIO/P or in the timeliness of its receipt by USDA reduces by some degree the effectiveness of program planning, arrangements with cooperators, orientation and counselling of the participant, and the ultimate yield and satisfaction of the program to the participant, to cooperators and to the Mission and home country.

AID's Manual Order 1383.1 specifies that the PIO/P must reach AID/W at least 90 days before the Mission's proposed starting date for nonacademic projects and 120 days for academic projects. A study of programs for participants arriving in July 1966 showed an average of 63 days lead time from the time the documents were received in USDA until the desired starting date. In a similar sample for 1968, an average of only 42 days lead time was given.

Inadequate lead time has prevailed over many years. The fault does not lie with OIT or the PDO's. It is estimated that the majority of PIO/P's are dispatched to USDA within 10 days of their receipt in OIT.

Numerous factors in the Mission-home country complex combine to influence the timely preparation and clearance of the PIO/P. USDA and cooperators can adjust to occasional exceptions to the "lead time" standard but many tardy PIO/P's put heavy strains on USDA program planners and on cooperators. Not only are working

relationships affected, but more seriously the quality of the training.

As to "completeness" of information, PIO/P's range from "fully adequate" in all aspects to grossly "inadequate." Roughly, two-thirds of FY 1968 documents can be rated as "adequate" or better. Some of the remainder are so deficient as to necessitate a formal request to Mission for specific supplementary facts. Program planners are often forced 1) to rationalize the probable situation based on their prior programming experience and then 2) make hurried program adjustments if needed after participants arrive.

Tardy and inadequate PIO/P's usually result from such circumstances in the home country as:

1. Lower priority given to training by Missions than to other urgencies in the country program or project.

2. Uncertain or nebulous status of the country project which sponsors the training being requested.

3. Limitations of specific, reliable country information relating to the project or lact of ready access to that information.

4. Lack of full cooperation and commitment from Mission counterparts or other units or officials in the host government, plus bureaucratic red tape in some developing nations exceeding even that in the U.S.

5. Divided or unclear responsibility within the Mission for preparing the PIO.

6. Clearance difficulties leading to compromising of the information or commitment so that the PIO/P can finally be approved and dispatched.

7. Lack of continuity among U.S. technicians, other Mission staff or host country officials.

8. Limited availability of strong participant candidates including their hesitation to leave present secure jobs for a less certain future career appointment.

9. Mission staff unaware of pertinent Manual Orders or the possible need to circumvent them to get the PIO/P cleared and on its way.

10. Newly appointed Mission technical advisor sometimes not acquainted with project or prospective participants.

These and other similar situations are inherent in AID's overall technical assistance program, especially in new countries. AID/W, USDA and cooperators must--and mostly do--understand and accept them as realities which confront Mission staff. Some improvement in the PIO/P's has been noted during recent years, but the progress is uneven. The improvement seems to be related to one or more of these factors:

1. Close collaboration between a strong training officer and other Mission staff.

2. Growing awareness in Missions and home countries of the high correlation of effective training of strong participants with rates of progress in country projects and programs.

3. Increased awareness by Missions of USDA's and cooperators' problems in training which can be relieved by better participant selection and better PIO/P information.

4. Responses to increased influences and pressures from PDO's.

5. Gradual accumulation of better home country information within Missions along with increased commitment from host government (sometimes influenced by returned participants helping formulate training policy).

6. Feedback convincing Mission technicians that clear PIO/P objectives get incorporated into training and the use by these technicians of previous program language as guidelines for preparing well-rounded PIO/P objectives.

Academic transcripts often are received separate from and usually later than the PIO/P. Transcripts sometimes arrive dangerously close to the target beginning date, preventing approach to the ideal institution for conducting the training. This persisting problem stems from 1) Mission difficulties in obtaining transcripts acceptable to U.S. colleges and 2) Missions' understandable desire to dispatch the PIO/P as soon as it is "cleared."

Difficulties in obtaining acceptable transcripts arise from the wide variations among LDC's in types of degrees granted, curricula, systems of grading and of record, needs for translation into English, and the deviousness of country channels to those authorized to issue transcripts. Most U.S. institutions request authoritative evaluations of foreign transcripts by the U.S. Office

of Education before committing themselves to admission. Among their valid reasons for rigid enforcement of admission policy is the hesitancy of faculty to allow foreign students, once enrolled, to fail in degree objectives.

With few exceptions, transcript and placement problems are solved amicably through effective communications which prevail among experienced personnel in AID/W, USDA, and the cooperating universities. An amazing amount of office time and paper work in Washington, D. C., and on campus is involved.

Tardy receipt of English proficiency scores introduces an additional uncertainty in planning and implementing highly productive programs--obviously inherent in a foreign training operation. The participant candidate strongest in competence and potential may be weak in command of English. If chosen, he may need to continue in special language training until shortly before departure for USA. Selecting participants mainly for their English proficiency is not sound. Mission technicians should identify strong potential participants well in advance and encourage them to begin language study while awaiting training opportunities.

Suggestions for promoting more adequate and timely PIO/P's and related information and documents: Strengthen present efforts by AID/W and Missions; increase emphasis on USDA's problems in planning programs and the vital role of the PIO/P in orienting outgoing AID training officers and technicians; conduct relatively simple analyses of how strong and poor PIO/P's affect planning and

implementation and distribute findings widely; use all possible means to elevate the importance and prestige of training with Mission staff; conduct a few thorough case studies of the high correlation between effective training and country project accomplishments.

B. ASSIST IN DEVELOPMENT (PLANNING) OF ALL PROGRAMS, REVIEWING AND APPROVING PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTATION

1. Assisting USDA in planning programs.

AID/W's participation is needed to: Augment PIO/P information if possible; keep USDA planners sensitive to broad aims of AID and adherence to specific PIO/P objectives; utilize PDO and technician broad and specific experience and competence; keep PDO's sensitive to resources, procedures and problems of USDA and cooperators; develop PDO support and discernment needed for review and approval of program, also in later communications with Mission; develop PDO discernment and support in his and also USDA's and cooperator's relations with the participant, especially should problems arise during training; enlist PDO discernment and support of USDA's overall budget needs and vice versa; and maintain continued high morale and rapport between AID and its USDA and cooperator partners.

Performance - The amount and character of AID assistance in program planning are below that desired by USDA and by AID itself. PDO's and regional bureau technicians participated in only about 20% of scheduled program planning meetings during FY 1968.

Factors contributing to the situation include: Heavy case load of projects per PDO (projects pending, in planning stage, arriving, in training and departing); inadequate staff assistance to PDO's, leaving them occupied with paper work rather than with training; PDO lack of encyclopedic knowledge on cooperating country and ready access to the "Country Program Book."

USDA Program Specialists do not press PDO's or regional bureau technicians for assistance because of 1) awareness of work load in AID or 2) lack of sensitivity to the PDO's role in planning. Under such circumstances, program specialists may not schedule planning meetings to suit PDO's convenience or availability; program specialists often do confer with PDO's or technicians by telephone seeking their advice or concurrence on debatable points.

It is suggested that: PDO's should have opportunity to visit Missions and countries of the area they represent; they should join program specialists in visits to some cooperators; they should also attend FTD weekly staff meetings when convenient and informally keep in close contact with program specialists as time permits.

2. Reviewing and approving programs prior to implementation.

PDO's are responsible for reviewing and approving programs and drawing technicians into this process when needed. The primary criterion is that each program must be in the closest possible accord with the guidelines provided in the PIO/P. A PDO's previous experience in training and his technical competence usually enables him to spot quickly any obvious shortcomings. Disagreements with

USDA, which occur rarely, tend to concern deviations from AID policies, relevant Manual Orders, or the PIO/P request. The recent instituting of individual participant budgets has been the occasion for some controversy. Prompt and amicable reconciling of differences is usually the end result.

3. Forwarding proposed programs to Mission.

PDO's initiate this action which is then carried through by OIT in accord with specific Manual Orders. The action includes PDO preparation of airgrams or cables interpreting out-of-routine problems or circumstances requiring Mission attention or action. Resistance to the Proposed Program idea within AID, which once existed, has disappeared.

With few exceptions, Proposed Programs are dispatched promptly after receipt from USDA to 1) expedite Mission review and concurrence or Mission requests for change and 2) enable Mission use of program in effective predeparture orientation for the participant, the arranging of travel to the U.S. and advance of maintenance allowance. Dispatch of the Final Programs and any Amendments needs less prompt attention unless they include changes of such significance as to require quick Mission reaction. In such cases, PDO's prepare explanatory airgrams.

4. Other needed communications with Missions are initiated by the PDO or by him and the bureau technician (or AID desk officer) jointly, following clear cut Manual Orders. Communications prior to project implementation usually relate to project funding, supple-

mentary information for the PIO/P, participant selection, language proficiency problems, discussion of alternative "call forward date" or length of training period. Communications after participant's arrival in U.S. usually relate to dispatch of the Final Program and/or Amendments, periodic reports on participant's progress, USDA-AID proposals for major program changes requiring Mission reaction and additional funding participant emergencies, and arranging home-bound travel.

AID/W performs these functions promptly and effectively except in a few isolated instances. Any deficiencies are usually traceable to: PDO's heavy case load; poor communication between the program specialist and the PDO; occasional difficulty in reconciling USDA program recommendations with PDO's adherence to rigid AID Manual Orders or other operating policies or procedures.

5. Arrange participants' arrival dates in line with proposed program or established alternative date and notify USDA of action in this regard.

The participant's arrival precisely on schedule is vital to his orderly and confident entrance into the training program. Early or late arrival introduces awkward complications for him and for the several agencies involved in providing a closely integrated and effective program of reception, housing, orientation and counselling, and the initial segment of training.

Dispatch to Missions of the Proposed Program by PDO's is accompanied by an airgram or cable establishing a fixed arrival

date and giving instructions as to date to report to initial "contact." Any changes from the originally established date which USDA might have to request are airgrammed or cabled to Mission. Copies of such messages are promptly sent to USDA as standard procedure. Conformance by Missions and participants is generally satisfactory. The comparatively few off-schedule arrivals are due to one or more of these factors:

a. Missions usually do not send confirmation that the original date or new date is satisfactory. They respond only if proposed date is not satisfactory in which case a reconciled date is established. This may reach AID/W and USDA late. The Mission cables specific arrival information only after travel reservation is made. The PDO office usually telephones this to the Program Specialist and sends copy of cable.

b. Late receipt by PDO of USDA's proposed starting date results in late notice to Mission and to participant.

c. Late receipt by PDO of USDA desire to substitute a new or different starting date.

d. Mission and participant difficulties in completing such matters as medical examinations, certain predeparture information, obtaining visa(s), and arranging international travel.

e. Seasonal peak arrival periods such as August and September.

Suggestions for improvement:

In AID/W: Amend Manual Orders to require Missions to confirm that arrival date is satisfactory; strengthen orientation on this

point with outgoing technicians and training officers; help Missions to understand better the serious effects of off-schedule arrivals on participants, program and cooperators; press harder on USDA to communicate arrival date earlier when different from that in Proposed Program.

In USDA: Strengthen communications with PDO on this point; more specifically send Proposed Program or new starting date to PDO earlier.

In Missions: Confirm to AID/W well in advance that proposed starting date (or reconciled date) is satisfactory; pace participant's predeparture activities more effectively; study and appreciate better the serious effects of off-schedule arrivals on participants, program specialists and cooperators.

6. Make appropriate public announcements regarding the program, giving due credit to USDA.

AID's efforts are effective as far as they go. The great volume and scope of the program are frequently and proudly pronounced, along with the basic framework of the AID-USDA partnership. However, inadequate efforts are made to interpret such vital matters as:

a. The crucial effects of training on development.

b. The special character and high quality of training and the usually favorable performance of participants--all of this being due to such factors as planning, USDA's relations with non-USDA cooperators, attitudes and efforts of participants in new and complex environments, continuous evaluation, and supervision.

c. The involvement of hundreds of communities and thousands of managers, other leaders and plain people leading them to better understanding of LDC's problems and efforts and stronger grass-roots faith in support of AID and other development programs (people-to-people efforts).

AID's efforts to provide information rarely reach beyond announcements and reports to governmental and professional circles. Americans rarely receive more than the prevailing steady diet of huge AID expenditures and failures.

But the situation is not easy to remedy. There is the usual lack of journalistic appetite for background information that cannot qualify as newsy. There are logistics problems in the picture--USDA has an information office in the IADS structure that is not now promoting the foreign training story more than cursorily while the AID information staff feels little responsibility for USDA's phase of training. The hardest facts and thus the best news stories on training are the overseas results which can only be learned via USAID's Missions and these are not now easily available to the USDA information staff.

One answer to the problem is to assign more responsibility to the USDA information staff for informing the public about foreign training. USDA's channels to the agricultural news media in the Nation are incomparable and greater public support within agriculture alone has great value.

7. Obtain and furnish to USDA systematic information regarding the extent to which previous participant training is being utilized.

USDA and non-USDA cooperators--in particular the land-grant universities--have continuously and emphatically expressed their needs for systematic "feedback" information from Missions on the appropriateness of training previously provided and the effectiveness with which former participants and the training they gained are being utilized. Are returned participants used in the career positions and fields for which they were trained or possibly in more influential positions in those or related fields? Are they training others? What are the justifications for Mission requests for additional training in the same fields for the same country? Is other manpower in these fields available, acceptable and used?

These and related questions are understandable in view of the many thousands of AID-sponsored participants trained over the years through USDA arrangements. There are frequent instances in which significant numbers from the same country have been given training in the same fields of work. Most of this is probably justified. Direct evidence of USDA and AID/W concern is found in 1) the recommended "follow-up" activities written into each firm training program and 2) in the staff units of OIT charged with follow-up and other evaluation responsibilities.

While the need for such feedback is recognized, the magnitude and complexities of obtaining systematic reliable information direct

from Missions year by year are not fully understood. Some of the complications are listed later in this section.

The prime illustration of AID's efforts in evaluating effectiveness of training and utilization is the "Global Evaluation of Participant Training" completed a few years ago. This study was conducted in all or most AID-cooperating countries and covered all fields of AID-sponsored training in the United States, i.e. agriculture, education, public health, labor, etc.

Data were obtained mainly through questionnaires completed by 1) participants who had been back home several years, 2) their supervisors and 3) some AID technicians. Individual country reports, now numbering 30, separate the data by broad fields of training, i.e. agriculture, education, etc. Further breaking down into agriculture's specialized areas was not attempted. A typical country report (for Ghana) is on file at USDA. The central point in the worldwide survey was to get some evidence or measure of utilization and then to discover what factors in the training program led to high or low utilization.

Some of the <u>limitations and difficulties</u> of obtaining a systematic flow of uniformly reliable information direct from Missions year after year are:

a. Measuring of appropriateness of training and effective utilization not needed until some years after participants return home.

b. Variations between Missions and between host countries and lack of continuity in Mission and country staffs--preventing use of uniform, standardized criteria and procedures needed to yield reliable and comparable data.

c. Other program priorities and country realities, diverting Mission and counterparts from effective follow-up.

d. Worldwide travel costs and geographical distances.

e. Universal nature of priorities--getting a job done takes precedence over checking its effectiveness.

Unfortunately, USDA planners do not now use effectively the findings already available to them from the worldwide survey and other evaluation results. PDO's and OIT in general should increase their influences on both USDA and Missions in this matter wherever possible.

The Global study has demonstrated certain feasibilities and techniques. These or adaptations of them should be used again and again to build up further conclusions.

C. IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. Predeparture Orientation.

Many problems which participants encounter in the U.S., especially in their initial orientation and training activities, stem directly from inadequacies in the orientation they received before departing the home country. Significant numbers get little or no such preparation.

The AID-USDA General Agreement makes no mention of home country orientation. Thus it should be treated in some manner in amending that Agreement. Most frequent problems relate to uncertainties about the content of the training program, official versus personal objectives, identity location of training institutions, amounts and disbursement of participant allowances, and costs of living. The sensitive problem of personal hygiene could be handled better overseas than after participants arrive.

OIT should increase its influence on Mission staff to intensify the orientation process overseas and follow more closely the specific Manual Orders. Because the Proposed Program of training is such an effective orientation device, all possible efforts should be made by USDA and OIT to assure its delivery to Missions in time for proper use.

2. AID/W's arrangements for reception services at port of entry and Washington, D. C., are fully effective. The relatively few breakdowns that occur are due to such factors as off-schedule arrivals, incomplete predeparture instructions, or participants' failures to follow such instructions. Port of entry services include meeting participants at airport, assistance in confirming or rearranging travel to Washington, assurance as to reception in Washington, and arranging any "layover" housing at port of entry which may be needed. Washington services include contact at airport, arrangements for initial housing and specific instructions as to hour and location of first official activity and the "Contact" person. Such

are vital to reducing anxieties and other tensions during the visitor's first hours in the U.S.

3. Participation in the Washington International Center's 5-day orientation, "Introduction to the United States," should be included in virtually all participant programs, except the programs of those who have been in the U.S. at length before. The present Agreement does not specify it, but the new Agreement could to prevent the occasional instances of participants being confused or "lost" during their first crucial days.

4. AID's provision of "Initial Administrative Orientation" is as effective as it can be when conducted in the rather fast-paced group situation which prevails. Deficiencies are mostly individual and stem from limited English and limited time. The Participant Handbook is an effective tool to complement the group orientation activity. It is on file at USDA.

PDO contacts with individual participants are often brief and impersonal. This is primarily due to the heavy case loads and the rationalization that USDA will add the personal touch.

5. Requirements and procedures for collecting insurance premiums from independently financed participants otherwise sponsored by AID Missions are appropriate and effective. The infrequent problems or shortcomings are of an individual nature and are related to inadequate predeparture orientation for such participants and/or the lesser degree of responsibility some of

these persons assume for learning and following AID regulations which do apply to them.

6. Arrange contractual services for insurance and for forwarding books and program-related materials to home country.

AID provision for these services has been effective in relieving participants and training cooperators of problems and anxieties during the training period which otherwise have serious divertive effects. The relatively few dissatisfactions which occur are inherent in the magnitude and complexities of AID's overall training program.

Insurance: The necessarily uniform "group" health and accident coverage does not fully meet unusually high costs incurred in some participant cases. The insurance is not intended to cover expeditures for treatment of chronic or other illness prevailing prior to participant departures for the USA. See Training Recommendation #16 for proposals for meeting unusually high costs and for handling possible liability claims against training cooperators.

Forwarding training materials: The maximum weight participants can ship home at AID expense--300 lbs.--is fully adequate in practically all cases. Frequent participant complaints that materials do not arrive in the home country until many weeks, perhaps several months, after participants' return is explained by the contract stipulation that the forwarding company 1) will use surface transport only and 2) does not hold any package longer than 45 days

regardless of the date on which it was received. Serious delays and possible loss result when the participant does not express packages to the company in a proper or timely manner.

Concerning both insurance and forwarding, the participant's lack of understanding of instructions or his irresponsibility in following regulations results in extra effort from the many persons who become involved. Effective communication and rapport which AID/W and USDA have with participants and cooperators prevent many slipups.

7. AID/W handles visa renewals expeditiously unless hampered by factors beyond the PDO's control. These factors are too many, judging by the numerous current cases reported by the universities where visas are expiring and the participants are in distress over the matter.

The relevant Manual Order provides sufficient flexibility and discretion to meet most needs for extensions. Delays or other complications are caused by such factors as late notice from cooperators and/or USDA of need for extending program period beyond original visa termination; difficulties in dealing with participants who request visa extensions or change in type of visa for personal or other nonprogram reasons; or delayed approval of an extension from the Mission.

Participant requests for extension of visa usually can be associated with 1) personal objectives of participant which may

or may not be ulterior (and often are involved with remaining for degree training); 2) shortcomings in predeparture orientation provided by the Mission; or 3) major political or other changes in the home country or in the AID program there which may threaten the participant's career opportunities. AID's retention of control over the visa, even during the participant's stay here on a self-financed basis, appears sound.

8. Conduct a final conference with participant(s) where possible, for purposes of evaluating the program.

AID PDO's and technicians currently do not conduct effective conferences with all individual participants and country teams. This is due to a combination of these factors: 1) other responsibilities; 2) USDA's evaluation efforts over the years; 3) the innovation of the DETRI terminal evaluation questionnaire complimenting USDA's technical evaluation efforts.

9. In view of the volume, especially at the peak seasons of departure, the homebound travel arrangements made for participants by PDO's and the AID/W Travel Division are fully adequate. The promptness with which these actions can be completed rests on 1) the timely receipt of "Departure Date" schedules from each USDA program specialist and 2) timeliness of participant requests for routing and stopovers en route (which cannot exceed 10 days). The earliest possible establishment of the firm Departure Date is needed to 1) give Missions advance notice of arrival details

and 2) enable USDA to calculate and provide final maintenance checks. Factors which increase difficulties are 1) lack of available economy class space on the planned departure date, 2) late changes in the program completion dates, and 3) uncertainty as to how much money participant will have after fiscal settlement at USDA (a factor with the less-responsible participants). A special example of AID's efficient performance is arranging return travel in those cases necessitating emergency return home, sometimes requiring an escort.

10. Arranging for interpreters as needed.

Country team projects justify the employment of the most competent interpreters possible for many reasons. Just one is the often high level of team members. Many qualities are needed in the interpreter beyond bi-lingual proficiency. With few exceptions, the performance of AID PDO's and the Interpreter Service Office has been fully satisfactory. Some interpreters are more than satisfactory--they are magnificent!

Factors which may limit AID's best performance are: Interpreters possessing the high qualifications desired are in short supply, especially in certain languages; other AID divisions (Public Health, Education, Labor, etc.) and other agencies such as United Nations and embassies compete for such interpreters; budget limitations on the Interpreter Service Office often restrict that unit's ability to contract with enough fully competent interpreters; and such interpreters require rest between projects.

Under these conditions the only alternatives for AID-USDA are to a) adjust the timing of the team project; b) conduct the project with one interpreter when two are really needed; or c) use less competent interpreters than are desired.

Special features of the Interpreter Service Office operations include systematic evaluation and records of interpreter performance, maintenance of appropriate professional and personal discipline, and providing kinds of reinforcement to these highly-skilled persons as may be needed at times.

It is noteworthy that many experienced interpreters prefer to work with AID-USDA team projects rather than with teams in other fields.

Suggestion: The only direct and practical improvement that can be made is to provide the additional budget and fiscal support the Participant Service Office needs to strengthen its contracting capability.

11. Obtain the required security clearance for technical leaders.

PDO's and others in AID accomplish this expeditiously except as limited by late receipt from USDA of full documentation and/or heavy case loads of the investigative units involved. There is no shortcoming in PDO's awareness of needs for prompt action in this matter.

Attachment No. 7

FY 1969 PASP PRIMARY PARTICIPANT COST ANALYSIS

AGENCY	TOTAL NO. AID & UN PARTICIPANTS	PROPOSED TOTAL COST	COST PER PARTICIPANT
USDA	1,648	1,415,000	806 1/
HEW	1,050	768,000	723
Labor	583	871,600	1,495
DOT	225	151,000	671
Interior	208	201,900	971
Commerce	224	389,000	1,736

1/ This cost could be reduced to about $625 if the evaluation recommendation is implemented to finance costs of training by USDA agencies under the PIO/P.

Attachment No.8

PARTICIPANT WORKLOAD DATA

U.S.				
SOURCE AND TIME	ACTUAL FY 1968		ESTIMATE FY 1969	
	NUMBER	MAN-MONTHS	NUMBER	MAN-MONTHS
PRIMARY				
A.I.D. Brought Forward From Prior FY.....	888	xxx	613	xxx
Arrived During FY.....	700	8832	705	7367
Total.....	1588	8832	1318	7367
UN Brought Forward From Prior FY.....	98	xxx	150	xxx
Arrived During FY.....	128	1461	145	1907
Total.....	226	1461	295	1907
SECONDARY (Some other Agency or A.I.D. primarily responsible for programming arrangements)				
REGULAR				
A.I.D. Brought Forward From Prior FY	22	xxx	1	xxx
Arrived During FY.....	29	42	29	25
Total.....	51	42	30	25
UN Brought Forward From Prior FY.....	--	--	1	xxx
Arrived During FY.....	4	3	4	4
Total.....	4	3	5	4

Attachment No. 8

SOURCE	ACTUAL FY 1968		ESTIMATE FY 1969	
	NUMBER	MAN-MONTHS	NUMBER	MAN MONTHS
CASUALS 1/				
A.I.D.	34	3	34	3
UN	28	2	28	2
Total	62	5	62	5
METHOD OF TRAINING				
CATEGORY I (In Agency Facilities) 2/	1931 a/	1511	1710 a/	1488
CATEGORY II (Outside Agency Facilities--Universities, Technical Institutions, etc.)	1448	8832	1282	7820

REMARKS:

a/ All participants receive at least a part of their training in USDA.

(Additional workload and cost figures will be found on pages 10, 11, 23 and 24 of attachment No. 5.)

1/ Drop-ins, Casual Visitors, and Programs of less than one week.

2/ Facilities under direct operational control of the Participating Agency; exclude Land Grant Colleges.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Attachment No. 9

US AID

Agriculture Technicians

	30 June 1968	1967	1966
Direct Hire	477	607	512
*PASA	273	227	133
Contract	475	551	519
Total	1,225	1,385	1,164
Washington Agriculture Personnel	39	44	

*Resident personnel only
(exclusive of short-term personnel
of approximately 138)

EVALUATION OF PARs (PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT) SUBMITTED BY USAIDs

Relatively few PARs were submitted by USAID Missions in time to be included in this evaluation report. The in-depth studies -- attachments 11 through 18 -- provide a representative cross section of PASAs and are included in this report to permit readers to evaluate the effectiveness of the PASA technique for supplying technical assistance.

General Observations

PARs submitted indicated the following:

1. Aims and objectives of PIO/Ts have been met.
2. Progress was generally on schedule and compatible with established timetables.
3. Quality of technical performance by PASA personnel has been satisfactory.
4. Project objectives are being met -- where host country cooperation is adequate.
5. Backstopping by USDA was good.
6. There should be more involvement of USDA in program development and program reviews at both Mission and Washington levels.
7. AID and USDA personnel in the field should make greater effort to assure host country support of each project.
8. Significant changes in purpose and design of projects have been made when needed.

Below are statements of project impact, achievements, significance, status of schedule, timeliness and other factors as reported in the PARs.

Project Impact

Tunsia: It is believed that, because of the interest the project has created in improving land and water resource development procedures in Tunisia, it should play an important part in the Host Countrys' efforts to reach its 1972 food goals.

Nigeria-Ag Credit: The project to date (in "hold" status since November 1967 when the last advisor departed) has been of limited effectiveness from the standpoints of training

Nigerians and increasing credit available to farmers. Major reasons the advisors were only marginally successful were: 1) A shortage of trained credit personnel; 2) Unsuitable administrative practices; 3) Unwillingness of Nigerians to adopt recommended changes; 4) Inability of the advisors to adapt fully FHA agricultural credit practices to the Nigerian situation. However, these problems are closer to solution today than in 1967 -- credit personnel are being trained, many of the recommended administrative practices have been implemented a new credit law is under consideration and the programmed advisors are expected to have more experience to adapt proven credit practices to local conditions.

Kenya - Ag Planning: This project is aimed at assisting the Ministry in establishing country-wide policies that will most economically and effectively develop the agricultural economy and the African farmers in it. The AID input through the PASA agreement already has had a significant effect on the molding of agricultural policy. Considering the enviroment in which this team has worked very good progress has been made.

Venezuela-Agr Credit: From February 1966, when the PASA was signed to September 1967, when the project terminated, accomplishments were:

1) Final disbursement of the $10 million AID loan for supervised agricultural credit;

2) Completed reorganization of the Agricultural Bank and improved administration of the Ministry of Agriculture;

3) Assisted in the organization of a pilot rural electrification cooperative;

4) Cooperated with North Carolina State technicians in installing a modern soil testing laboratory;

5) Cooperated with Utah State technicians in a report and proposal for integral development of land and water resources.

Nigeria - Soil & Water Cons: The overall performance of the project, and its effectiveness toward implementation of project goals as defined, is considered satisfactory.

West Africa - Major Cereal Crops: The high caliber of personnel associated with this project acccunts for effectiveness of project implementation. This project, because of its success and importance, should be continued through the current operational phase to train adequate research personnel and to attain currently proposed objectives.

Brazil-Agr Econ. Planning: There do not seem to be any particular problems associated per se with the implementing Agency (PASA). The technicians worked hard to create the necessary conditions and made considerable progress only to encounter retrogressive changes which were beyond their powers to counter effectively.

Brazil - Market News Service: This project has made a contribution to the achievement of sector and good plans. It has contributed to agricultural economic growth.

Brazil-Agr Credit System: In general the implementation of the project is progressing satisfactorily. The inputs of both technical assistance and funds to capitalize the initial credit programs

have resulted in a positive response from the Government of Brazil with its own resources.

Brazil-Agr Coops: This project has been planned and is being implemented in a reasonably efficient and effective manner and overall performance of achieving project targets is satisfactory.

Brazil - Distribution, Storage and Farm Service Facilities: The overall performance of this project has been satisfactory considering the circumstances. The area of the project devoted to wholesale centers, retail food stores and the corn crib program has been very satisfactory. The Farm Service Center portion has been unsatisfactory. One of the limiting factors has been the lack of an overall agency within the government to work on marketing problems.

Output Report and Forecast

Kenya-Agr Planning: Both PASA and Mission personnel were involved in preparing and reviewing the PAR submission -- USDA personnel participated in drafting the entire document. There were no major changes in objectives or directions during the life of the project.

Nigeria - Soil Cons: PASA/SCS personnel have been technically well qualified, but at times over-zealous in promoting soil and water management activities. Recent Mission reviews have provided information which served in reaching a decision to curtail activities in certain areas and to focus greater attention on training and institution building.

Project Significance

Tunisia: Unless sufficient number of appropriate counterparts are designated to work with the SCS members, the project is unlikely to have the desired long-term results. The Mission is considering the possibility of providing one or two U.S. field personnel to work with the GOT subsequent to the scheduled phaseout of the SCS team but only on condition that the GOT designate appropriate counterparts.

Because it was desirable to use PASA team technicians on other priority activities (2.2 man years), some of the work scheduled during 1968 was not accomplished.

Nigeria-Ag Credit: The project continues relevant, important and significant to the development of the country and to the futherance of U.S. objectives.

Kenya-Agr Planning: Efforts of the economists, together with the Miner Feasibility Report on the Kenya Milk Commission, already have caused changes in government policy and resulted in the hiring of an international management team to help the KMC. Situation papers, that have been prepared together with recommendations, have resulted in a top-level survey of the research facilities and actions. There has been a decided awareness of the lack of reliable statistics and the need for these in working with economic planning. The output of this project has been accomplished under conditions which were not conductive to maximum efficiency. Significant policy changes have been made as a result of U.S. input.

West Africa - Cereal Crops: Despite the internal crisis in Nigeria, the work has not suffered. This is due to continued support and reflects the high priority assigned to the project.

Status of Schedule

Tunisia: Of the 14 major actions listed in the project implementation plan, four were completed, eight were on schedule and two -- dealing with training and counterparts -- were behind schedule.

Nigeria-Ag Credit: Of the five major actions listed in the project implementation plan and in the work plan of November 1967, all are behind schedule. However, the recent fielding of the PASA team leader should stimulate positive action toward getting the project under way again.

West Africa - Cereal Crops: The 16 major actions scheduled for start or continuing implementation in the project plan are all on schedule.

Venezuela-Agr Credit: The major actions of providing full-time and short-term consultants, supervising and preparing analysis and program plans, and training participants all were completed on schedule.

Overall Timeliness

Tunisia: Project implementation was on schedule -- all 17 factors of resource inputs of the implementing agency were marked as positive or satisfactory with no significant problems.

Nigeria-Ag Credit: Of the 17 factors of resource inputs of the implementing agency three were marked negative or less than satisfactory-028, 036 and 040 as follows:

028-The original FHA PASA technicians (1966) had difficulty in adapting their technical knowledge to Nigerian conditions.

036-Working relations of the original three technicians with cooperating Country Nationals in the Western State were considered good; for the senior advisor they were considered less than satisfactory.

040-This item rated less than satisfactory because of the practice of the FHA technicians reporting difficulties to their backstop agency and frequently failing to inform the Mission of these problems. They also made recommendations on program and policy changes to the backstop office without informing the Mission.

Kenya-Agr Planning: Of the 17 factors of resource inputs of the implementing agency all were marked as positive or satisfactory except 039.

039-U.S. input to the implementation of this project was slow. Recruitment and arrival of scientists did not occur until after all other donor scientists had arrived.

Venezuela-Agr Credit: Of the 17 factors of resource inputs of the implementing agency all were marked positive except 030.

030-Marked negative due to initial difficulties encountered in recruiting and training qualified field supervisors and high turn-over rate. Problem was overcome through improved selection of new employees and on-the-job training programs.

Brazil-Agr Credit System: Experience with the participant training phase of this project has been extremely satisfactory. Since 1965, 48 participants have been sent to the U.S. to study the

agricultural credit system there. Top-level technicians and administrators have been selected and have returned with praise for the value of programs arranged for them.

Brazil-Agr Coops: Overall implementation performance has been very satisfactory during the past two years. Implementation of most of the project is on schedule. The USDA implementing actions have been satisfactory. USDA has furnished technicians, both long-term and short-term, as requested. Backstopping has been satisfactory.

Role of the Cooperating Country

Tunisia: The situations which caused the major delays were: 1) funds not available at the project level early in the year; 2) equipment, including trucks and personnel transportation, not being maintained at a reasonable rate; 3) local supplies, which amounted to hundreds of items, not being on hand when needed; 4) lack of sufficient professional counterparts.

Nigeria-Ag Credit: After an initial burst of support for this project Nigerian performance has been only marginal. However, by the departure date of the advisors a satisfactory work plan had been negotiated and now several of the modifications in credit legislation and administrative practices have been implemented. Seventeen agricultural credit personnel have returned from two years training and 20 others are currently enrolled. Project loan funds appear adequate.

Kenya-Agr Planning: There has been no real continuity to leadership. There has been a lack of sufficient secretarial services to cope with the detailed reporting required. There have been

two counterparts who have shown an unusual aptitude for handling the requirements of the position.

Venezuela-Agr Credit: Host country support was satisfactory to the point of allowing the Mission to phase out--leaving an established supervised agriculture credit institution where none existed before.

Nigeria - Soil Cons: Country performance in this project generally has been good. Major problem is the scarcity of high-level Nigerian manpower trained in soil conservation.

Brazil-Agr Econ. Planning: Quantity and quality of actual country effort was limited. Project was not rated high politically. The host country made no effort to widen participation in project development, implementation and benefits. Host country project funding has been unsatisfactory. Procedural and bureaucratic problems remain largely unresolved.

Brazil - Market News: Generally, country performance in relation to this project has been as good or better than usual.

Effect on Purpose and Design

Tunisia: Necessary key changes in purpose and design -- to ensure that the SCS team's orientation is towards training and demonstration - already have been accomplished.

Nigeria-Ag Credit: Future consideration will be given to initiating similar programs in other states.

Kenya-Agr Planning: The initial start has proven of value and shown conclusively to government officials the need for the basic information produced by the scientists.

Kenya-Agr Planning: It now appears that additional scientists are needed to further the steps initiated by the change in organization. Consideration should be given to supplying teams of advisors to the planning research and marketing division for periods of 3 to 6 months. There is a need for 4 teams to study: 1) cereals production and marketing; 2) dairy production, organization and marketing; 3) meat production, consumption and use; 4) agricultural inputs, especially fertilizers.

PREVIOUS PAGE BLANK

NIGERIA

I. Nature of Service

On February 15, 1965 USDA negotiated a technical assistance PASA with AID providing technical services to the Government of Nigeria in the field of soil and water conservation in the six Northern States of Nigeria. A team of five full-time soil conservationists were to assist the Ministry of Agriculture to organize, plan, and establish practical and effective soil and water conservation programs which would include proper land use, treatment, and management.

On-the-job training of local agricultural workers was a most important component of the assignment. As part of the PASA, SCS makes available appropriate informational and training materials needed by the specialists in their assistance activities.

Reviews of annual and quarterly reports, end-of-tour reports, and other special reports indicate that good progress is being made on this PASA.

II. Quantity of Service

The Team Leader arrived in July, 1965 and was shortly followed by two soil conservationists and one engineer. Another engineer joined the team in November 1967. By the Spring of 1968 the team had made remarkable progress in establishing a soil and water conservation program in the North. The six Northern States had 86 personnel assigned full-time to soil and water conservation projects. The Native Authority of Katsina had assigned 13 additional people to work full time on various projects under the supervision and guidance of the USAID/SCS technicians. The team trained 58 Nigerians in their training programs at Katsina and Mubi; these men are now assigned to projects in the six States. The training is a six-month's course of classroom and field instruction.

There are over 35 demonstration projects in the six States that are demonstrating proper land use and serving as training areas for Nigerian personnel.

Eleven participants have received soil conservation training in the U.S.; five for six months in 1962, and six for eight months in 1963. All participants are now actively engaged in conservation work.

Present plans call for a change of the location of the training center -- from Katsina to Jos -- starting March 3, 1969. At this time, two technicians will be stationed in Jos, an engineer at Maiduguri, and the Team Leader in Kaduna.

A recap of resident and short-term technical assistance by fiscal years:

Year	No. Resident Technicians	No. Short-Term Consultants
FY '65 (7/1/64-6/30/65)	0	2 (6 mos.)
FY '66 (7/1/65-6/30/66)	4	0
FY '67 (7/1/66-6/30/67)	4	2 (6 mos.)
FY '68 (7/1/67-6/30/68)	5	0
FY '69 (7/1/68-6/30/69)	4	0

III. Quality of Service

The quality of technical service provided the Northern Nigerian States by USDA has been superior. However, the project has lacked a sound design outlining a program with definitive targets of a manageable scope. Some of this weakness has been outside the influence of the PASA group. An evaluation team said, in 1968, that the cooperation of the Native Authority and the governments of the States has been exceptional, indicating a high quality of work on the part of the USDA technicians. The willingness of these State governments to continue their contributions is a good indicator of the excellence of the USDA assistance. The Federal Ministry of Natural Resources has assigned a counterpart to work directly with the Team Leader at Kaduna. Thre additional Nigerian technicians will be assigned to the team as counterparts.

IV. Cost of Service

PASA costs, by fiscal years:

FY	Amount
1965	$18,000
1966	97,700
1967	121,185
1968	118,600
1969	130,381

V. Administrative Arrangements

In April or May of each year, the USAID/Lagos, in cooperation with the PASA Team, estimates needs of PASA agricultural technicians, both resident and short-term, for the following fiscal year beginning July 1. The Mission sends this information by airgram through AID/W to USDA/IADS; then forwards a PIO/T funding and authorizing AID/W to negotiate a PASA with USDA. The USDA reviews the Mission's data from a program and administrative standpoint and then develops a budget for the fiscal year. This is submitted to the Africa PASA Officer of AID/W for developing the PASA.

If a new resident technician is required by the PASA, IADS consults with appropriate USDA services -- in this case, SCS -- for selection of suitable candidates, then submits nomination by airgram to the Mission through AID/W. After Mission and country clearances are received, IADS proceeds with the appropriate USDA agency to process applicant for the position requested. Language training is not required for work in the Northern States of Nigeria, so no arrangements are necessary. However, the orientation course offered by FSI is given the candidate. IADS then cables Mission, through AID/W, the ETA for the new technician.

For short-term consultants, after receipt of an airgram request from the Mission and PASA Team Leader, IADS follows a pattern for recruiting similar to that used for resident technicians. No language training or FSI orientation is

provided for short-term consultants. IADS provides orientation and briefing, makes travel arrangements, prepares travel orders, and performs essentially all administrative functions in getting short-term consultants recruited and on board. TDY reports are submitted to the Regional Coordinator of IADS, which are then distributed to appropriate USDA agencies and AID/W.

VI. General Evaluation

During the four years, USDA has provided 5 resident technicians and 4 consultants from SCS. Working relations with AID and host country officials have been cordial, frank, and beneficial. Host country institutions have been strengthened in existing work and support in new initiatives. Continuity of technical advisors has been a positive factor in USDA PASA assistance.

In the yearly program evaluation and program planning, closer liaison between the USAID program office and the Team Leader is needed. Uncertainties resulting from this lack result in regrettable anddetrimental delays in presenting program to Nigerian officials.

Conservation results:

1. Land use changes -- 30 percent average change at projects -- intensified use of best land, developed good agricultural land to cropping, marginal land to permanent cover.

2. Application of conservation practices and measures: terracing, bunding, waterways, contouring, gully control, drop structures, rotations, pasture improvement, reforestation, shelter belts, natural re-vegetation, channel improvement and grass flumes, protecting eroding land and controlling water problems. This has contributed to increased food production.

3. Increased food production, improved farming operations and better management by cooperative farmers have increased interest in adjacent areas and conservation is expanding to adjacent villages and hamlets.

4. 35 demonstration projects are demonstrating proper land use and serve as training areas.

5. Gains in production as a result of a Soil and Water Conservation field demonstration are shown below:

4 projects show the following:

a. Average increase in crop yields.

Guinea corn 8 bu. to 20 bu.

Millet 6.5 bu. to 17 bu.

b. Dollar value increase	Benefit-Cost Ratio
1. 640 Ac. @ $17.00/Ac.	2.61 : 1
2. 320 Ac. @ $18.00/Ac.	2.65 : 1
Village water and fish production $400/Ac.	
3. 400 Ac. @ $10.00/Ac.	2.45 : 1
4. 1,200 Ac. @ $16.00/Ac.	13 : 1

c. Secondary benefits.

Reduced land damage by erosion and sedimentation

Reduced flooding

Increased land values

Resettlement of farm families to better land

Training area for Soil Conservation staff

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

6. Establishment of Soil and Water Conservation Sections in the State Ministries of Natural Resources, and Federal Government participation by assigning 4 staff members to full-time Soil and Water Conservation project work.

7. Strong staff and budget support by State Governments.

a. 99 Nigerian technicians assigned to the Soil and Water Conservation project.

b. 12 additional staff, A.A.S. grade and higher, in training.

c. State budgets vary from $2,700 to $22,000.

d. Total Funds	M.N.R.	N.A.
FY 65/66	$198,000	20,000
FY 66/67	210,000	27,000
FY 67/68	100,000	20,000
FY 68/69	110,000	26,000

VII. Recommendations

1. The USAID/SCS team of one soil scientist (Team Leader), one conservationist, and two engineers should be kept intact as a team for FY 70.

2. A program for the life-of-the-project, accompanied by new work plans annually, should be formulated and subjected to periodic evaluation. Long-range goals and short-term targets should be established and supported by a planned strategy and a financial plan for achievement. Periodic reporting should be modified to evaluate progress and problems related to achievement of each goal and target. Plans and their implementation should seek the establishment of a sound program that will continue upon completion of AID assistance.

3. Field demonstration assistance should be continued, with priority being given to the three States (North Central, Northeast and Benin Plateau) when budget and staff are sufficient to carry on the planned program. Work in the other three Northern States should be limited to assistance on specific request from these States.

4. Existing projects with unfinished work should be given priority over new projects for funds and manpower.

5. Steps should be taken to investigate the possibility of adding a course in Soil and Water conservation to the curriculum of the Agriculture School.

6. There should be greater cooperation between agricultural extension services and SCS to broaden the benefits of soil conservation measures for the farmers.

7. There should be no unilateral cut in personnel. Such unilateral action by USAID would cause more harm and ill-feeling than any dollar savings would be worth.

INDIA

I. Nature of Service

The USDA negotiated a technical assistance PASA with AID on September 28, 1966 to help increase agricultural production in India through improved soil and water management. These services include:

1. Developing and establishing integrated planning techniques at the Center and State levels for programs involving work under different ministries and departments within ministries.
2. Identifying and defining cooperative coordinated programs in soil and water research, resource inventory, and soil survey that will assist the Government of India in achieving planned targets in agriculture.
3. Assisting in the formulation of a water research program in a national framework plan to systematically determine inter-relationships of soils, crops, fertilizer and water; developing criteria for farm investigation methods, systems and layout adapted to Indian conditions; and making provision for consumptive use estimates based on meteorological data for the major irrigated crops in each climatic zone.
4. Developing, in selected states such as Mysore, Uttar Pradesh, and Punjab, demonstrations of proper soil and water management and providing training for large numbers of Indian technical personnel in techniques of land shaping, irrigation ditch layout and drainage, developing and appreciation of coordinated planning in the field of soil, plant and water relations; and the mechanics of organizing and administering an agricultural area designed to effectively use available water and soil with improved seeds and fertilizer in intensive multi-crop agriculture.

Reviews of annual and quarterly reports, end-of-tour reports and other special reports indicate that, although there has been some difficulty in obtaining the hoped for degree of cooperation between the various GOI ministires, the project has been a valuable asset in the Mission's program in agricultural development.

II. Quantity of Service

There are currently 13 Soil and Water technicians in India - 5 on the Central Team in New Delhi, and 4 each on the Pilot Projects in the Mysore and Punjab States. Four additional technicians report to the Uttar Pradesh State in June of 1969. Also, 4 additional technicians have been requested for the Central Team. Since the inception of the project in mid-1967, USDA has provided 7 short-term consultants for a total of 20 man months.

John Phelps, of SCS, is the Team Leader. He arrived in New Delhi on October 3, 1966 and initially served as Deputy Team Leader. In December 1966 he was assigned the additional responsibility of Acting Chief Soil and Water Management Branch, USAID. In July 1967, the Acting designation was removed and he was also appointed PASA Team Leader. In May 1968, the Branch was upgraded to the Soil and Water Management Division and he has served in the dual capacity of Division Chief and PASA Team Leader since that time.

The Central Team in New Delhi was initially staffed by 4 men in October 1966 to implement the project. An additional Central Team member arrived in June 1968. Don Williams, Administrator, SCS, and Eugene Ransom, Asia Regional Coordinator, IADS, went to New Delhi in October 1966 and F. A. Prange, Assistant to the Administrator, SCS, for International Programs - June 1967 to assist in implementation of the Agreement.

Pilot projects in the Mysore and Punjab States were staffed in October 1967 and December 1968 respectively. The project in Uttar Pradesh will be staffed in June 1969. The long time requirement in staffing has not been created by any lack of enthusiasm for the projects by AID, USDA or the responsible high officials at the Center and States. It is the result of the drawn-out administrative process at both the Center and State that a proposal must follow to be sanctioned and receive financial approval.

The BALPA exercise in early 1968 may have contributed to delay since AID/New Delhi found it difficult to press for rapid GOI and State approval of projects until its overall staffing situation was clarified.

III. Quality of Service

The quality of technical service provided to this program has been good. High quality technicians have made up the resident teams. Top level civil and irrigation engineers, agronomists, soil conservationists, and soil scientists are in residence at each of the Pilot Project Areas as well as at the Delhi location.

IV. Cost of Service

Total funding for FY-1969 is $456,462 distributed as follows:

Central Team:	$200,355 (includes 4 technicians not yet recruited and 8 man-months of TDY)
Mysore:	$91,500
Punjab:	$133,480 (funded for 10 months)
Utarr Pradesh:	$51,127 (1 man funded for 7 months, 3 for 2 months).

Prior year funding was as follows:

1968	
Central Team	133,558
Mysore	84,348
1967	
Central Team	107,810

V. Administrative Arrangements

In the spring of each year, USAID/INDIA, in cooperation with the PASA Team, estimates needs of PASA agricultural technicians, both resident and short term, for the following fiscal year. The Mission forwards a PIO/T (Project Implementation Order for Technical Assistance) for the Central Team and each Pilot Project. The PIO/T's provide funding and serve as the authorization for AID/Washington to negotiate a PASA with USDA. The USDA reviews the Mission data from a program and administrative view and then develops appropriate budgets for the fiscal year. These are submitted to NESA/TECH of AID/W for developing the PASA's.

If a new resident technician is required by the PASA, IADS consults with SCS for selection of suitable candidate, then submits nomination by airgram to the Mission through AID/W. In the event the required expertise is not available in SCS, IADS, in conjunction with SCS, consults with other appropriate USDA services. After Mission and country clearances are received, IADS proceeds with appropriate USDA agency to process applicant for the position requested. IADS arranges with the Washington Training Center of AID for appropriate training at the Foreign Service Institute and the Asian Training Center. IADS then cables Mission, through AID/W, the ETA for the new technician.

For short-term consultants, after receipt of an airgram request from the Mission and PASA Team Leader, IADS follows a similar pattern for recruiting as is used for resident technicians. No language training or FSI orientation is provided for short term consultants. IADS provides orientation and briefing, makes travel arrangements, prepares travel orders and performs essentially all administrative functions in getting short term consultants recruited and on board. TDY reports are submitted to the Regional Coordinator and Country Officer of IADS, which are then distributed to appropriate USDA agencies and AID/W.

The Regional Coordinator and the Country Officer work closely with AID/W counterparts in the Agriculture Branch of the near East and South Asia Bureau, the India PASA Officer and desk officials. The IADS Regional Coordinator and Country Officer make periodic supervisory visits to PASA teams, as does the SCS Assistant to the Administrator for International Programs.

VI. General Evaluation

During the two years (1967-68 F.Y.) the USDA has provided 13 resident technicians at various levels to assist USAID and the Indian Government with pilot projects for Soil and Water Management. Such projects will point the way for fuller utilization or irrigation potential and more efficient soil and water management practices. It has been recognized that the planning and execution of Pilot Projects for Soil and Water Management will require consideration of all aspects of the water problem and that all concerned Ministries and Departments must actively participate at all stages.

The services performed at the Delhi level have proven to be vital since the Central Government offices provide the lead and some financial assistance to States in carrying on the Project work. The technicians at Delhi working with Indian technicians have planned and programmed for three pilot projects, one in the State of Mysore, one in the State of Punjab and one in the State of Uttar Pradesh. Four technicians have been on the job in the State of Mysore for a period of one year. Punjab technicians have just recently arrived. Good progress has been made in starting the program in Mysore.

The performance of individual personnel has been good and counter part technicians have finally been assigned by the Indian Government.

Since 1966 there have been a total of seven consultants from the services of the Department of Agriculture. Four more have been requested for special services during 1969.

The working relations with AID and host country officials have been good.

Delays in getting the PASA signed and the slowness in getting country approval for technicians has caused delays in implementing the projects, and raised difficulties in recruiting and holding good people for long-term assignments.

VII. Recommendations

1. It is recommended that the technical assistance be continued through the AID/USDA PASA program.

2. A line item should be included in the budget to fund consultants not specifically envisioned by USAID/INDIA when the PIO/T was first prepared. This item would be administered by IADS and enable AID to utilize the entire resources of the Department to support the program. This would greatly simplify and expedite response by USDA to requests for expertise not available in SCS such as economic and marketing analyses, etc. This item should be sufficient to cover all requests which might be received by USDA, either in support of USDA PASA programs, or in support of other USAID/India programs. USDA currently has a total of 24 resident PASA personnel in India with nine more expected to arrive in the next few months.

TUNISIA

I. Nature of Service

USDA negotiated a technical assistance PASA with AID on February 7, 1962, providing technical services to the Government of Tunisia in the field of soil and water management. The agreement requested services which were to be a part of a program for watershed planning and development. The establishment of the project would provide a demonstration area in Tunisia where all applicable soil, water, and plant conservation and range management techniques could be applied in harmony, where Tunisian technicians could be trained in efficient and economical means of conservation and where a stable economy could be developed for the local population. The results of this demonstration were to apply to some 5,000,000 hectares of arid rangeland in Tunisia.

Reviews of annual and quarterly reports, end-of-tour reports, and other special reports indicate that good progress has been made on this PASA.

II. Quantity of Service

On March 18, 1962, John H. Johnson, Watershed Planning Specialist from the Ft. Worth, Texas E&WP Unit, was assigned to head up the planning activity. He arrived in April and by October completed the preliminary examination phase. In September 1962, Louis E. Derr, State Soil Scientist from Oklahoma; John V. Alden, Surveying Technician and Training Instructor from the SCS Training Center at San Luis Obispo, Califl; and Roy G. Andrews, Hydraulic Engineer and Head of the Beltsville Central Technical Unit, arrived to assist in the detailed watershed planning phase. Louis C. Gottschalk, Geologist of the Washington Office staff, spent most of October 1962, in Tunisia studying sedimentation. In March 1964 a team of four technicians started work on major project in Oued Marguellil. For details, refer to attached draft PAR.

A recap of resident and short-term technical assistance by fiscal years:

Year	No. Resident Technicians	No. Short-Term Consultants
FY '64 (7/1/63-6/30/64)	3	3 (3 mos.)
FY '65 (7/1/64-6/30/65)	5	8 (13½ mos.)
FY '66 (7/1/65-6/30/66)	8	1 (1 mo.)
FY '67 (7/1/66-6/30/67)	9	1 (1 mo.)
FY '68 (7/1/67-6/30/68)	13	0
FY '69 (7/1/68-6/30/69)	9	0

III. Quality of Service

The quality of technical service provided the Government of Tunisia has been exceptionally high. Many of the specialists recruited from USDA have had overseas experience and were able, since the beginning of the project, to offer the team and its objectives invaluable help. Short-term consultants were selected on the basis of their technical ability and experience and their former work overseas.

Some of the problems encountered throughout the life of the PASA, and the ability of the specialists to handle them, are outlined in the attached draft PAR.

IV. Cost of Service

PASA cost, by fiscal years:

FY	Amount	USDA Services Involved
1963	$70,000	SCS
1964	80,000	"
1965	130,000	"
1966	231,000	"
1967	237,300	"
1968	250,056	"
1969	167,105	"

V. Administrative Arrangements

In April or May of each year, the USAID/Tunisia, in cooperation with the PASA Team, estimates needs of PASA agricultural technicians, both resident and short-term, for the following fiscal year beginning July 1. The Mission sends this information by airgram through AID/W to USDA/IADS; then forwards a PIO/T (Project Implementation Order for Technical Assistance) funding and authorizing AID/W to negotiate a PASA with USDA. The USDA reviews the Mission's data from a program and administrative view and then develops a budget for the fiscal year. This is submitted to the Africa PASA officer of AID/W for developing the PASA.

If a new resident technician is required by the PASA, IADS consults with appropriate USDA services -- in this case, SCS -- for selection of a suitable candidate, then submits nomination by airgram to the Mission through AID/W. After Mission and country clearances are received, IADS proceeds with appropriate USDA agency to process applicant for the position requested. Often language training is required in wich case IADS arranges with AID/W and the Language Center for appropriate training; in a similar manner, IADS arranges with AID/W and the Foreign Service Institute for a standard "orientation course" of six weeks. IADS then cables Mission, through AID/W, the ETA for the new technician.

For short-term consultants, after receipt of an airgram request from the Mission and PASA Team Leader, IADS follows a pattern for recruiting similar to that used for resident technicians. No language training or FSI orientation is provided for these short-term consultants. IADS provides orientation and briefing, makes travel arrangements, prepares travel orders and performs essentially all administrative functions in getting short-term consultants recruited and on board. TDY reports are submitted to the Regional Coordinator and respective Country Officers of IADS, which are then distributed to appropriate USDA agencies and AID/W.

VI. General Evaluation

(See attached draft PAR.)

VII. Recommendations

(See attached draft PAR.)

0 1 0 16 9 6 2

WATERSHED PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT

TUNISIA

69 245 - - 167 - 75 - 3 - - -

USDA/SCS 4 0 AFR(AJ)4-00

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The original concern of the Government of Tunisia in the Oued Marguellil Watershed Project was flood prevention. As the flood prevention studies progressed, it was shown that flood control dams would fill rapidly with sediment. Technicians on the 1962 AID team proposed that a general conservation plan for the watershed be prepared and implemented before any dams be constructed. It was agreed.

1-A. 003

Sample areas were studied in detail, and these findings were projected for the whole watershed. At a meeting held in Washington in June 1963, the OWP Soil and Water Conservation Plan was reviewed and approved by GOT, Soil Conservation Service and USAID officials.

The great flood of November 1964 (which was caused by a storm classified as having a frequency of once in 100 years) caused approximately 1 million dinars of damage in the Kairouan plains. The flood renewed GOT's interest in flood prevention. A high level TDY Team was asked to make a depth study of the problem and indicate what steps should be taken to protect the valley. The Srhira Dam was proposed. It would replace nine of the 39 smaller dams proposed in the general watershed plan. A flood control dam was designed for the Srhira site. The Government of Tunisia then asked for storage of water for management (irrigation). Alternate two was designed. GOT decided it did not have sufficient funds for the big dam and asked that it be designed in two stages. It would build the first stage, flood protection, in the near future, and the second stage later. Thus, the third alternative was designed. In August 1966, GOT made a firm request for SCS to design a dam with the features of Alternate three but asked that portions of the second phase be incorporated into the first phase in order to save approximately seventy thousand dollars in overall construction. Alternate four-phase one was designed in detail. The detail plan and specifications were given to GOT in January 1968. An access road to the dam site is approximately 75% completed. Bids for construction have not been issued.

It was agreed early in 1964 that there should be an aggressive land program implemented. The first PASA Team member had arrived in 1962 and had directed TDY activities, as well as giving direction to formulating a program for operations. The PASA Team membership was increased to three in 1964, and to 9 in 1966. Because of difficulties in getting equipment for the Project, little conservation application work was done until May 1966.

The next 16 months were very dry. Thus, the mechanical conservation practices did not control any water and vegetative practices did not look good because of too little water. On September 9, 1967 a sizable storm dropped nearly 2" of water on the Upper Watershed in 25-30 hours. Mr. Ben Osman, chief of H.E.R., viewed the effectiveness of the practices and declared that the Project was good. During the next few months he 1) took the Project out of "an experiment" classification, gave it full status of a Project, 2) asked the Project Managers to "up" their estimated work load for 1968 by 1/3 (300.000 to 400.000 dinars), and 3) established three committees to rewrite conservation regulations and programs in keeping with the procedures and criteria used in the Oued Marguellil Watershed Project.

Another sizable storm occured the first week of June 1968. The day after the storm, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Ben Osman) and the Secretary of State with their staffs visited portions of the Project. The minister firmly stated the Project was good, and that it was A-1 priority work. Later, he and the Chief of Génie Rural asked that en-

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

1-A. 008

gineers and technicians from all Governorats be trained in the work being done on the Project. Training materials have been prepared, and the Chief of the Génie Rural stated that the training sessions will be completed during the first six months of 1969.

Besides the flood prevention aspects and the establishment of conservation practices the Project has fostered a 100 hectare Seed Production Center and a Deferred Grazing Program. Fifty-six hectares of the former are irrigated and should start producing seed this year (estimate - 5 tons grass seed). Five thousand hectares of range and watershed protectionland have been deferred from grazing. Supplemental feeds are being provided by the Project to help bridge the feed gap caused by the elimination of grazing from the areas being protected.

During the past six years, the importance given to certain Project targets, have fluctuated. The first Project Target was a flood prevention plan. Then a target to prepare a conservation plan for the W/S was established. When these were accomplished, the Project target was to demonstrate how the practices in the Conservation Plan would benefit the local agricultural economy. When this target was realized, the over-riding target became the extension of the specifications, procedures and "know how" used in the OMWP in order that similar Soil and Water Conservation programs could be carried out in other watersheds of Tunisia. Especially for the local units of government, two overall output targets have been paramount. First, the establishment of a complete conservation program on as many sub-watersheds as possible. Second, the construction of flood prevention dams.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

It is difficult to compare the costs and returns of a Project which was established for the purpose of demonstrating how modern soil and water conservation programs are beneficial to farmers as well as to the political sub-divisions. However, every effort is being made to reduce the cost of each practice. For example, the cost of terracing has dropped by 30% yet the quality of terraces are better than those constructed a year or two years ago. during the last year

In the States, many studies have been conducted on the benefits of conservation practices. They are all favorable. However, in the States the B-C ratio of soil and water conservation program for farms or for watersheds are not calculated unless large dams or other large works of improvement are planned.

Tools used to accomplish the Project Targets mentioned above have been effective. As is generally accepted, land and water resources should be managed or developed on a watershed basis. Thus of necessity the Project is large. Because of its scope, the Project has carried a great impact on the political and technical leadership of the country. Local leadership also gives strong support for the Project which indicates that the benefits received and anticipated are very important to

1-A. 008

the local people. When considering the support given the Project and the relatively rapid accomplishment of Project targets, the tools used seem to have been effective.

It is believed that, because of the interest the Project has created in improving land and water resource development procedures in Tunisia, it will play an important part in the Host Country's efforts to reach its 1972 food goals. However, the Project will have a greater effect on the food goals beyond 1972.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

	UNIT	12/31/68				
Principal Soil and Water Conservation Practices established on Cropland						
Terraces	ha.	4600	1700	2291	5000	15,000
Waterways	ha.	146	155	113	151	300
Farm Ponds	No.	15	16	14	19	40
Erosion Control Structures	No.	7	–	6	10	90
Orchard Planting	ha.	717	555	37	900	6,000
Tree Planting	ha.	99	–	76	99	–
Diversions	km	42	34	39	45	100
Range Management applied to potential Rangeland	ha.	2000	–	–	2000	?
Protection of Watershed Protectionland from Livestock Damage	ha.	3000	–	–	3 000	?
Soil Surveys	ha.	63,214	52,000	58,000	16,000	157,000
Sub-Watersheds Planned	ha.	35,294	–	25,969	41,000	157,000

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Increase Agr. Prod. by 30% by 1972. 2 2

The short term targets of the Project like those listed in Part I-B, have been and will be substantially attained. The long term target or ultimate goal of the Project is that the success of the short term targets bring about an organization within the Government of Tunisia supported by trained technicians which will spread this type of work to all watersheds in middle and northern Tunisia. There is evidence that GOT will establish the organization and will train technicians. Promoting this fact of the Project will be an important part of the 1969 program. Four training sessions have been planned. They will be scheduled during the first 6 months of 1969.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

664-11-120-018

N
Y
N
N
Y
N
N
N

014 Because it was desirable to use PASA Team technicians on task force activities (2.2 man years), some facets of production were curtailed during 1968. Thus, some scheduled work was not done.

017 The heavy rain fall of September 8-9, 1967 and June 3-4, 1968 provided an opportunity for the conservation practices to show their worth. On June 5, following the latter storm, Ben Osman while touring the Watershed with Mr. Ben Salah, said: --- the Tunisian Government regards the Oued Marguellil Watershed Project as one of the most important works of improvement in Central Tunisia, and stated that the Project was A-1 priority work (see section 1-A. 008).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Flood Prevention Plan	completed	
General Conservation Plan for the Watershed	completed	
General Soil Survey Report for the W/S	completed	
Detail Soil Survey and Land Classification		X
Detail Soil and Water Conservation Planning by Sub-Watersheds		X
Production of Adapted Range and Pasture Grasses and Legumes		X
Construction of Administrative Center		X
Secure and Maintain 1) Vehicles for Transportation and 2) Equipment and Supplies for the Establishment of Conservation Practices		X
Obtain and prepare Participants (16)	completed	
Training of GOT Engineers and Technicians from all Governorats in the Principles and Procedures used in the Project		X
Establish a Deferred Grazing Program on 5000 hectares of Land with associated Practices		X

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

X

P
P
P
P
P
P
P

P

P

P

P
P
P
P
P
P
P
P

P

P

P

P

P

P

P

P

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

x x P

P

P

P P

P P

P

P

P

There have been some implementing problems. Most of the situations we refer to as problems exist because field activities cannot be done on schedule or cannot be completed at the normal rate. Thus, time is lost but more important, the effectiveness of some practices is greatly reduced. The situations which have caused the major delays are: 1) Funds not being available at the Project level early in the year. 2) Equipment including trucks and personnel transportation not being maintained at a reasonable rate; 3) Supplies, which amounts to hundreds of items, not being on hand when needed.

Another major implementation problem is the lack of sufficient professional counterparts. However, one agronomist was added to the Project staff in September. No civil engineers have been placed on the staff.

It is significant that field operations have accelerated with a decreasing amount of assistance from the PASA Team (8.5 man years 1966 - 4.5 man years 1968).

b. Implementing Agency Actions.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

c. Participant Training.

059 Three men graduated from Oklahoma State University in 1967 - two returned to the Project. One was assigned to head the administration

058 of Chott Maria Agricultural High School. After three years, one returned to O.S.U. for Masters degree. He recently returned with the degree and is at present working in the Tunis Soil Conservation Division of M.E.R.

It is believed by AID Mission that the participant with the Masters degree should give direct assistance to field operations for a few months before assuming administrative duties at Tunis. A letter requesting this type of assignment was written to the Ministry of Agriculture as soon as the Mission learned of the participant's return.

d. Commodities.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

664-11-120-018

P
P

P
P

P

P
P
P

P *
*

P

P
P
P

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

It is the intent of the Government of Tunisia to give strong support to the Project. However, 1) because of a shortage of civil engineers they hesitate to assign civil engineers to the Project --- particularly, when the PASA Team can and will do the work. 2) Higher priority has often caused Government funds to be diverted to other uses. Thus, at the beginning of the year, the Project has often had limited funds. 3) Weak individuals in administrative positions has resulted in ineffective management.

The Government has indicated that they will take aggressive action to train technicians for spreading the type of work done in the Project.

The Project is very important politically and socially in the Kairouan Governorat --- to a lesser degree in the Le Kef Governorat. The local people are depending on the Project to upgrade their agricultural economy and to give them work during the process of

664-11-120-013

Continued

100. A new division has been established within the Ministry of Agriculture for the promotion and handling of soil conservation activities.

083. GOT leadership of the Project is not as effective as a Project of this size and scope demands. Because of weak management, many things which could be done on time, are late and very untimely. For the same reason, subordinates are less effective than they should be.

087. As indicated above, there has been a problem of getting funds to the Project. Also, the Government has often been slow in paying vendors after the payment has been ordered by the Project manager. This delay sometimes causes vendors to stop sales to the Project. Consequently, any facet of the Projet can be delayed.

089. Resources in Tunisia are such that maintenance should not be a major problem --- again weak management.

100. Paper planning is adequately performed. Planning and management at the field level regarding day to day and week to week activities are not done or not done effectively.

101. Professional technicians or counterparts have never been adequate. There are three professional counterparts assigned to the Project. There should be a minimum of five. It is agreed in the PROG that two more will be added this year - Civil engineer and Forester. In addition to the above, twelve well trained Agents Techniques

* Scattered throughout this report are comments regarding the desire and intent of the GOT to extend the effect of this Project. It does have the capacity to extend the work if the training which is planned is done and if at least one civil engineer becomes thoroughly acquainted with PASA Team's handbooks, design criteria and field procedures.

Scattered through this

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

664-11-120-018

If the GOT gives general training in conservation as practiced in the Oued Marguellil Project, to civil engineers and others, and if the agreed to counterparts are assigned to the Project, it probably can be assumed that an improved soil and water conservation program is to be spread over middle and northern Tunisia. In this case, assistance may be needed to give technical and administrative guidance to the expanded program.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Under a PASA with the USDA/SCS, AID initiated in 1962 a 10-year Watershed Planning and Management Project in the Oued Marguellil to demonstrate sound soil and water conservation practices, management techniques and flood prevention measures.

AID/W, NFR/ID/NOR proposes reducing U.S. assistance at the end of CY 1969. The SCS team would be reduced to two members, a senior soil conservationist and a civil engineer. These two technicians would continue until the end of FY 1971 (June 30, 1971).

664-11-120-018

109 NARRATIVE FOR PART IV-B:

The Agriculture Division recommends that reduction of the SCS team from six to two members not take place until June 1970. Following that, the 2-member team of senior soil conservationist and engineer should be continued until the end of FY 1971. January through May is a most important work period. If finances are available, the best work of the year can be done during this period. Better work can be done, because the soil is moist and can be handled more easily, and because laborers can do more work per day than in July and August. All project technicians should remain through this period. At the end of May 1970, four of the technicians will have completed their 2-year tours of duty: one in March, two at the end of April, and one in May. ~~The division~~ should make use of this most productive five-month period in these mens' tour of duty before releasing them.

FID

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Vietnam No. FE 10-67-FE 6-67

(Total of 7 PASAs)

I. Situation

Although the Vietnam PASA is unique in many respects and will not submit a PAR it was decided to include it in the in-depth study because it is generally considered to be one of the more successful, and lessons learned from the problems encountered might possibly be helpful in dealing with other PASAs.

Men from both AID and USDA who were prominent in negotiating the contract were interviewed, as well as those who had the responsibility after the program actually began. PASA team members and regular USAID employees working in the same program were also contacted in an effort to get as complete a picture as possible.

Date negotiations started:	February 1966
Date of PIO/T-PASA	September 1966
Length of contract agreement:	Year by year depending on funding

Personnel	As of 12/67	12/68
ARS	8	6
FES	44	30
FHA	12	3
FS	5	2
IADS	5	4
SCS	7	0
SRS	4	2
Total	85	47
Total authorized	110	
PASA Distribution	12/1967	12/1968
Saigon	26	28 1/
Field	59	19

This PASA, one of the largest negotiated with USDA, is unique in that it involves several different agencies working together, was integrated into the AID program and received special attention from high ranking AID officials as well as Secretary Freeman. At President Johnson's request, Secretary Freeman went to Vietnam in February 1966 with a team of ten U.S. agricultural expects to evaluate past agricultural efforts and recommend improvements in United States assistance. The team recommended an expanded effort by the U. S. agricultural community to help Vietnamese farmers, as part of the general rural development (pacification) program.

1/ 1 POW

Follow-up--Building the Program. The details of USDA involvement in this expanded program were worked out by further high-level missions, and formalized in communications between Freeman and AID Administrators Bell and Gaud in the summer of 1966.

Jerry Overby, chosen USDA Chief of Party, arrived in Saigon in January 1967. Mr. Overby also acted as Deputy to the Food and Agriculture Officer of USAID. Within a year there were 86 USDA specialists in Vietnam. These men were completely integrated with direct-hire personnel from AID. About two-thirds of the men now work on the Saigon staff; the rest were assigned to jobs in one of the Regional Offices, or in a Province as a Provincial Advisor. No attempt was made to separate them or their duties from those of direct-hire employees. The Deputy to the Regional Agriculture Advisor in IV CORPS was a PASA man from FES.

The USDA personnel have functioned under the following 7 PASA's:

1. Area Agriculture Advisors. Federal Extension Service employees are working with the Vietnamese Ministry of Agriculture at the national, regional, and provincial levels. Their aim is to improve the effectiveness of the Ministry's agriculture program, and help Vietnamese extension men improve communications with farmers needing help. Twenty of these advisors are in the field. Three are in Saigon working on extension planning. The remaining are serving in specialized Saigon program staffs such as rice and protein production.

2. Credit and Agricultural Organizations. Farmers Home Administration employees assist the Government of Vietnam in reorganizing and improving the agricultural credit and cooperative systems in Vietnam. They work with Agricultural Development Bank to build an agricultural credit institution to serve the total agricultural economy. They also work with the Tenant Farmers' Union, the Farmers' Association and the Farmers' Cooperative toward the goal of establishing a unified cooperative farmer organization to serve the individual farmer through cooperative effort in credit, purchasing, processing, marketing, storing and distribution of farm produce.

3. Forestry. Forest Service employees advise the Directorate of Forestry in establishing and implementing an integrated forest management program including forest policy management, protection and utilization. The team also provides technical assistance to small sawmill operators and assists in studying timber utilization possibilities.

4. Statistics. Statistical Reporting Service employees assist the Agricultural Economics and Statistics Service in the collection, processing and publication of agricultural production statistics and prices.

5. Agricultural Economics. International Agricultural Development Service employees advise and assist the Vietnamese and

U. S. Governments on Vietnamese agricultural policy. They work to improve the effectiveness of agricultural programs and the productivity of the agricultural economy through effective economic planning, analysis and policy development. They have played a key role in rice and protein program planning, and in bringing about improved rice price policies.

6. Crop Production. Six Agricultural Research Service employees have provided assistance to the Ministry of Agriculture's crop production program--research and seed multiplication. Because of difficulties in developing an effective working arrangement with the GVN, the project is being closed out, with one man remaining to advise on applied research and variety trials.

7. Irrigation and Rural Engineering. The Soil Conservation Service had a seven-man Vietnam team which advised the Directorate of Hydraulics and Rural Engineering in planning, design and construction of water control and utilization projects. It was reduced to three men by the early 1968 personnel cutbacks, and security and other conditions in Vietnam during 1968 further reduced both the effectiveness of such long range projects and the AID Mission's interest in them. The PASA was terminated in December by mutual AID-USDA agreement.

The consensus of opinion among those interviewed indicates that the PASA was, overall, very successful, although problems were encountered. The performance of the individual personnel was good and they are given credit for some of the present success in the program. One of the reasons given for this is that they were able to get wider participation and create greater interest of the host government officials.

It was widely indicated that the involvement of the host government, AID, and USDA officials in the planning stages very likely forestalled many problems. Other positive factors contributing to the success of the operation include:

1. Good orientation -- most men knew why they were there; (some of the briefing was not accurate)
2. Team leader over all agencies was helpful;
3. Job was too big for AID alone -- needed help;
4. Integration of PASA with direct-hire personnel helped promote better understanding of country objectives;
5. Negotiating officials, working through Secretary Freeman, were able to get top-level men who otherwise might not have been released by their agencies.

Some of the major AID/USDA program achievements and problems are discussed below:

1. The Rice Production Program is the major U. S. civilian success story in Vietnam, both in terms of expected effect on production and the way its implementation is strengthening the Vietnamese Ministry of Agriculture in Saigon and the

provinces.

The Rice Goal Plan 1968-71 is Vietnam's first comprehensive agricultural production program. The plan was drafted by U. S. agriculturalists (especially the PASA Agricultural Economics Team), approved by Vietnamese counterparts, and adopted by leading Vietnamese officials as the country's principal agricultural program. President Thieu strongly supports this plan which has increasingly become a Vietnamese operation in fact as well as in name. Other support was given this activity by shifting fertilizer distribution to commercial channels, increasing government credit to growers, and introducing rice drying apparatus.

2. The USDA used the leverage of the PL 480 program to bring about a major Vietnam policy improvement in late 1968--an increase in the Saigon rice price. This has encouraged greater movement of rice from the Mekong Delta (Vietnam's rice bowl), and a strengthening of farm prices there.

After months of promises and delays, Economy Minister Ho took bold action in late November by announcing a Saigon PL 480 resale price increase of 25 percent. Our PL 480 leverage had proved effective, in striking contrast to the situation in early 1967 when policy makers had been most unreceptive to tying PL 480 to meaningful GVN policy reforms. Delta paddy price did increase 10 percent between November

and January.

3. The Protein Production Program (aimed at increasing animal production) has moved much more slowly than the rice production effort. It is just beginning to show results, particularly for poultry. A protein consultant team (including one USDA man) went to Saigon in September. By late October the team had submitted the Vietnam Poultry Plan. The Vietnam Swine Production Plan is expected to follow in the near future. Important protein staff positions are gradually being filled, most by non-USDA personnel.

4. After several years of lull, significant action on land reform is now a real possibility. Both AID and Vietnamese interest in the problem has increased markedly in the last six months.

5. Second Freeman Visit. Secretary Freeman visited Vietnam again in July 1968. He found remarkable progress in the rice production program but saw continued serious rice price problems in the absence of strong GVN action to raise resale prices and initiate a price support system. (Action on the former was taken in November.)

Other major recommendations included:

(a) Developing and implementing the Protein Program;

(b) Increased adaptive research on rice;

(c) Establishment of procedures to detect and control insect infestation on rice;

(d) Continued emphasis on rice drying, storage and transportation problems;

(e) Expansion of variety trials for grain sorghum and improvement of production methods;

(f) Increased attention to irrigation facilities since the high yielding varieties are heavily dependent on effective water control;

(g) Increased availability of agricultural credit to farmers.

Another significant factor in USDA's ability to provide efficient support to the Vietnam program is the open-end PASA with IADS for TDY's and supervisory trips. This arrangement gives greater flexibility to meet specific problems without negotiating a new PASA on each occasion ~~such~~ that a need arises. 33 short-term consultants have been sent to Vietnam since March 1966 to make specific recommendations for agricultural improvements. In addition to technical consultation, high ranking USDA officials have taken 18 supervisory trips to Vietnam since implementation of the PASA programs. These trips, varying in length from a few days to several weeks, are primarily to review

and assess various technical assistance projects and to improve USDA support of such projects. The regular resident PASA's are negotiated through their respective agencies in order to provide maximum use of the Department's resources.

Problems

1. Two PASA groups -- regular technical assistance and provincial ag advisor types -- were involved in negotiations, causing some friction. Personality conflicts were in evidence.
2. Some individuals in USDA PASAs tried to act unilaterally at times to get things done causing some irritation in AID channels.
3. SCS program didn't get enough mission support;
4. Lack of continuity in mission program along with personnel changes caused serious problems in morale and recruitment, especially from 1968 on.
5. Most of the men were on their first overseas tour; they tended to relate orientation to Stateside experiences and hence some were less effective initially than they might have been.
6. Differences over salaries sometimes developed since private contractors tended to pay more.
7. Lack of continuity in administrative leadership, particularly with the military, was evident.

Recommendations

1. Provision should be made to screen and reconsider the few men who show up in orientation as poor overseas risks--particularly for Vietnam assignments.

2. In the absence of more detailed explanation in the PIO/T, it would be helpful for the men in understanding the aims and objectives of their job before reaching the field if the Mission supplied a better picture of what was needed and expected.

3. The pattern of integrated staffing should be continued, including the service of the USDA chief of party as Deputy Associate Director for Domestic Production.

4. More careful consideration should be given to the recommendations of the survey team.

MAJOR CEREALS IN AFRICA PROJECT

I. Background

This is an agricultural research project initiated in 1963. The objectives were three-fold: (1) to bring about increased agricultural production in Africa through the development of improved cereal strains, (2) to provide in-service training on the research as an aid in increasing technical competence, and (3) to develop more effective cooperation among the participating countries in disseminating research information.

II. Development of the PASA

The first PASA position was filled in 1964. Others were added as housing facilities became available. The present staff totals 10, equally divided between West and East Africa. As a direct result of breeding and agronomic developments from this program, some 250,000 acres of hybrid maize were grown in Kenya in 1967 and 1968. Approximately two-thirds of this acreage is being grown by African farmers with total land holdings of 10 acres or less. Participating farmers have achieved yield increases of 3-4 times their traditional levels of production. As a result of adopting this new technology, Kenya has moved from a maize deficit region in 1965 to a maize surplus region in 1968.

Work under this PASA has been conducted at three centers; one in West Africa (Nigeria) and two in East Africa (Kenya and Uganda). This separation was done because of the soil and climatic differences

between the two regions. Within each region work has been done on: (1) improvement of maize, sorghum and millet, (2) research on agronomic practices to establish optimum time of planting, fertilization, etc., and (3) methods of controlling insect pests and diseases. In 1968 the program was expanded to include work on cereal processing and milling at Nairobi, Kenya.

Extensive research has been conducted in Kenya to develop improved maize populations and to evaluate these for the production of commercial hybrids. Agronomic research has been conducted to develop new farming practices which maximize yield. This information has been made available to the Eastern African research workers through an extensive series of regional trials. Similar work has been done on sorghum and the millets. The same general pattern of research and regional trials has been used for the quite different forms of these crops in West Africa. On the basis of breeding and agronomic research conducted on maize in Kenya, the acreage of hybrid maize has increased from 100 acres in 1963 to approximately 250,000 acres in 1967 and 1968. Improved production practices have been adopted by local farmers. Plantings are made earlier, at heavier planting rates, weeds are controlled, and fertilizer is used at recommended levels. The net effect of this combination of practices has been a yield increase of 3-400 percent. The breeding stocks developed have been evaluated throughout eastern Africa and are being

utilized to an increasing extent. Some 150,000 acres of this material were grown in Uganda, Tanzania and Ethiopia in 1968.

Sorghum hybrids have been developed at the center in Serere, Uganda. This material is being evaluated in regional trials in East Africa. Desirable agronomic practices have been established and with appropriate extension effort this material is ready to move into commercial production. Millet research is progressing rapidly but is not yet ready for commercial use.

In West Africa relatively greater emphasis has been given to disease resistance in the maize program. Sources of resistance have been found for the two most destructive diseases, rust and leaf blight, and this resistance is being incorporated into the locally adapted breeding stocks. Experimental hybrids currently under test give promise of substantial yield increases.

Sorghums adapted to Northern Nigeria are tall and inherently low yielding. U.S. material was not applicable. From crosses of U.S. and native material new dwarf, high yielding types have been developed. Preliminary trials indicate a doubling of yields should be feasible. Material now available is ready for an expanded regional program when the political situation will permit. Attention must also be devoted to the development of an adequate seed production and distribution system.

The World Sorghum Collection has been screened and sources of

resistance found for some of the major diseases. Such material is being utilized in the breeding program. No insect control measures have yet been developed which are feasible for general farmer use.

III. Funding

This project was funded by WOH/ARDS from FY-64 through FY-68. Beginning in FY-69 the East Africa segment is funded by the African Bureau. The total PASA will be funded by the African Bureau in FY-70. The total cost thus far has been $1,861,895.

Under the terms of the PASA, AID supplies funds for the project and USDA/ARS provides the scientists and develops and supervises the research program. Progress is reviewed in the field annually by the ARS Project Backstop Officer. The budget is developed jointly by the scientists in the field, the AID Food and Agriculture Officer of the host country or countries involved and by USDA and AID/W.

IV. Evaluation

Regional projects are relatively new and several administrative and operational problems have been encountered. Most research and preliminary regional trials are best handled on a regional basis. However, when research findings are ready for field use, cooperation and participation of the country AID mission and Ministry of Agriculture is required. The system used in Kenya has been quite effective due largely to support by EAAFRO (East African Agricultural Research Organization). A similar or equally appropriate system is needed in other participating countries of the region.

The complex organizational pattern within both AID and USDA tends to limit flexibility and on occasion result in delays in policy decisions. However, on this PASA considerable cooperation and coordination has been achieved. Those involved combine the knowledge of social, political, and economic aspects of agriculture in the region possessed by the AID staff with the scientific competence of the staff supplied by the Department of Agriculture. IADS has facilitated both the budgetary and the management aspects of the PASA.

This regional project has been effective in increasing maize production in Kenya. The results of this program are being extended to other East African countries. The same potential exists for increases in both sorghum and millets. In West Africa progress has been less spectacular but improved types of maize and sorghum are available. These can only be utilized effectively with the development of a seed production and distribution system and a more effective extension approach. Increased effort must be expended if the research findings are to be adopted as rapidly as possible in the region.

V. Recommendations

(a) The project should have built-in provisions for extending results of the research to other countries in the region. A line item providing for extension type personnel should be added to accomplish this if necessary.

(b) IADS should be more closely involved in evaluation on the project as part of the overall USDA-AID program reviews.

ATTACHMENTS - SECTION II

To the Evaluation Report of the
General Agreement Between the
USDA and AID

March, 1969

Table of Contents

Attachment	Number of Pages
No. 16 - Summary Statement of Brazil PASA	Fifteen
No. 17 - Summary Statement of El Salvador PASA	Seven
No. 18 - Summary Statement of Paraguay PASA	Eight
No. 19 - Evaluation Statement of PASA Member Orientation	Five
No. 20 - List of Countries Where USDA PASAs Have Operated	One
No. 21 - WOH-Funded PASAs with USDA	One
No. 22 - PASA Statistical Breakdown by Regions	One
No. 23 - USDA Technical Assistance Annual Summary, FY 68	Twelve
No. 24 - Review of "Other" USDA/AID Projects	Six
No. 25 - Areas of Increasing Importance in U.S. Foreign AID	Two
No. 26 - Relationship Between TC&S and Total Support Budget	One
No. 27 - Participating Agency Support Program, Training and TC&S, FY 69	One
No. 28 - Relationship of USDA Activities in Support of AID Compared to Total Reimbursable Activities	Two
No. 29 - Relationship of IADS/ISG and WOH Reports and Information	Three

Attachment	Number of Pages
No. 30 - Report of 1968 Work and Evaluation IADS/ISG	Twelve
No. 31 - AID's Agricultural Backstop Officers' Comments, Questions and Suggestions	Six
No. 32 - History of Congressional Concern on Financing USDA Activities	Three
No. 33 - Examples of Technical Consultation and Support Service	Twenty-six
No. 34 - Analysis of TC&S Activities of IADS	Thirteen
No. 35 - Letter of 12/15/67 on TC&S, Training and PASA Administration	Eight
No. 36 - Progress Report and Questions for TC&S Task Force	Two
No. 37 - July-December 1968 Report of USDA TC&S Activities	Seven

BRAZIL

I. Nature of the Service Performed

Resident PASA specialists have provided technical assistance in the fields of economics and statistics, agricultural credit, marketing, market news reporting, minimum price and commodity stabilization, cooperatives, and soil resource surveys. In addition, the resident PASA team has been supported by 18 consultants in the fields of credit, livestock disease control, soil surveys, soybean breeding, marketing, grain storage, cooperatives, sugarcane breeding, statistics, mite control, and minimum price and stabilization.

Reviews of the PAR's, annual and quarterly reports, end-of-tour reports and other special reports indicate that good progress has been made on the projects under this PASA with the exception of one project which the GOB failed to support.

II. Quantity of Service Performed

A total of 4 PASA's have been signed to provide technical assistance for agricultural development in Brazil. Three of these PASA's provided resident specialists. The fourth PASA provided the services of a short term consultant for 6 months in the field of livestock disease control. After reaching a high of 24 specialists in August 1967, the PASA has dropped to 11 specialists at the present time and by the summer of 1969 will have further decreased to 9 specialists due to the BALPA program and completion of projects.

Following is the order of the PASA development in Brazil:

December 13, 1963 - USDA completed pre-PASA survey. (A review of USAID program-USDA survey team, ERS Report, December 13, 1963.)

July 15, 1964 - Two PASA's were signed for 15 resident specialists in the fields of economics, statistics, agricultural credit, marketing, market news reporting, cooperatives, and minimum price and stabilization.

October 8, 1964 - PASA signed for 2 resident specialists to develop a soil resource survey for frontier development.

July 18, 1965 - The last of the originally requested 17 resident specialists entered on duty in Brazil.

October 9, 1966 - PASA resident specialists increased to 23 with the arrival of the last of 6 additional specialists in the fields of cooperatives (4) and marketing facilities (2).

August 2, 1967 - PASA resident specialists in Brazil reached a high of 24 with the arrival of a cooperative training specialist.

February, 1969 - PASA resident specialists number 11.

III. Quality of Service Performed

Expansion and Improvement of Agricultural Credit System

The GOB has recognized the need for this project as evidenced by its action in passing enabling legislation and greatly increasing in funds for credit to farmers. Indications are that the GOB will not only continue its agricultural credit program but will also improve it in the years to come. Since the GOB created agricultural credit in 1964 to assist in financing the production of food, the credit program has been strengthened by the Banking Reform Law and the National Credit Law. The credit law required that commercial banks invest at

least 10% of their resources in rural credit. Since the implementation of this law began in 1967, the commercial system has more than doubled its loaning to rural credit, mostly for short term credit. At the beginning of this project, one bank, the Bank of Brazil, with less than 500 agencies was reaching no more than 10 to 12% of the farmers. Today 88.7% of the banking system of Brazil, with some 7000 agencies is involved in making rural loans. The total capital in the system is double, in real terms, the 1964 level. It is estimated that from 35 to 40% of all farmers now have access to a source of credit. PAR of February, 1969, states that increased inputs of fertilizer, better seed, lime, and improved tools and equipment made possible by more adequate credit has been important in helping to modernize and increase agricultural production. The financing of improved storage, processing and marketing facilities have likewise contributed to a greater quantity of better quality agricultural products reaching the market place. Even though good progress has been made as indicated, there are possibly as many as 2,000 additional cooperatives that need financial assistance, as well as another 40% of the farm families. Additional types of credit are needed before a balanced credit program can be said to exist.

A review of quarterly reports, annual reports, end of assignment reports and the PAR indicates that this project has made good to excellent progress.

Establishment of Nationwide Market News Service

Project has been accepted by GOB as evidenced by GOB's degree of interest, participation and contributions. State governments are also realizing the value of market news reporting as evidenced by expansion now being made in Sao Paulo and Parana. Indications are that this project will continue to receive support by the GOB in the future. Market News teletype reporting of wholesale market prices began in 1965 with the linking together of Brazil's 3 largest wholesale markets, Sao Paulo, Belo Horizonte and Rio de Janeiro and has been extended to Curitiba and Porto Alegre (5 states). Air pouch service is used to Recife. PAR states that project has contributed to increases in farmers' income and has increased efficiency of markets in the area where the service is operating. Many letters have been received from producers and others praising this Service. From standpoint of cost this project has been inexpensive to AID.

A review of quarterly reports, annual reports, end of assignment reports and the PAR indicates that good to excellent progress has been made.

Improved Price Support and Food Supply Stabilization

The minimum price support program is financed by Brazil. U. S. inputs are the services of 1 specialist.

This Minimum Price and Stabilization program has progressed in a very satisfactory manner. Overall, Brazil has demonstrated the capacity to operate a minimum price program. Cooperation between

the Brazilian Government agencies operating this program has improved which results in a more efficient program. Announced GOB positions include improvement and expansion of the storage system as well as a minimum price program that will encourage agricultural production. GOB has implemented the program by (1) Announcement of minimum prices 45 to 60 days before planting time; (2) Special emphasis on the loan program instead of primarily a direct purchase operation; (3) Substantially increased minimum prices; (4) Closer cooperation between the agencies involved in the actual operation of the program (CFP, CIBRAZEM, and the Bank of Brazil); (5) Establishment of higher minimum prices in the Northeast to encourage production so that commodities will not have to be imported from other parts of Brazil, and (6) Announcement of net minimum prices to producers at interior points rather than gross prices at consumer centers. As a result of these and other factors there has been an increasing amount of participation in the program by the farmers.

The project has been successful in achieving most project targets, i.e., increased minimum price levels to assure farmers a fair income and to provide adequate food and fiber at reasonable prices, to encourage the loan program rather than the direct purchase program, and reorientation from a consumer to a farmer oriented program. Progress is being made in an effort to change the method of handling grain in sacks to a bulk fungible system. Brazil plans are progressing

to recuperate 15 bulk storage locations which were constructed 10 years ago and are not being used. Brazil still needs to change its warehouse laws and to create an agency to police warehousemen.

PAR points out that the objectives of this project have been substantially accomplished, however, additional consultant services may be needed when the GOB is ready to change its existing warehouse laws.

A review of quarterly reports, annual reports, end of assignment reports and the PAR indicates that good to excellent progress has been made.

Agricultural Economics Planning and Analysis

This project was designed to assist the GOB in building, strengthening, and integrating Brazilian institutional capabilities for producing the economic data and analysis essential to solving national problems of Agriculture and food supply.

The project planned to accomplish these objectives with the technical assistance provided by three economists working in the respective fields of statistics, including production, forecasts, and situation and outlook reports; agricultural market development; and the development of capabilities of the Ministry to perform economic research on production aspects and overall planning.

Progress was reported in participant training, inservice training through lectures, seminars, and training courses, and in strengthening the statistical and analytical activities of the Ministry through increased staffing of the Ministry by the Ministry. A limited impact has been made on modernizing agricultural production and marketing.

The PAR states that less than satisfactory results have been made and lays the blame on the GOB.

Apparently both the concept of the time required to implement the objectives and the methods of implementation of this project were unrealistic at least for a country so large, so developed, and so sophisticated as Brazil. This project, or at least those charged with

its implementation, envisaged drastic changes being made rapidly in the organizational and staffing patterns at high levels within the Ministries. It also envisaged working with Brazilians at the policy making levels including the Ministers.

The reporting in the PAR stresses the negative rather than the positive by emphasizing what was not done rather than what was done. The implementation of the project seems to have been orientated more toward accomplishing the "end" results quickly rather than toward the intermediate steps or stages of development necessary before the finished product could evolve. In retrospect it appears that an "evolutionary" approach for project implementation would have been better than the more "revolutionary" approach attempted. In other words, a step by step approach may have accomplished more than the continual pressure applied for drastic reorganizations within the GOB.

This project was definitely an institutional building type of project which makes definitive reporting difficult, except where the reporting can be done in retrospect over many years. Since the life of this project has been only about four years, it is much too early to determine what its effect has been on perhaps to what degree it will influence the future thinking and development of institutional building in Brazil which is sure to come.

The PAR states that Brazil needs this project very badly. It is true that Brazil does need the reforms, improvements, and institutional development envisaged for the project. However, a new approach -- one of taking the first step and proceeding in an orderly manner--should be followed. The project cannot be completed in any measurable time limit.

Development of Agricultural Cooperatives

Brazil has thousands of cooperatives, the great majority of which are not providing adequate services needed by the farmers. Most of these cooperatives want to improve their services but lack the "know how" to develop an effective cooperative.

This project soon determined that the shortage of trained cooperative specialists in Brazil made it impossible to provide the amount and kind of technical assistance needed by the individual cooperatives. The project, therefore, has concentrated its efforts on (1), acquainting the GOB of the problem and (2), the developing of a corps of Brazilian specialists with the expertise needed to effectively assist individual cooperatives.

Progress has been made and is continuing to be made on both of these objectives. A cooperative training center has been established and is operating at Campinas in Sao Paulo State. Coordinating councils have been created and are operating in four States to coordinate the efforts of all Brazilian Agencies and others interested in assisting cooperatives in these States.

Thirty-five participants have completed the training course on cooperatives at Madison, Wisconsin. Twenty-five specialists have completed the INDA, 3 months course on cooperative development. Approximately 400 Managers, Directors, and other cooperative employees have recieved training in seminars conducted by INDA. Over 500 personal visits have been made by U.S. specialists to cooperatives to provide technical assistance and guidance. And 225 cooperatives have been either organized, revitalized, or reorganized. This project is also assisting the Peace Corps by helping to coordinate the services of 40 Volunteers who are working in the cooperative sector in Brazil.

Even though a sound foundation has been made for training Brazilian specialists in cooperative development, this is only a means to an end. The ultimate goal is to improve the living conditions of farmers through cooperative endeavors.

It has been recommended that this project be continued until June 30, 1971. The project is presently scheduled to be closed on June 30, 1970. The additional year is needed to better ensure the continuity of the program after the U.S. technical assistance provided by this project has been withdrawn.

PAR seems to imply that GOB is not ready or perhaps capable of assuming full responsibility for cooperative development at this time. A review of quarterly reports, annual reports, end of assignment reports and the PAR indicates that this project has made good to very good progress.

Development of Distribution, Storage and Farm Service Centers

The purpose of this project is to assist in modernizing the agricultural marketing system through improved facilities used in the marketing system.

Progress reported includes -- new wholesale markets have been built at Sao Paulo and Vitoria and construction is underway on one at Recife. Improvements have been made in the Rio de Janeiro wholesale center. A feasibility study and plans have been prepared for a proposed wholesale center at Salvador and it is ready for financing. Assistance has been given to Fortaleza, Ceara State, and Sao Luiz, Maranhao State, relative to wholesale centers. A poultry cooperative in Recife is now marketing frozen cut-up poultry in modern attractive packages. A simple but efficient corn crib was designed and promoted with the result that an estimated 30,000 were constructed in 1965. Statistics are not available on number built since 1965. One Farm Service Center has been constructed and in addition to its primary use will be used to train personnel for other farm service centers and grain storage throughout Brazil.

New wholesale centers are now being considered by local organizations in 6 additional cities (Porto Alegre, Curitiba, Niterio, Belo Horizonte, Brazilia and Belem).

A review of quarterly reports, annual reports, end-of-assignment reports, and the PAR indicates that the overall progress of these projects has been good to very good. However, the Farm Service Center portion has been unsatisfactory.

IV. Cost of Service

Year (FY)	Cost	USDA Services Involved
1965	$440,335	IADS, C&MS, SCS, FHA, ERS, FCS, ASCS, ARS
1966	584,205	IADS, C&MS, SCS, FHA, ERS, FCS, ASCS, ARS, FCA
1967	663,018	IADS, C&MS, SCS, FHA, ERS, FCS, ASCS, ARS, FCA
1968	463,310	IADS, C&MS, SCS, FHA, ERS, FCS, ASCS, ARS, FCA
1969	445,745	IADS, C&MS, SCS, FHA, ERS, FCS, ASCS, ARS

V. Administrative Arrangements

In April or May of each year, the USAID/Brazil, in cooperation with the PASA Team, estimates needs of PASA agricultural technicians, both resident and short term, for the following fiscal year beginning July 1. The Mission sends this information by airgram through AID/W to USDA/IADS, then forwards a PIO/T (Project Implementation Order for Technical Assistance) funding and authorizing AID/W to negotiate a PASA with USDA. The USDA reviews the Mission's data from a program and administrative view and then develops a budget for the fiscal year; this is submitted to LA PASA Officer of AID/W for developing the PASA.

If a new resident technician is required by the PASA, IADS consults with appropriate USDA Services for selection of suitable candidate, then submits nomination by airgram to the Mission through AID/W. After Mission and country clearances are received, IADS proceeds with appropriate USDA agency to process applicant for the position requested. Often language training is required in which case IADS arranges with AID/W and Language Center for appropriate training; in a similar manner, IADS arranges with AID/W and the Foreign Service Institute for a standard "orientation course" of 6 weeks. IADS then cables Mission, through AID/W, the ETA for the new technician.

For short-term consultants, after receipt of an airgram request from the Mission and PASA Team Leader, IADS follows a similar pattern for recruiting as is used for resident technicians. No language training or FSI orientation is provided for short term consultants. IADS provides orientation and briefing, makes travel arrangements, prepares travel orders and performs essentially all administrative functions in getting short term consultants recruited and on board. TDY reports are submitted to the Regional Coordinator and respective Country Officers of IADS, which are then distributed to appropriate USDA agencies and AID/W.

Country officiers and the Regional Coordinator work closely with AID/W counterparts in the Agricultural Division of the Latin America Bureau, the LA PASA Officer and desk officials. IADS Country Officers and Regional Coordinator make annual supervisory visits to PASA teams.

VI. Evaluation of the PASA Program in Brazil

Good progress has been made under the PASA arrangement in Brazil. Several factors contributed to this success, some of which are: (1) A pre-PASA survey. (2) The day to day "backstopping" support given to the specialists by their parent agency, plus supervisory visits. (3) The services of highly qualified consultants when needed. (4) Program continuity in funding, objectives, and with a minimum number of personnel changes. Second tour assignments have been the rule rather than the exception. (5) Training, both on the job and through the participant training program has played a large part in the implementation of the PASA program and more important will provide the expertise necessary to continue the development in their respective fields.

Problems

The major problems of project implementation are related to:

1. Lack of continuity of projects.
2. Lack of trained personnel in host country.
3. Low salaries paid by host government.
4. Lack of funds on the part of the host country.
5. Lack of coordination on project, and between projects within the Ministry as well as between Ministries.
6. Lack of a counterpart project or appropriate counterpart office within the Ministry to provide an effective "tie in" with a specific activity of the PASA. A good example is in marketing where there is no Marketing Division in the Ministry.
7. Lack of appropriate long term credit for agricultural development.
8. Lack of reliable economic and statistical data.
9. Political changes in GOB and move to Brazilia.
10. Receptivity to "change" especially at the higher levels of the host government.

VII. Recommendations

It is recommended

1. That the Presidential policy of reducing overseas personnel as initiated by the BALPA exercise be reviewed (world-wide recommendation).
2. That the level of technical assistance being provided for the development of cooperatives be continued at a level sufficiently high to maintain the rate of development now being made in Brazil. It has been determined that a minimum of 4 specialists will be required for the next 2 years to provide the assistance to carry out plans already being implemented. This number was previously agreed to but latest reports indicate that the 4 positions agreed to may be reduced to 3.
3. That a minimum level of 3 resident specialists in agricultural credit be maintained for at least 2 more years. The greatly increased amount of capital and the number of loans make this necessary.
4. That an evaluation in depth be made of the Agricultural Economics Planning and Analysis project to determine what future action USAID should take.
5. That sufficient funds be budgeted annually to provide adequate supervisory and consultant services.

EL SALVADOR

I. Nature of Service

USDA negotiated a technical assistance PASA with AID on May 1, 1963 providing technical services in connection with agricultural development in El Salvador. These services cover the following fields of activity: adaptive research on fruits, vegetables, food and feed crops; extension education in agriculture and human resources development; agricultural credit; agricultural marketing and market development; land use economics and natural resources development; and the development of host country agencies and institutions through which agricultural development may be guided and implemented.

Reviews of annual and quarterly reports, end-of-tour reports and other special reports indicate that good to excellent progress is being made on this PASA.

II. Quantity of Service

Claud Horn, Research Specialist with ARS, was the first employee to enter on duty under this PASA on August 4, 1963, arriving in El Salvador September 4, 1963; he has served as Team Leader since initiation of the PASA. Dr. James Schwinden, Land Use Adjustment and Policy Advisor, ERS, entered on duty October 2, and arrived El Salvador October 5, 1963. Francis Kutish, Extension Marketing Specialist, FES arrived El Salvador November 20, 1963. The PASA team actually began technical assistance with 3 resident technicians in fiscal year 1964.

Following is a recap of resident and short-term technical assistance by fiscal years:

FY	No. Resident Technicians	USDA Services Participating	No. Short-Term Consultants	USDA Services Participating
1964	3	ARS, FES, ERS	7 ($8\frac{1}{2}$ mos.)	ARS, ERS, SRS, FES, IADS
1965	5	ARS, FES, ERS, FHA	9 (9 mos.)	ARS, FES, SCS, ERS, IADS
1966	5	ARS, FES, ERS, FHA	12 (16 mos.)	IADS, ERS, ARS, FES, SCS, FHA, OIG
1967	6	ARS, ERS, FES, FHA, ASCS	9 (11 mos.)	ARS, FES, FHA, ASCS
1968	4	ARS, ERS, FHA, ASCS	9 (10 mos.)	ARS, FHA, FES, FS
1969	4	ARS, ERS, FHA, ASCS	6 (12 mos.)	FHA, IADS, ARS, ERS, P&SA, FES

Total numbers of resident and short-term consultants increased each year from fiscal year 1964 through fiscal year 1966 and 1967, after which there has been a gradual reduction, largely due to lack of funds.

III. Quality of Service

The quality of technical service provided to El Salvador by USDA has been good. High quality senior technicians have made up the resident team since it began operation in September 1964. For consultant requests, USDA has selected capable scientists many of whom have had world-wide experience.

Agricultural Research: A senior research technician was selected with 30 years of experience (half of which has been in foreign service with USDA) to coordinate research activities in El Salvador and to serve as Team Leader. With the assistance of 23 ARS short-term consultants (experts), USDA has contributed much to the training of Salvadoran scientists and to helping them find solutions to problems which limit the production of food. A new

variety of beans (Selection 184) has been developed which is resistant to most local virus diseases and yields up to 2 and 3 times the average yield of traditional local varieties. Livestock diseases have been identified and placed under control; livestock record systems have been introduced; artificial insemination has been improved; varieties of vegetables have been selected and adapted which are resistant to many of the local diseases and plagues limiting production of local varieties; insects and diseases have been identified with subsequent control measures recommended; and soils and irrigation studies have been made with recommendations for management practices to increase yields.

Agricultural Marketing has been supported through resident specialists from FES and ASCS, together with 8 experts and short-term consultants from ERS, ASCS, FES, ARS and IADS. A market news service has been initiated to provide service for livestock and basic food products. Commodity growers and marketing associations have been organized, with commodity committees serving as liaison between government and private enterprise. The Marketing Section of the Ministry of Agriculture was reorganized with the assistance of the USDA Marketing Economist, who developed job descriptions for all positions. This resident technician also assisted the Ministry in reorganizing the Planning Department and developing a long time agricultural development plan for the country. Storage and facility improvements have been made to handle rice, corn and beans. Crop diversification has been promoted through improved marketing efforts. The resident PASA technician initiated and developed a survey to analyze production, marketing and consumption data for the country's principal agricultural commodities.

Agricultural Credit expertise has been provided by two resident FHA technicians and 7 short-term consultants working with the rural credit agency, "A.B.C." Supervised credit personnel have been trained, credit

programs have been reviewed and improved, and the rural credit agency has been reorganized with the help of the resident and short-term specialists from USDA. Loan servicing has improved, loan processing has been expedited, and loan deliquency has been reduced. Loansto farmers made by A.B.C. increased from 12 with total loan value of $9,191 in 1962 to 8,528 loans in 1968 with loan value of $3,493,765.

During this 7-year period, a total of 26,128 loans were made for a total credit value of $13,172,012. Loan payment delinquency was reduced from 46% in 1964 to 15.4% in 1967.

IV. Cost of Service

Following is a tabulation of PASA cost, by fiscal years:

FY	Amount	Services Involved
1964	$130,580	ERS, ARS, FES, FHA, OMS, FAS, IADS
1965	130,000	ERS, ARS, FES, FHA, SCS, IADS
1966	171,000	ERS, ARS, FES, FHA, SCS, OIG, IADS
1967	179,500	ERS, ARS, FES, FHA, ASCS, IADS
1968	133,000	ERS, ARS, FES, FHA, ASCS, FS, IADS
1969	153,280	ERS, ARS, FES, FHA, ASCS, P&SA, IADS, FAS

V. Administrative Arrangements

In April or May of each year, the USAID/El Salvador, in cooperation with the PASA Team, estimates needs of PASA agricultural technicians, both resident and short term, for the following fiscal year beginning July 1. The Mission sends this information by airgram through AID/W to USDA/IADS; then forwards a PIO/T (Project Implementation Order for Technical Assistance) funding and authorizing AID/W to negotiate a PASA with USDA. The USDA reviews the Mission's data from a program and administrative

view and then develops a budget for the fiscal year. This is submitted to the LA PASA officer of AID/W for developing the PASA.

If a new resident technician is required by the PASA, IADS consults with appropriate USDA Services for selection of suitable candidate, then submits nomination by airgram to the Mission through AID/W. After Mission and country clearances are received, IADS proceeds with appropriate USDA agency to process applicant for the position requested. Often language training is required in which case IADS arranges with AID/W and Language Center for appropriate training; in a similar manner, IADS arranges with AID/W and the Foreign Service Institute for a standard "orientation course" of 6 weeks. IADS then cables Mission, through AID/W, the ETA for the new technician.

For short-term consultants, after receipt of an airgram request from the Mission and PASA Team Leader, IADS follows a similar pattern for recruiting as is used for resident technicians. No language training or FSI orientation is provided for short term consultants. IADS provides orientation and briefing, makes travel arrangements, prepares travel orders and performs essentially all administrative functions in getting short term consultants recruited and on board. TDY reports are submitted to the Regional Coordinator and respective Country Officers of IADS, which are then distributed to appropriate USDA agencies and AID/W.

Country Officers and the Regional Coordinator work closely with AID/W counterparts in the Agricultural Division of the Latin American Bureau, the LA PASA Officer and desk officials. IADS Country Officers and Regional Coordinator make annual supervisory visits to PASA teams.

VI. General Evaluation

During the six years (FY 1964-69) USDA has provided seven resident technicians and 52 consultants from eleven Services of the Department of Agriculture. Working relations with AID and host country officials have been cordial, frank, and beneficial. Host country institutions have been strengthened in existing work and supported in new initiatives.

Continuity of technical advisors has been a positive factor in USDA PASA assistance. The ability of the resident technicians from key Service agencies of the Department to draw on specialized expertise from throughout the entire Department has enabled USDA to contribute significantly to El Salvador's agricultural development.

Annual delays in getting the PASA signed and the lack of forward funding create uncertainties in project plans and implementation. Such uncertainties also result in delays in getting technicians "on board".

VII. Recommendations

It is recommended that the major portion of technical assistance to agricultural development in El Salvador be continued through the AID/USDA PASA program. The following general recommendations are made:

1. Continue resident technical assistance in research, with emphasis on adaptive research in basic food crops, fruits, vegetables, and livestock improvement.
2. Continue resident technical assistance in supervised agricultural credit, with efforts toward consolidation of host credit agencies, and toward reduction in costs of loan processing and delinquency.
3. Continue resident technical assistance in agricultural marketing and planning, keeping both phases closely related to each other and to production potentials.
4. Review and evaluate the Extension program and the Vocational Agricultural programs to see if resident technicians are needed in these fields.
5. Continue to budget for each fiscal year an adequate allotment for short-term consultants, without specific designation as to specialty or problem. This will enable the PASA team and Mission to meet unanticipated problems and emergencies that may arise.

EVALUATION

USDA/AID PASA PARAGUAY

I. Nature of the Service Performed

This is a technical assistance PASA designed to (1) improve land tenure practices and assist GOP in its colonization efforts; (2) improve agricultural policies and sector planning capacity; (3) improve and expand agricultural marketing, processing methods, services and facilities, (4) integrate and expand the Research and Extension programs toward priority export sectors, e.g., livestock, forestry and domestic crops, and (5) develop a permanent Cooperative movement capable of contributing to increased production and modernization of rural life.

II. Describe the Quantity of the Service Performed, Giving Trends Over the Last Three Years.

A. FY 1965 - Recruitment of the initial USDA/PASA team was initiated during the last half of FY 1965, following completion of a joint AID/USDA/College study on "Agricultural Development in Paraguay" which identified technical assistance needs in agriculture.

B. FY 1966 - The first three resident team members arrived in Paraguay during the first quarter of FY 1966 beginning work in the fields of cooperatives, marketing and land tenure/colonization. In addition, two short term consultants provided special assistance in forestry and parasitology/cattle, respectively. Also, three additional experts were brought in to complete,

together with the PASA Team leader, study-recommendations on "improving the organization of agricultural services in Paraguay".

C. FY 1967 - A Forestry Utilization advisor joined the PASA group during the second quarter of FY 1967, thereby increasing PASA to four (4) members. Short term consultant (3) assistance was also provided during FY 1967 in soil conservation, poultry production and marketing, and cooperative law.

D. FY 1968 - Technical assistance continued in the four initial areas during the first half of FY 68. When the PASA Team Leader returned from home-leave in January 1968 for his second tour he shifted from the land tenure/colonization position to the planning/policy position working directly with the Ministry of Agriculture. Fund stringency precluded filling the land tenure/colonization vacancy and the position was abolished. A second cooperative technician came in for several months overlap with the initial incumbent prior to the latter's retirement in January, 1968. In addition to the five (5) resident technicians, four (4) short term consultants provided expertise in marketing (2), forestry/sawmill operation, and agricultural statistics.

E. FY 1969 - By the end of the second quarter of FY 1969, five (5) resident technicians were in country working in the following areas: agricultural planning and policy, marketing, cooperatives, forestry utilization, and livestock extension, the latter position

having been under recruitment for several months. During the second quarter, a marketing economist was provided to carry on the marketing work upon retirement of the first incumbent. USDA is presently recruiting a forest products economist to complete a short term assignment in Paraguay prior to the close of the fiscal year.

III. Quality of the Service

A. Review of annual, quarterly and end-of-tour reports indicate that the USDA PASA is making satisfactory progress toward objectives and that quality of the service is on the whole very satisfactory.

B. Performance Evaluation Reports reflect satisfaction of USAID/Paraguay officials regarding competency of the PASA technicians from the standpoint of training, experience and performance.

C. Identifiable progress and tangible results are becoming increasingly evident and speak well for the effectiveness of the PASA service. A few examples are:

1. Training and assistance given to Paraguayans in preparation of a regional plan involving 30 colonies and about 16,000 families has contributed to the progress of the colonization program;

2. The Department of Policy and Planning in the Ministry of Agriculture, for the first time, has started operating under a detailed work plan, and the third national agricultural planning exercise has involved more Paraguayans (100) than any previous effort; exemplifying the influence and rapport the PASA Team Leader has with the Ministry's Poliy and Planning Entity.

3. Formation of a Marketing Federation among six vegetable production cooperatives increased economic benefits to tomato producers by $200,000 in 1968.

4. In forestry, (a) assistance to the Paraguayan industry in initiating the use of a drying chemical will reduce the drying time of wood from two years to two months, and (b) a sawmill modernization study has formed the basis for recommended procedure and loan program to modernize the sawmill industry;

5. An increased volume of quality eggs and broilers is now evident in the Asuncion market reflecting results of technical assistance rendered to the private poultry sector; and

6. Factual dependable data essential to sound planning and programming is being developed on a continuing basis through the work of PASA technicians and short term experts.

IV. Cost of the Service

Fiscal Year	Amount ($)	USDA Services Involved
1965	35,600	IADS, ERS, FCS, C&MS
1966	140,000	IADS, ERS, FCS, C&MS, FS, ARS
1967	160,640	IADS, ERS, FCS, C&MS, FS, SCS, FES
1968	167,000	IADS, ERS, FCS, C&MS, FS, SRS
1969	180,805	IADS, ERS, FCS, C&MS, FS, FES

V. Administrative Arrangements

A. Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year, USAID/Paraguay in cooperation with the PASA Team, estimates PASA technical assistance

needs, both resident and short term, for the year and transmits this information to USDA/IADS by airgram through AID/W. Subsequently, the Mission forwards a PIO/T which provides funding and authority for AID/W to negotiate the fiscal year PASA with USDA. Following review of the Mission's data from a program and administrative standpoint, USDA/IADS prepares a budget and submits it to the LA PASA Officer, AID/W as basis for developing the PASA.

B. When a new resident technician is required under the PASA, IADS consults with the appropriate USDA Services arranging selection of suitable candidate; then submits nomination by airgram to the Mission through AID/W. After Mission and country clearances are received, IADS proceeds with appropriate USDA agency to process applicant for the position requested. When language training is required IADS arranges with AID/W and Language Center for appropriate training; in a similar manner, IADS arranges with AID/W and the Foreign Service Institute for a standard "orientation course" of 6 weeks. IADS then cables Mission, through AID/W, the ETA for the new technician.

C. For short-term consultants, IADS follows a similar pattern for recruiting, except, no language training or FSI orientation is provided. IADS provides suitable orientation and briefing, makes travel arrangements, prepares travel orders and performs essentially all administrative functions in getting short term consultants recruited and on board.

D. IADS provides program and administrative backstopping to the PASA Team and the individual USDA agencies involved provide technical backstopping to their respective people on the PASA. In this connection, supervisory travel of both IADS Regional personnel and USDA Agency personnel is performed on an annual basis to the extent travel funds and regulations permit.

E. Resident technicians submit to IADS and the Mission quarterly, annual and end of tour reports which provide basis for supervisory guidance, changes in program emphasis/direction, etc. IADS distributes copies of these reports to AID/W and to USDA Agencies concerned -- TDY reports are submitted to IADS and following reproduction are distributed to the Mission, AID/W and the appropriate USDA Agency.

F. Country Officers and the Regional Coordinator work closely with AID/W counterparts in the Agricultural Division of the Latin America Bureau, the LA PASA Officer and desk officials.

VI. Evaluation

This PASA operation is working out very satisfactorily, is well received within the Mission family and making a substantial contribution to accomplishment of the Mission program objectives in agriculture. This favorable evaluation is attributable to a number of factors. There was a good pre-PASA input in terms of a joint AID/USDA/College study for the purpose of identifying technical assistance needs. Highly competent people have been recruited. Continuity of PASA personnel in respective technical fields has been maintained. Specialized technical support has been provided when requested under the short-term consultant arrangement, in addition to regular technical backstopping by the USDA agencies concerned. The PASA Team operates as an integral part of the Mission's agricultural division and is directly involved in matter of program assessment and planning.

Certain Paraguay Government related problems and conditions of operation have been encountered, which have tended to slow down the rate of progress toward objectives. These are (1) lack of adequate budgetary support for the Ministry of Agriculture and other agricultural sector agencies resulting in unsatisfactory salaries and inadequate working facilities for their employees as well as lack of transportation for field work; and (2) lack of qualified Paraguayan counterparts in a few cases. These adverse operational factors are recognized by both the Government of Paraguay and the USAID Mission and through joint effort gradual improvement is being effected.

VII. Recommendations

AID's present agricultural program has been in operation nearly five years and currently involves PASA, New Mexico University and direct hire technical inputs. Considering the importance of agricultural development to the economy of Paraguay, it would seem appropriate for an AID/USDA/College team to evaluate the overall agricultural development effort in depth at field level within the next two years. This would provide real assessment of progress and guidelines for changes in program emphasis.

Evaluation Statement

Orientation

The Need

American technicians overseas are sometimes ineffective. While they have technical ability their experience in national planning or implementing broad programs is often limited.

With AID budgets reduced, each AID/USDA technician must be more effective. With the average cost of a two year tour over $50,000, and personnel being reduced, we must take every step to make the technician more than just an advisor in a narrow subject. We must help the technician: 1) understand his assignment 2) reduce his frustrations 3) focus on key issues 4) know where and how to get help 5) be a member of the AID team 6) understand the host country's framework 7) work effectively within the cultural and economic framework of the country 8) evaluate his progress 9) encourage counterparts to accept responsibility and continue the programs. These are the aims of a good orientation program, and the USDA orientation seeks to meet these needs of every employee departing for an AID assignment.

Current Work

Authority and procedures for orientation are contained in the AID-USDA agreement and in the PASA Handbook (Title 8, Chapter 7 and Title 2, 102.4). Final authority for orientation rests with the Washington Training Center in AID. (AID Manual Order 461.4 and 462.4), although decisions are based on recommendations from IADS, the technician's agency, and AID Bureaus.

Information Services Group in IADS has prime responsibility for orientation of USDA employees departing for an AID overseas assignment. Its duties are to:

> Maintain active liaison with AID's Training Center; arrange for AID orientation, language testing and training; supply AID with briefing materials; act as control point for all USDA staff undergoing AID training; advise USDA personnel on AID policy and procedures concerning training and orientation.
>
> Schedule USDA orientation and briefings for USDA staff involved in AID work; select and make appointments with briefors; set up group briefings; arrange for briefings at non-Washington points, such as Beltsville; and prepare and distribute individual schedules for each man.
>
> Conduct individual briefing sessions to explain: IADS and USDA organization; public affairs responsibilities; reporting procedures and how to write good reports; how to work with Mission information staff; how to get technical information; AID's translation program and how to use it.

PASA personnel generally receive up to one week of USDA orientation, up to three weeks at the AID Washington Training Center, up to three weeks at the Foreign Service Institute (area studies), and up to 16 weeks at FSI for language training. Not all personnel receive the full program; exceptions may be agreed upon by the various agencies involved, (e.g. Asian Training Center).

Typically, the only technician who attends the full six-week AID/FSI orientation and the full one-week USDA orientation is one who has never been overseas, has never been based in Washington, D. C., and whose experience has been limited to his own specialty. This represents only about one-third of all formal orientation in 1968.

Number of USDA Personnel in
Formal AID Orientation, 1968

1 week - 10
2 weeks - —
3 weeks - 16
4 weeks - 10
5 weeks - 9
6 weeks - 24

USDA orientation is designed to supplement that given by AID/FSI. AID/FSI sessions are usually general in scope, relating to AID administration, cultures in LDC's, and the history of the region. USDA sessions are more specifically related to the man's own assignment and the host country's agricultural problems. Rarely, if ever, do the USDA and AID orientation schedules overlap or conflict. Attachment "A" is a condensed comparison of the two schedules.

If a technician does attend AID/FSI orientation, USDA briefings are generally limited to four days, two to discuss the host country's agriculture and the specific PASA, and two to discuss administrative matters and specific subject-matter problems.

If a technician does not attend formal AID orientation, (about half the time) we set up visits with appropriate AID officials, such as country desk officers, agricultural technicians, and the AID Washington Training Center; the USDA sessions are limited to a day or two.

Each orientation schedule is tailored specifically to the man's needs. Orientation is planned for periods from one hour to one week, depending on the specific assignment and the man's experience. Each briefor is given a copy of the schedule, including instructions on the objectives of the briefing and the briefee's background and specific assignment. Each technician receives a special selection of printed materials, to help him understand his assignment, his support, and the host country's economic problems and potentials. The material supplements handouts received in AID.

Progress

A USDA technician who departs for AID assignments today is far better prepared to do an effective job than one of several years ago. Not only is he better prepared by AID, but USDA briefings focus directly on assignment objectives, and the man meets all the people who will be backstopping him. He is made aware of agricultural development in general, and his specific role in the host country's development. He understands the host country's P.L. 480 program, the role of agribusiness, his reporting responsibilities are fully explained, and he is told how to use the full resources of the Department, in addition to his own agency's resources.

We are constantly evaluating and improving USDA orientation:

1) End-of-tour evaluations in 1967 revealed that both AID and USDA briefings were too general; needed to focus more on agriculture and the specific assignment. Pre-departure evaluation revealed that some men were still uncertain as to their objectives. In 1968, orientation was improved to better meet these needs.

2) IADS' Information Services Group now maintains liaison with AID's Washington Training Center, thus facilitating AID's work with USDA, and permitting accurate record keeping and implementing of AID policies and procedures. This coordination and special briefings take about one quarter of a man-year.

3) We brief departing technicians on effective communications in LDC's including production and use of radio and television programs, motion pictures, exhibits, photographs, slides, and audio-visual equipment to train counterparts and others in host country. This supplements AID's communications theory briefings.

4) We prepared a brochure "New Careers in International Agriculture" to prescreen applicants for foreign assignment, encourage qualified applicants to inquire, and explain AID/USDA technical assistance agreements. (Attachment B)

The Future

Some things we propose for the coming year to make orientation and departure procedures more effective are:

1) Briefing Book - Would contain all necessary checklists, information, schedules, directions, country fact sheets, reporting instructions, etc. Procedures would be more easily understood, the technician's orientation could begin before he gets to Washington, and administrative matters could be handled more efficiently. The book will be patterned after AID's own Orientation Handbook.

   Target: April 1969.

2) Field Evaluation - A short evaluation form will be mailed to all AID/USDA field people, asking for opinions and attitudes on the effectiveness of orientation, both AID and USDA.

Target: January 1969.

Attachments

A - Condensed Comparison of AID and USDA Orientation.

B - "New Careers" leaflet (for distribution only to USDA employees).

C - "Information Sources" sheet.

ISG/IADS
12/68

Summary Comparison of Orientation
AID and USDA

AID

Explanations of AID
Security Briefings
Variety of films
Communications (cultural)
Civil Rights
World Affairs
Employee organizations
Foreign Policy
Peace Corps
Food for Freedom
Land Reform
Public Health
Counterpart Funds
Country Team
Agricultural Development (45 min.)
Congressional Relations
Development Research
American Culture
Human Relations
Mission operations

FSI

Country and Area Studies
(Cultural, History, General)

USDA

PASA concept and purpose
Team History
USDA/IADS organization
Chain of Command
Reporting Responsibilities
Discuss Briefing Materials
Agricultural Development
Relations with Mission
Foreign Training
Use of Audio-Visuals
Subject Matter
Agricultural Attache
Country Briefings
- -PL 480
- -Agric. Economics
- -Sources of Data
- -Subject Matter

Measuring Performance
Nutritional Improvement
Agribusiness
Regional Coordinator
Agricultural Trade
Evaluation of all Orientation

Attachment No. 20

COUNTRIES WHERE USDA PASAs HAVE OPERATED

EAST ASIA

- Laos
- Thailand
- Korea
- Vietnam

NESA

- India
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Turkey
- Jordan
- Afghanistan

AFR

- Ethiopia
- Nigeria
- Tunisia
- Kenya
- So. Rhodesia
- Liberia
- Congo - (Kinshasa)
- Ghana
- Senegal

L.A.

- Colombia
- Venezuela
- Brazil
- Bolivia
- Dominican Republic
- Nicaragua
- Chile
- Argentina
- Ecuador
- Paraguay
- El Salvador
- Uruguay
- R.O.C.A.P.

Attachment No. 21

WOH-funded PASAs with the USDA - FY 1969

Project Title and PASA Control Number	Amount for FY 1969
Research:-	
Research on Sterility Method of Tsetse Fly Control (RA(AJ)1-00)	$ 154,900
Analysis of Factors Associated with Differences and Changes in Agricultural Production in the LDCs (RA(AJ)2-00)	181,100
Improvement of Grain Legume Production in the Near East and South Asia Regions (RA(AJ)3-00)	404,620
Development and Use of Improved Varieties of Major Cereal Crops in Africa (West Africa Area only) (RA(AJ)4-00) (Note: The Africa Bureau agreed to assume funding and other responsibilities for the East Africa area under a continuing PASA arrangement in FY 1969)	271,298
Analysis of Demand Prospects for Agricultural Exports of LDCs (RA(AJ)2-66)	349,685
General Technical Services:-	
Fortification - Development of New Foods (WOH(AJ)1-69)	106,943
Plant and Seed Materials (WOH(AJ)2-69)	50,000
Technical Services for Soil Salinity (WOH(AJ)3-69)	35,000
Total	$ 1,553,546

Attachment No. 22

Office	No. of PASAs	Reg. Tour Pers.	Reg. Tour M/Y	TDY Pers.	TDY M/Y	Wash. Back-stopping Pers.	Wash. Back-stopping M/Y	% Overhead	Fiscal Overhead Amount	Personnel	Other	Total Amount
WOH/ARDS	7	66	52 6/12	0	0	4	3 4/12	15	167,483	810,783	395,217	1,373,473
WOH/NCF	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	15	13,949	82,994	10,000	106,943
Africa	21	72	58 11/12	13	2½	5	1 4/12	7½ to 15	233,131	1,247,547	566,765	2,047,443
East Asia	4			4	1 4/12			7½	22,218	152,286	1,500	188,524
		37	25 5/12	19	4	12	3 11/12	7½ to 15	142,960	860,436	134,110	1,134,347
NESA	15	33	25 1/12	49	10 7/12	3	8/12	7½ to 15	130,179	834,725	32,591	991,698
Vietnam	8	97	28 3/12	0	0	9	5 8/12	15	329,603	2,139,855	54,599	2,524,057
Total	71	310	195 2/12	85	18 5/12	33	15 1/12		1,039,523	6,128,626	1,194,782	8,366,485 8,362,931 3,354

11

WOH/ARDS:8/15/68

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
International Agricultural Development Service
Washington, D. C. 20250

USDA TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ANNUAL SUMMARY, FY 1968
(July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968)

AID-FUNDED ACTIVITIES

	Resident PASA's	Regional/Worldwide PASA's	Short-Term PASA's	Total
Countries or Regions	25	6	18	37
USDA Agencies	12	2	14	15
PASA's	37	7	35	74
Technicians:				
On Board:				
Long Term	145	61	-	206
Short Term	8	-	14	22
Completed:				
Long Term	57	10	-	67
Short Term	62	1	53	116
Total Technicians	272	72	67	411

NON-AID ACTIVITIES

Countries or Regions	25
Agencies	8
Projects	40
Technicians	64

IADS - 8/12/68

Attachment No. 23

USDA Technical Assistance

Comparative Summary, Fiscal Years 1965-68

Description AID Funded Activities:	FY-1965	FY-1966	FY-1967	FY-1968
Number of PASA's:				
Resident	13	23	28	37
Regional and Worldwide	13	13	13	7
Short Term	22	48	28	35
Total PASA's	48	84	69	79
Number of PASA's by Benefitting Area:				
Africa	12	23	13	18
Asia	10	30	31	39
Latin America	21	28	22	19
Worldwide	5	3	3	3
Total	48	84	69	79
Number of Technicians:				
Long Term	119	161	255	273
Short Term	79	139	119	138
Total Furnished (On board & Completed)	198	300	374	411
Number of Technicians by Benefitting Area:				
Africa	58	86	54	66
Asia	23	64	149	200
Latin America	89	113	107	99
Worldwide	28	37	64	46
Total	198	300	374	411

Total USDA Technicians Assigned Overseas Under PASA's 1/

July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Country or Region	USDA Participating Agencies & Offices																	
	ARS	ASCS	C&MS	CSRS	ERS	FCA	FCIC	FCS	FES	FHA	FS	IADS	REA	SCS	SEC	SEG	SRS	TOTAL
Africa Area																		
Chad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Congo	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Ethiopia	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Gambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Ghana	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kenya	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3
Liberia	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	5
Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	-	1	-	6	-	-	-	13
Senegal	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	8
Tunisia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	13	-	-	-	16
Zambia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total, Africa Area	4	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	2	8	-	8	-	24	-	-	-	51
Asia Area																		
Afghanistan	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	4
India	2	4	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	10	1	-	-	29
Jordan	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Korea	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2
Laos	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Nepal	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	3
Pakistan	3	-	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	-	3	-	-	-	12
Thailand	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7	-	-	-	8
Turkey	2	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	-	-	2	17
Vietnam	14	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	55	13	5	8	-	7	-	-	5	111
Total, Asia Area	22	6	2	4	8	-	-	-	56	17	6	19	-	37	2	1	9	189

1/ Includes LT & ST, On board & Completed figures.

Total USDA Technicians Assigned Overseas Under PASA's (cont'd)[1/]

July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Country or Region	USDA Participating Agencies & Offices																	
	ARS	ASCS	C&MS	CSRS	ERS	FCA	FCIC	FCS	FES	FHA	FS	IADS	REA	SCS	SEC	SEG	SRS	TOTAL
Latin America Area																		
Argentina	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Bolivia	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Brazil	4	3	2	-	6	1	-	7	-	3	-	2	-	2	-	-	1	31
Chile	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Colombia	1	-	1	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Dominican Republic	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	6
Ecuador	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	7
El Salvador	4	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	3	3	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Guatemala	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
Nicaragua	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
Paraguay	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	3	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	9
Uruguay	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Venezuela	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4
Total, Latin America Area	13	7	5	-	14	1	-	11	11	8	6	3	-	4	-	-	5	88
Regional/Worldwide																		
Africa Regional	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Asia Regional	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
ROCAP [2/]	9	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	11
Worldwide	10	-	-	-	36	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46
Total, Regional/ Worldwide	45	-	-	-	36	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	83
Grand Total	84	13	8	7	58	2	1	11	69	33	12	31	-	65	2	1	14	411

1/ Includes LT &ST, On board & Completed figures.
2/ Regional Office, Central America & Panama.

USDA Resident Country Assistance PASA - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Country	PASA No.	Agency	Title	Overseas Technicians Requested LT	Requested ST	On Board LT	On Board ST	Completed LT	Completed ST
Africa Area									
Ethiopia	AFR 2-66	ARS	Plant Prot. & Pest Control	1	-	1	-	-	-
Gambia	AFR 11-68	FHA	Asst. to Agr. Services	1	-	1	-	-	-
Kenya	AFR 36-66	ASCS, CSRS	Agr. Planning	3	1	2	-	-	1
Liberia	AFR 42-66	IADS, ARS, ERS, C&MS	Agr. Productivity	1	4	1	-	-	4
Nigeria	AFR 3-65	FHA, IADS	Agr. Credit	7	-	-	-	7	-
"	AFR 12-65	SCS	Soil & Water Conservation	5	-	5	-	1	-
Senegal	AFR 13-67	FES, FCA, SCS, IADS	Agr. Development	5	5	3	2	-	3
Tunisia	AFR 4-00	SCS	Watershed Management	9	1	9	-	3	1
Zambia	AFR 29-68	SCS, FHA, FES	Oper. Pers. Gov.t. Rep. Zambia	4	-	-	-	-	-
			Total, Africa Area	36	11	22	2	11	9
Asia Area									
India	NESA 38-66	ASCS	Agr. Prod. Incentives	2	3	-	-	2	2
"	NESA 16-67	SCS	Soil & Water Management	5	1	5	-	-	1
"	NESA 12-68	SCS	Soil & Water Management	4	-	4	-	-	-
"	NESA 33-68	CSRS	Agricultural Production	4	1	2	-	-	1
Jordan	NESA 20-66	FHA	Agr. Credit & Co-op	1	-	-	-	1	-
"	NESA 32-67	FHA	Financial Adm. & Management	1	-	1	-	-	-
Nepal	NESA 57-00	FHA	Agr. Credit & Co-op	2	1	1	-	1	1
Thailand	FE 31-65	SCS	Soil & Water Management	5	1	5	-	1	1
Turkey	NESA 60-67	SCS	Soil & Water Management	3	4	3	-	-	4
Vietnam	FE 6-67	FES	Agr. Extension & Training	33	-	33	-	15	-
"	FE 10-67	FHA	Agr. Credit & Co-op	5	-	5	-	8	-
"	" " "	SCS	Irr. & Rural Engineering	3	-	3	-	4	-
"	" " "	ARS	Plant & Seed Multiplication	8	-	8	-	-	-
"	" " "	FS	Forestry	3	-	3	-	2	-
"	" " "	ARS, ASCS, ERS FES, IADS, SRS	Technical Support	1	20	1	4	-	14
"	" " "	SRS	Stat. & Price Supporting	2	-	2	-	2	-
"	" " "	IADS	Agricultural Economics	3	-	3	-	1	-
			Total, Asia Area	85 1/	31	79 1/	4	37 1/	24

1/ Reflects reduced personnel staffing in Vietnam as of June 30, 1968.

USDA Resident Country Assistance PASA's - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Country	PASA No.	Agency	Title	Overseas Technicians Requested LT	Requested ST	On Board LT	On Board ST	Completed LT	Completed ST
Latin America Area									
Bolivia	LA 76-65	ERS	Rural Development	2	-	2	-	-	-
Brazil	LA 1-65	ARS, ASCS, C&MS, ERS, FCA, FCS, FES, FHA, IADS	Agricultural Development	21	8	14	1	7	7
"	LA 29-65	SCS	Frontier Homestead Program	1	1	1	-	-	1
Chile	LA 41-66	SRS	Crops & Livestock Stat.	1	-	1	-	-	-
Colombia	LA 43-67	ARS, C&MS, ERS, FCS	National Agr. Planning	5	1	4	-	-	1
Dominican Rep.	LA 75-65	ASCS, FES, FS SRS	Agr. Prod. & Distribution	6	3	3	-	-	3
Ecuador	LA 49-00	ERS, FES, FHA, SCS, SRS	Agr. Prod. & Distribution	7	-	6	-	1	-
El Salvador	LA 13-00	ARS, ASCS, ERS, FES, FHA	Agr. Prod. & Distribution	4	11	4	1	-	10
Nicaragua	LA 46-00	FES	Agr. Prod. & Agrarian Reform	2	3	2	-	-	3
Paraguay	LA 1-65	C&MS, ERS, FCS, FES, FS	Agr. Prod. & Instit. Dev.	7	4	5	-	-	4
ROCAP 1/	LA 11-68	ARS	Agr. Policy Development (Foot & Mouth Disease)	2	-	2	-	-	-
Venezuela 2/	LA 74-66	FHA	Agricultural Credit	1	-	-	-	1	-
			Total, Latin America Area	59	31	44	2	9	29
			Total, Resident Country Assistance PASA's	180	73	145	8	57	62

1/ Regional Office Central America & Panama
2/ Phased Out

USDA Regional and Worldwide PASA's - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Region	PASA No.	Agency	Title	Number of Technicians Requested LT	Requested ST	On Board LT	On Board ST	Completed LT	Completed ST
Africa Regional	AFR 3-00	ARS	Bovine Pleuro-Pneumonia	3	-	2	-	-	-
" "	RA 1-00	ARS	Tsetse Fly Control	2	-	2	-	-	-
" "	RA 4-00	ARS	Major Cereal Crops	12	-	11	-	-	-
Asia Regional	RA 3-00	ARS	Improvement of Grain Legumes	15	-	11	-	-	-
Worldwide	RA 12-00	ARS	Development Vegetable Protein in Food Technology	10	-	-	-	10	-
"	RA 2-00	ERS	Production Technology in Underdeveloped Countries	12	1	10	-	-	1
"	RA 2-66	ERS	Demand Prospects for Agricultural Exports	25	-	25	-	-	-
			Total, Regional & Worldwide	79	1	61	-	10	1

USDA Short-Term PASA's - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Country	PASA No.	Agency	Title	Number of Technicians Requested	On Board	Complet
Africa Area						
Chad	AFR 25-66	SCS	Range Management	1	1	-
Congo	AFR 12-68	IADS	Self-help Survey	1	-	1
Ethiopia	AFR 21-68	ARS	Locust	1	-	1
Ghana	AFR 6-68	ARS	Agr. Sector Study (Phase II)	1	-	1
Tunisia	AFR 4-68	FHA	Agr. Credit Study	1	-	1
"	AFR 27-68	IADS	Nutrition	2	-	2
			Total, Africa Area	7	1	6
Asia Area						
Afghanistan	AJ 59-67	ARS, C&MS SEC, SEG	USDA Survey Team	4	-	4
India	AJ 17-67	ARS, SEC	Lysine Meeting	2	-	2
"	AJ 19-67	ARS	Symp. on Tropical Plant Path.	1	-	1
"	AJ 1-67	IADS	Agr. Production & Policy	2	-	2
"	AJ 23-68	IADS	Food Fortification	3	-	3
"	AJ 29-68	IADS	Agr. Production Promotion	1	-	1
"	NESA 23-66	IADS	Fortification Consultant	1	-	1
"	NESA 48-68	IADS	Fortification Consultant	1	1	-
"	NESA 52-68	IADS	Milk Toning Consultant	1	1	-
Korea	FE 25-67	ERS	Outlook Services	1	-	1
"	EA 16-68	SRS	Statistics	1	1	-
Laos	FE 10-68	FS	Small Industry Development	1	-	1
Nepal	NESA 34-68	SRS	Food Grain Production	1	-	1
Pakistan	AJ 15-67	SCS	Range Development	1	-	1
"	AJ 60-67	CSRS	Agricultural Marketing	1	-	1
"	AJ 28-68	ARS, IADS	Pakistan Seed Potato Study	2	-	2
"	NESA 37-68	ARS	Soil Salinity	1	-	1
"	NESA 47-68	C&MS	Agricultural Marketing Team	1	-	1
"	NESA 50-68	IADS	Nutrition Program	1	-	1
"	NESA 51-68	FES, SCS, ERS, ARS	Watershed Management	5	5	-
Turkey	AJ 17-68	ERS	Agri. Policy Conference	3	-	2
"	AJ 27-68	SRS	Agri. Statistics Conference	2	-	2

USDA Short-Term PASA's - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1958

Country	PASA No.	Agency	Title	Number of Technicians Requested	On Board	Completed
Asia Area (con't)						
Turkey	AJ 60-67	ERS	Farm Irrigation Water Dev.	3	3	-
"	AJ 54-67	ARS	Soil & Water Improvement	1	-	1
"	NESA 45-68	ARS	Wheat Production Consultant	1	-	1
Thailand	PRR	ERS	Agricultural Economist	1	-	1
			Total, Asia Area	45	11	34
Latin America Area						
Argentina	LA 25-68	ARS	Agriculture-Livestock-Meat Technology	1	-	1
Guatemala	LA 41-67	SCS	Agr. Policies & Institutions	1	-	1
Venezuela	LA 32-67	ARS,FES, IADS	Rural Improvement	3	-	3
ROCAP	LA 51-67	ARS	Agr. Policies & Development	4	-	4
"	LA 2-68	IADS,ARS FCIC	Agr. Policies & Development	4	-	4
"	LA 16-68	ARS	Industrial Investment and Trade Promotion - (ICAITI - Freeze Drying Program)	1	1	-
Uruguay	LA 26-68	ASCS	Marketing Grain Storage	1	1	-
			Total, Latin America Area	15	2	13
			Total Number Technicians Short-Term PASA's	67	14	53

Non-AID Sponsored Activities - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Agency	No. of Technicians	Description	Country	Sponsor
ARS	1	Mediterranean Fruitfly Eradication Project	Chile	FAO
	2	" " " "	Central America	IAEA
	1	" " " "	Costa Rica	IAEA
	1	" " " "	Tunisia	IAEA
	1	Plant Quarantine	Carribbean	FAO
	12	Control of Foot and Mouth Disease Outbreak	England	USDA
	1	Rice-drying Practices	Philippines	Rice & Corn Adm.
	1	Beef Cattle Improvement	Uganda	Govt. of Uganda
	1	Review of agricultural research and adm.	Brazil	Nat'l Academy Sciences
	2	Assist in the establishment of a tropical agricultural research institute	Colombia	Rockefeller Foundation
	1	Collaborate in health related research on tobacco	Taiwan	Joint Commission on Reconstruction, Taipei
	1	Study of agricultural research priorities for Africa	Ivory Coast	Nat'l Academy Sciences
	1	Assistance in specialty field of animal health	Iran	FAO
Sub Total	26			
ERS	1	Study food requirements and production in Indonesia	Indonesia	Asian Develop. Bank
	1	Production economics research, consulting and teaching assistance	Philippines	Univ. of the Philippine

Non-AID Sponsored Activities - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Agency	No. of Technicians	Description	Country	Sponsor
ERS (cont'd.)	1	Economic analysis of experimental irrigation studies in various states in Brazil	Brazil	IRI Research Instit.
	4	International implications of foreign competition in winter fruits	Mexico	Mexican Ministry of Agriculture
Sub Total	7			
FES	1	To assist with training program for Home Economics Staff	Mexico	Ford Foundation - Oklahoma State Univ.
	1	To assist with Home Economics Extension Training Seminar	Malaysia	State Department
Sub Total	2			
FHA	1	To assist the Brazil National Water Loan Program	Brazil	U.S. Public Health Service
FS	1	Furnish Consultant on Forest Economics Research	Kenya	FAO
	1	Furnish Consultant on Dendrology	Costa Rica	FAO
	1	Furnish Consultant on River Basin Develop.	Colombia	FAO
	1	Participate in Wildlife & Land Use Symposium	Kenya, other East African Countries	Ford Foundation
	1	Provide Bark Beetle Infestation Consultant	Okinowa	DOD
	1	Provide Research Entomologist Specialist	Samoa	FAO
	1	Provide Range Management Specialist	Kenya	FAO
	1	Provide Timber Management Specialist (Genetics)	Malaysia	FAO

Non-AID Sponsored Activities - July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968

Agency	No. of Technicians	Description	Country	Sponsor
FS (cont'd)	2	Provide Hydrology Specialist	Greece	FAO
	1	Provide Genetics Specialist	Greece	FAO
	1	Provide Silviculture Specialist	Costa Rica	FAO
	1	Provide Watershed Management Specialist	Taiwan	FAO
	1	Provide Forest Inventory Specialist	Taiwan	FAO
	1	Provide Forest Inventory Specialist	Panama	FAO
	2	Provide Forest Management Specialist	Rome	FAO
	1	Provide Watershed Management Specialist	Philippines	FAO
	1	Provide Forest Management Specialist	Philippines	FAO
Sub Total	22			
IADS	1	Participate in Food & Nutrition Seminar	Indonesia	Nat'l Academy Science
	1	Provide Nutrition Specialist	Saudi Arabia	State Department
Sub Total	2			
RCDS	1	Participate in Land Reform Study	Panama	FAO
SCS	1	Furnish technical assistant to Govt. of India	India	Ford Foundation
	1	Furnish Soil Survey Interpretation Specialist	Korea	FAO
	1	Furnish Soil Scientist	Sudan	FAO
Sub Total	3			
Grand Total	64			

Review of Other USDA/AID Projects

Providing Short-Term Consultants. In addition to TDYs in support of resident PASAs, USDA responds to requests for short-term specialists to meet ad hoc problems as they emerge. Sometimes, the USDA man goes out as part of an AID team; at other times he may be responding to a specific request by a Mission.

Examples of short-term PASAs are the following: A USDA entomologist, requested to make a quick trip to Ethiopia to survey locust outbreaks there, found sharp buildup of locusts and predicted extensive crop damage in East Africa and the Near East next year unless the swarms were controlled. Conditions mirror those of 1952 when the outbreak was not initially controlled; control took ten years. He also found a sudden upsurge of Locusta Migratoria, potentially more dangerous than the desert locust, and is now at work setting up control programs.

Other short-term projects include a soil and water team in Pakistan working on problems of soil erosion and silting of Pakistan's large irrigation facilities; and a consultant to Thailand to assist with grain marketing problems and advise on the feasibility of a proposed commodity futures market for that country.

Providing Research in Support of Agricultural Development Programs. Both the Agricultural Research Service and Economic Research Service are conducting a number of studies funded by AID. The research is directed at increasing food production, improving nutrition, identifying economic trends and investigating production incentives.

a. Factors Associated with Differences and Changes in Agricultural Production in Underdeveloped Countries. Three reports from this project were published in 1968: Taiwan's Agricultural Development: Its Relevance for Developing Countries Today; Accelerating India's Food Grain Production 1967-68 to 1970-71; Growth of Crop and Livestock Output in Selected Developing Nations. Three other such reports are nearing completion on Nigeria, Mexico and Greece. The last three, for publication in 1969, are on Brazil, Colombia and India. In total, the seven countries provide a broad sampling of development environments.

b. Analysis of Demand Prospects for Farm Products of Less Developed Countries. Five reports were published in 1968 presenting data on trade flows of selected farm commodities for 19 importing or exporting regions. These data, not available in this form from other sources, are presented in tabular form so that the volume of trade -- exports and imports -- among the 19 regions can readily be analyzed. These series include commodities which account for 80 percent of the agricultural exports and 33 percent of all exports of less-developed countries and are the most comprehensive series available. These series should fill a part of the information gap in international trade and make possible a more comprehensive analysis of changes in the patterns of trade in agricultural products.

The project on the demand prospects for agricultural exports of less-developed countries is being conducted in three phases: (1) historical analysis of trade flows; (2) analysis of demand prospects; and (3) analysis of policy implications of estimated world demand prospects.

c. The "major cereals" project in Africa seeks more vigorous strains of millet, sorghum and corn. In Kenya, corn hybrids yielding 70 bushels per acre are now planted on 25 percent of the corn acreage; traditional varieties yielded only 12 bushels. Although the Kenya project began in 1958, and USDA became directly involved in 1963, much of the early work was based on USDA experience.

Increased amounts of hybrid corn seed has made it possible to send seed to Ethiopia and Tanzania. Sorghum hybrids, based on East African germ plasm, look promising. Fertilizer trials with millets have now furnished enough data that the information can be incorporated in a "package" for extension workers.

d. ARS researchers in Kenya are seeking a solution to Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia, a respiratory disease that kills from 10 to 70 percent of the cattle in Africa and Asia. The three-man team is supported by ARS' Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory in the U.S. Tests of existing vaccines show that cattle are protected for at least six months. So far, some of the screening tests are able to detect carriers of the disease.

e. USDA scientists in India and Iran are developing superior legume varieties for South Asia. In India, for example, grain legumes yield 300 to 700 pounds per acre, compared with yields of 1,300 to 1,800 pounds else where. India's production of these crops must increase 60 percent in the next decade. Several strains of beans, chickpeas and cowpeas were outstanding in yield tests and have been recommended to the Ministry of Agriculture for multiplication and release. Improved cultural practices such as correct planting date, seeding rates, fertilization and irrigation have been shown to improve yields as much as 300 to 400 percent over those presently obtained by farmers. Studies of virus and fungal diseases isolated several resistant lines in beans and cowpeas. In addition pathogens associated with various root-rot diseases were isolated and identified.

Entomology research has resulted in recommendations for control of various crop pests, and work has continued on the control of pests of stored seeds. From the large germplasm collections in India and Iran, seed materials have been sent to or exchanged with 14 other less-developed countries.

f. A Tse-tse Fly control team in Africa is working on methods to control the pest in the same way the screwworm was stopped in the U.S. -- release of sterile males. Results of the release of adult flies look promising and it may be that there has been a breakthrough in the rearing of adults. Meanwhile, plans are going ahead for the pupal release phase of the project.

Special PASAs. A relatively new PASA, and a promising new means of focusing USDA resources on key problems in AID food and agricultural programs, is the PASA on improving nutrition worldwide. The PASA involves working with private industry to develop high protein foods appropriate to LDCs and encouraging fortification of existing foods with protein.

Most development efforts thus far have focused on increasing farm production. Another breakthrough being made will also help reduce malnutrition in less-developed countries -- that of new high protein foods and improved protein quality in existing foods.

Fortifying cereal grains with essential amino acids such as lysine or protein concentrates from oilseeds, legumes, or fish is one alternative. With USDA/AID encouragement, Government of India bakeries began marketing "Modern Bread" fortified with lysine. The Indian Government will soon require vitamin and mineral fortification of wheat flour produced in major mills. Plans are underway to use simulated rice kernels carrying vitamins, iron and calcium, and eventually lysine, to fortify government-milled rice. The Government of Peru has issued an Executive Order calling for fortification of cereal grains. In Guatemala, the Institute of Nutrition for Central America and Panama is undertaking a project to fortify corn, a major staple in the Guatemalan diet. With USDA leadership, AID is supporting a research project in Thailand to fortify rice with lysine.

A second alternative is developing new foods that are high in protein. To succeed, these new foods must be as acceptable to the population as conventional foods, must be available at low cost, and must be made primarily from raw materials indigenous to the country or easily imported. New products can be quite successful if they meet these criteria.

With USDA assistance, ten contracts have been signed by AID with U.S. companies to produce high protein foods in developing nations; at least three nations are already producing protein-fortified foods commercially.

AREAS OF INCREASING IMPORTANCE IN U.S. FOREIGN AID FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

As agriculture in developing countries becomes increasingly market oriented rather than subsistence, it will encounter problems similar to those U.S. agriculture has faced in the past fifty years. USDA has been the focal point within U.S. for efforts to bring about a better balance between supply and demand for farm products -- while sustaining farm incomes. USDA has provided the policies and programs to guide farmers in making their production and marketing decisions. And the Department has developed and carried out programs to facilitate orderly market movements of farm commodities with benefits for producer, consumer and middleman as well. Much of this program and personnel experience is highly relevant for today's foreign assistance to LDC agriculture.

Specifically, USDA personnel have unique competencies in the areas indicated below. The IADS staff itself has expertise in these fields and in the knowledge of how the full range of USDA competence may be brought to bear on problems of these kinds in developing countries:

1. <u>Agricultural Development Policies</u>

   Supply/demand balance

   Diversification and the allocation of agricultural resources based on market considerations

   Trade policies on commodities and agribusiness imports and exports

2. <u>Agricultural Markets and Marketing</u>

   Price policies and mechanisms

   Market facilities -- physical and location considerations

   Market organization and operations

3. Agricultural Program Planning and Administration

Organization and administration of agricultural agencies

Program planning for the agricultural sector

Relationship between TC&S and Total AID Funds Transferred to USDA for Technical Assistance Activities[1/]
(in thousands of dollars)

Year	Technical Consultation Support Service[2/]		Total Technical Assistance Activities[3/]	
	Man-years	Amount	Man-years	Amount
FY 1963	34	345	245	2,873
FY 1964	34	368	266	3,888
FY 1965	44	554	319	5,232
FY 1966	55	664	368	6,122
FY 1967	56	793	443	7,769
FY 1968	54	785	516	8,962
FY 1969 (est.)	52	762	509	10,679

1/ Source US Department of Agriculture Budget Explanatory Notes (FY 1965 and successive years budget material)

2/ Project adjusted for comparability, to reflect activities previously carried under TC&S and subsequently transferred to PASA funding (ARS - Plant and Seed and Soil Salinity projects; IADS - Nutritional Group).

3/ Excludes funds provided for subsistence payments to foreign trainees while in the U.S.

8/26/68

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
PARTICIPATING AGENCY SUPPORT PROGRAM
TRAINING AND TC&S, FY 1969

ARS	193.7 1/
ASCS	29.7 1/
C&MS	27.3
CSRS	3.4
ERS	166.6
FAS	173.9
FCS	21.5
FES	142.7
FHA	112.0
FS	141.0
INF	1.5
IADS	1,019.1
NAL	0
REA	5.0 2/
SCS	126.4
SRS	69.6
TOTAL	2,233.4

1/ These are revisions worked out between the two agencies since our submission of 8/14/68.

2/ The amount for REA includes $3,400 for reinstatement of the special training program requested by AID.

Relationship of USDA Activities in Support of AID Compared to Total Reimbursable Activities

In discussions with representatives of AID, and quite frequently internally within the USDA, the question has been raised that when does USDA agencies charge AID for services provided and don't charge other government agencies. Most government agencies enter into "reimbursable services" for other agencies or bureaus. These consist of undertaking activities which they can best perform because of experience and program interest. However, the purpose for which the service is rendered is the furtherance of the requesting agencies authorized objectives. This type of activity which is extremely common in Federal finance is authorized by Section 601 of the Economy Act of 1932. An analysis of the USDA budget submission will highlight the extent of this type of activity and the number of agencies (other than AID) serviced by the various USDA agencies involved in TC&S.

Relationship of TC&S Activity to USDA Agencies Total Reimbursable Programs Based on FY 1968 Budget Request
(in $000's)

Agency	TC&S Activity	Reimbursable Services to Others				
		Total	USDA Agencies	AID Program	Other Gov't Agencies	Other Organiz.
ARS	149	12,925	5,996	2,024	2,142	2,763
C&MS	1	52,178	4,642	112	28	47,396
CSRS	3	127	-	125	-	2
ERS	139	4,016	2,163	997	596	260
FAS	85	257	1	214	42	-
FCS	1	223	5	192	-	26
FHA	22	36,259	3,209	800	31,950	300
FES	49	3,251	-	1,695	1,455	101
FS	48	8,657	200	311	6,576	1,570
IADS	467	5,954 1/	--	5,954	-	-
REA	1	45	-	10	19	16
SCS	23	15,777	9,244	1,522	827	4,184
SRS	19	3,150	2,487	274	279	110
	1,007	142,819	27,947	14,230	43,914	56,728

1/ IADS program activity established to coordinate and administer the USDA program efforts in support of international agricultural assistance and training. Activities have been financed by reimbursement from AID. Amount shown includes subsistence payments to Foreign Training participants ($3,700,000).

Relationship of IADS Information Services Group and the WOH Reports and Information Staff

The Reports and Information Staff, Office of the War on Hunger, is responsible for public affairs activities concerning the War on Hunger. In carrying out its responsibilities, it acts under the policy guidance of the AID Information Staff and the AID Congressional Liaison Staff. Necessarily, it must coordinate pertinent activities with other bureaus and offices of AID and with other departments and agencies of the government.

Some of the specific duties of WOH/RIS include:

--Publishing a monthly magazine, War on Hunger, for professionals and the general public (distribution 8,000);

--Preparation, publishing and distribution of speeches, releases, pamphlets, messages and other material for public dissemination;

--Preparation and distribution of internal reports for WOH and AID;

--Responding to inquiries and requests from Congress, the public and the media;

--Conceiving and preparing exhibits;

--Serving as a clearinghouse generally for all AID public affairs activities relating to food, population, agriculture, health, nutrition and research activities;

--Acting as liaison with external organizations concerned with these activities.

The Information Services Group of IADS:

--Provides orientation and briefing services for agricultural technicians serving AID;

--Prepares and controls reports involving AID such as the annual PL 480 report, progress reports of PASA teams, etc.;

--Serves as communications liaison for AID activities relating to USDA;

--Serves as a source of information and public affairs activities for AID.

Within the broad areas of public relations covered by WOH/RIS a special relationship must be established and continued with USDA. This is as true for information activities as for soil studies or marketing research. As noted above, the activities of WOH/RIS and Information Services Group of IADS do not duplicate each other: they are instead complementary.

The work of IADS is essential to WOH/RIS. This office prepares and edits major articles for the War on Hunger magazine; expedites reviews and clearances of important AID documents being prepared for Congress and the public; provides shortcuts for access to the media services aimed at special audiences. Attempting to do this within AID would be costly and wasteful. In short, IADS Information Services functions as an essential arm of AID's entire public affairs activities. If IADS' Information Services group did not exist, something exactly like it would have to be created.

If AID is to perform its information functions effectively, it is imperative that WOH/RIS be able to call on the service of IADS for immediate and knowledgeable information. Experience has shown that the various offices and staffs of USDA have expertise in their special fields, but few have a grasp of AID's functions. The role of IADS helps to fill that need. It follows that if this service to AID is to be effective, the information functions of

IADS must be firmly established and maintained. It would appear that a PASA for specific funding would guarantee such stability.

Attachment No. 30

1968 REPORT OF WORK AND EVALUATION

INFORMATION SERVICES GROUP
International Agricultural Development Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture

1968 Work Report

(page)
Technical Information..... 1
Orientation..... 3
Public Information..... 4

Evaluation of Projects

Technical Information..... 5
Reports..... 7
Public Information.....10

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

1968 WORK REPORT

I TECHNICAL INFORMATION

REQUESTS

This office answered over 4,000 requests for technical information in 1968.

Requests from AID Missions (direct-hire). AID agriculturists have requested technical information from the Department for many years, traditionally routing letters through AID/W. Last year we answered 260 of these "official" requests. For example, AID/India wanted specifications and ideas on small farm equipment. After gathering information from several USDA agencies, we wrote to 30 manufacturers in several countries, in order to provide a comprehensive response.

We also answered another 300 requests from AID Missions which come to us via a variety of other routes. For example, an AID contract employee's letter came to us from Korea via his Senator and the Secretary. We researched USDA agencies, State Departments of Agriculture, and trade associations to provide a comprehensive reply.

USDA/PASA Team Requests. We also perform general information backstopping services to USDA team members on AID assignments. We filled about 400 requests from PASA teams in 1968. These are requests for information outside the competence of the man's home agency.

Regardless of the source of the request, when printed information is outdated or not applicable to the specific inquiry, we ask the appropriate specialist, whatever his institution, to supply additional data directly to the Mission. And, we generally supply other information which may be pertinent. This might be reprints of articles, reports from international agencies, or professional journals.

RTAC Requests. We answer the AID Regional Technical Aid Centers' (translation services) requests for translation copies, artwork and photographs. About 100 titles were handled last year. We also review some 2,000 USDA publications and hundreds of other agricultural publications each year, and recommend materials for translation. Upon our recommendation, for example, RTAC/Mexico plans to translate three USDA publications on rice, including the recent USDA/AID report, Rice Drying in Vietnam. Among those translated last year was a series of articles originally appearing in the IADS International Agricultural Development Newsletter.

Other Requests. In addition, we answered over 3,000 requests for general information from AID/W, USDA/W, USDA, Peace Corps, other government agencies, foundations, universities, LDC officials, private business, libraries, and from the public. One such public request came from the Ohio Council of Churches asking for "a publication to explain the world food problem." They distributed 200 copies of an IADS paper to church leaders.

PUBLICATION DISTRIBUTION

AID Publications Packet. Reviewed, selected, and obtained some 50,000 copies of 400 useful publications and other materials for weekly packets to AID Rural Development Officers. These, valued at $5,000, were furnished by USDA at no cost to AID.

USDA/AID Team Packet. Reviewed, obtained, and sent some 25,000 copies of 200 technical publications to PASA team members.

Distribution to USDA/W and AID/W. Regularly distribute to 300 USDA people in Washington, connected with AID programs, significant articles and publications on international agricultural development, including AID's War on Hunger magazine, Front Lines, Development Digest, and IADS material. Special items of top significance are distributed to AID/W agricultural officials. Other mailings are made (average of one mailing a month) to 300 key decision-makers outside USDA.

IADS NEWS DIGEST

Prepared and distributed monthly 1,300 copies of the IADS News Digest to AID Missions, USDA/AID teams, within USDA, and to university and foundation specialists involved in international development. At AID's request, the Digest is also distributed to AID/W officials. Average printing cost of the newsletter, which highlights current events in international agricultural development, is $20 a month.

AID/USDA LIBRARY

Began an indexed library of books, development assistance reports, and other information. Over 200 significant titles are now cross-indexed, filed, and easily located with a card index. An estimated 1,000 additional titles are in the library. Some 216 titles are contained in a USDA/AID publications list which we prepared and distributed to PASA Teams and AID Missions. About ten new publications on development were listed each month in the IADS News Digest.

GENERATING TECHNICAL INFORMATION

USDA/AID Reports. Significant USDA/AID reports were printed (about 1,000 copies each) and widely distributed to AID missions, USDA/AID teams, AID/W agricultural officials, universities, foundations, etc. Examples: Rice Drying in Vietnam, Grain Marketing Problems in India, and South Vietnam Trial Plantings of Sorghum.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Other Reports. Also located, reprinted, and distributed about 15 other significant reports and articles from outside sources. Examples: The Impact--Actual and Potential--of Modern Economic Entomology on World Agriculture, The Use of Energy for Food Production, and Caribbean Agriculture--Its Problems and Potentials. Also, at our request, Successful Farming magazine reprinted 3,000 copies of a series of six articles on the world food problem and sent them to us for distribution, at no cost to USDA or AID.

AID's Magazine. Submitted 20 articles to War on Hunger magazine, including eight original articles. Examples: mechanization paper by Schertz, marketing paper by Kriesberg, and an Asian agricultural revolution paper by Brown.

USDA Agency Magazines. Helped prepare 18 articles for USDA agency magazines. Examples: SCS' Conservation, FCS' News for Farmer Coops, FAS' Foreign Agriculture, and ERS' Farm Index.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Prepared the following administrative reports: Technical assistance section of the U.S. report to FAO; USDA/AID section of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture; a weekly report on status of USDA/AID programs for the White House; and a bi-weekly IADS report on USDA/AID operations to the Secretary. We also coordinated and edited the self-help section of the President's P.L. 480 annual report to Congress.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TEAM REPORTS

Preparation. Edited and processed 15 USDA/AID special survey and consultant reports. Examples: Rice Drying in South Vietnam, West African Regional Rice report, West Pakistan Seed Potato report, Grain Drying in El Salvador, Central American Insect Study, Modernizing the Sawmill Industry of Paraguay, Agricultural Survey of the Congo, two survey reports on Tanzania. We are now editing the 250 page report of the Pakistan soil and water conservation survey team. Our assistance covers the entire range from initial consultation with the writer, to editing, organization, layout, arranging for art work and preparing the report for the printer.

Report-Writing Training. Prepared a special how-to-do-it publication on report writing to help USDA/AID specialists prepare quarterly, annual, consultant, and survey reports. Regular pre-assignment seminars on report writing are resulting in better organization, more attention to significant details and more effective recommendations.

II ORIENTATION

Coordinate USDA/AID orientation programs for personnel scheduled for overseas AID assignments. This includes arranging schedules for about 100 men a year, holding one hour introductory briefings with 150, and arranging for AID/FSI orientation with the AID Training Centers. Each man is given a specially selected, and regularly up-dated, consultant's kit.

III PUBLIC INFORMATION

PRESS RELEASES

Prepared self-help sections of 44 USDA press releases announcing new P.L. 480 food aid agreements. These sections spell out the self-help agricultural measures to which the food aid recipient nations agree as a precondition to aid.

Also prepared ten general interest press releases for cooperative USDA/AID release.

SPECIAL ARTICLES

Furnished drafts, information and/or advice to magazines and newspapers for articles on the world food problem. Examples: Successful Farming (series of six articles), U.S. News and World Report, Catholic Rural Life, Cereal Science Today, Science, Foreign Affairs, Journal of Marketing, OECD Agricultural Review, Time, Newsweek, New York Times, Journal of Commerce, and Washington Post.

In addition, produced two photo stories, released through the USDA Office of Information: The Second Front in South Vietnam and The Answers Came From His U.S. Training. Some 2,500 copies of each were sent to magazines and newspapers, and 10 mat services (each such service has 700-800 newspaper clients).

TELEVISION AND RADIO APPEARANCES

We arranged 21 TV appearances on USDA television series (produced by NBC) for returning USDA and AID technicians. These included Allen Bjergo, former "county agent" in Vietnam; Bill Johnson, AID food and agriculture officer in Vietnam; Bill Jones, West Africa rice study; and John Barron, Malawi agricultural credit advisor. Our assistance includes script writing and arrangements for visual aids. These TV programs are shown by about 400 stations.

We also arranged seven radio appearances of USDA/AID technicians on the USDA radio series which is carried by about 550 radio stations.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION SUPPORT

THE NEED

AID and USDA recruit and train some of the best agriculturists in the United States and send them to developing nations, expecting them to produce results comparable to their domestic accomplishments under hardships unprecedented in their careers. In the United States, they were a phone call away from other experts; a short distance from a tremendous backlog of vital information in their field. A morning newspaper or a monthly professional journal, delivered on time, told them the latest developments. A solid organization backed up their everyday efforts.

Much of this is erased when they embark upon new assignments in developing nations. The information flow, in many cases, recedes to a trickle. Their ability to make sound decisions and to map out good programs based on the best information is seriously impaired. This dearth of good technical agricultural materials -- or too much inappropriate material -- seriously limits the work of U. S. agricultural advisors (USDA, AID, university, foundation, etc.) and government officials of the developing nations.

We must help these advisors by simulating the flow of useful and timely information. We must: 1) react quickly and responsibly to their requests for information; 2) accelerate the transfer of information generated in one LDC to another; 3) acquaint them with the store of knowledge within USDA, universities, foundations, development banks, and other sources; 4) develop a depository of agricultural information, with an effective retrieval system; 5) develop a system for generating information; and 6) accelerate translations of U.S. publications which can be used as teaching tools on foreign assignments.

CURRENT WORK

Authority and procedures for USDA technical agricultural information backstopping rests in the PASA Handbook (Title 2, 102.2). This work is carried out cooperatively with Agricultural and Rural Development Service in AID's War on Hunger office.

During the past year, the IADS Information Services Group has helped make U.S. advisors more effective with faster, direct replies to requests, wider and more frequent distribution of unsolicited but vital information, and an improved "memory" system in the form of an indexed development library to aid in backstopping. This expanded service came at less cost to AID than the year before.

THE FUTURE

Among things needed this coming year to improve the flow of technical information to U.S. advisors and LDC officials are:

1) Shorten time between time advisor requests information and when he receives a quality answer.

a. Make the IADS technical information service better known within AID, USDA, universities, development banks, and foundations through a descriptive flyer, personal memos and other contacts. Many in these institutions receive requests and are unsure where to find answers; hence, requests are "bucked around" too often, too long, needlessly. Much of the time, simple requests can be serviced within hours.

b. Following up on the AID questionnaire concerning effectiveness of the weekly publications packet to Mission Rural Development Officers. Although the responses we have seen have been favorable, we must make improvements suggested in these cables.

2) Make technical information more widely available, and make a greater effort to reach those technicians who rarely take advantage of the technical information backstopping service.

a. Expand and focus more on critical issues in the weekly packets of publications to AID RDOs and USDA PASAs.

b. Reprint and widely distribute more of the exceptional USDA/AID reports and other materials. Two reports treated this way last year, RICE DRYING IN SOUTH VIETNAM and MARKETING PROBLEMS OF INDIA, received favorable response from the missions, which requested 458 additional copies.

c. Encourage USDA agencies to continually keep their men on PASA teams up-to-date on current developments in their field.

e. Submit more articles on agricultural development to AID and USDA magazines, newsletters, and other media.

f. Update and expand existing USDA/AID publications list for wider distribution to help both requestors and those who receive requests in locating sources of needed information.

g. Continue to improve and expand the IADS library of USDA/AID reports and other appropriate publications, including detailed indexing for quick retrieval of information requested. Also, work to tie IADS development library system in with existing Government and other systems to broaden the clientele base.

h. Issue flyers and memos to overseas specialists explaining service available to them. This is the other side of the coin as listed in (1a) above in making service more widely used.

REPORTS

THE NEED

Good decisions depend, in part, upon complete, accurate, current information. And, a report is part of a memory system that can provide the vital prologue needed to give continuity to decision-making. Without this memory, improvements over the past are often delayed or blocked.

A good memory system is vital for the effective progression of a program in any country. For instance, those working on a market news service in Brazil should know the history of market news programs in Brazil so they can build on past successes and avoid known pitfalls.

But even more important -- and this is where the present reporting system is woefully lacking--is the need for the memory or experience found in one country to form a backdrop for programs beginning in other countries. It is possible that the experience shared from a project in one country could save considerable work in another country by eliminating the possibility of making similar mistakes. Or, highly effective measures discovered in one nation could be employed immediately in another nation without time-consuming and costly surveys and studies.

Too often AID's reports have been ineffective, because: 1) The writer misunderstands the context of his assignment and focuses largely on irrelevant details and administrative matters; 2) The person to whom the report is submitted does not make proper use of the information (does not respond critically to the writer), does not follow up on recommendations; 3) Distribution is often limited; therefore, useful information is not used widely enough; 4) Reports are "lost." Technicians without benefit of institutional continuity, sometimes repeat errors of the past.

Most institutions require reports. But AID, and other organizations with dispersed operations, must especially have good field reports, because of the necessary long distance supervision, and because wise policy decisions in headquarters must be based on understanding of current field problems and conditions.

CURRENT WORK

The following reports are required in USDA/AID:

Resident

1. Quarterly Progress

2. Annual Progress

3. End of Tour

Short Term

1. Consultant

2. Survey Team

Instructions on program reporting are contained in the PASA Handbook (Title 9, Chapter 2 and Title 2, 102.5).

IADS' Information Services Group currently assists resident teams, survey teams, and consultants prepare reports and ensure their effective use. In 1968, two report-writing brochures, Getting Action From Your Reports and Instructions on Writing Short-Term and Survey Reports, were published and distributed to overseas AID and USDA specialists.

ISG has helped standardize reporting, with many reports being cleared for proper agency credit, clarity, distribution plans, and economical printing. ISG also aids technicians, giving them some report writing orientation, offering suggestions on drafts, and designing covers, title pages and layout to improve appearance and readibility.

ISG specialists review many USDA/AID reports. Highlights are noted in the IADS News Digest, distributed to AID-related personnel, plus various administrative reports. Significant reports are reproduced and distributed.

All reports are now retained in permanent files for use by resident staff, departing technicians, and survey teams. The first annual List of AID/USDA Publications was produced in 1968 which offers AID-related personnel a comprehensive survey of available resource materials.

THE FUTURE

Improvements are needed to ensure that reports will:

1) provide means of effectively and promptly informing program planners of current LDC developments; specifically, progress, problems, and new goals.

2) be available to technicians and decision-makers, wherever they may be, who can then benefit from significant breakthroughs, innovations or problems, wherever they occur.

3) be put in the hands of succeeding "generations" of technicians and decision-makers so they may build on past experience.

Needed in 1969 are:

1) Resolution of the apparent differences of policy between AID/W, Missions, and USDA in reporting procedures.

2) Improvement of report quality. This will be done by more vigorous orientation and better response to reports from Washington.

3) Increased distribution of significant reports to technicians in other nations to foster cross-fertilization of ideas. Such media as AID's War on Hunger magazine, and Front Lines newspaper and USDA publications could be used as vehicles for this information.

Also during 1969, special projects should be undertaken to improve specific areas of the current reporting process, including:

1) Cooperating with AID, foundations, universities, private consultant firms, and other public and private institutions to build an effective reports-exchange system, so that each institution will have at its fingertips the information generated by the others. A central repository of reports could be established.

2) Planning for reports should become an integral part of the procedure for establishing new AID/USDA PASA contracts. For example, a provision for report reproduction funds should be in every contract.

3) Group or individual seminars on reports writing should be established as a regular component of the pre-assignment orientation.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

THE NEED

Our business is foreign aid and agricultural development; any evaluation of IADS public affairs work must be considered in terms of how much agricultural development we have inspired. IADS' work is largely sponsored by AID, but it is in the USDA complex; thus, our public affairs work must conform to both agencies' requirements.

Broadly, our goals are to:

1) Reinforce public awareness of world food problems and their implication to the United States, and emphasize long-range benefits of agricultural development in LDC's to U.S. agriculture and to the U.S. economy.

2) Stimulate, particularly in the developing countries, a better understanding of the significance of agricultural progress and how it can be achieved.

3) Improve impressions abroad about U.S. agriculture and U.S. farm policy objectives.

Specifically, we support AID's public affairs programs: fostering greater public understanding of foreign aid, technical assistance, agricultural development, agribusiness investment in LDC's, and need for nutrition improvement. USDA has the resources and capability to reach a tremendous audience -- rural and urban -- which traditionally has not been interested in international development. AID can tap this capability through IADS.

CURRENT WORK

In 1964, a public information officer was assigned to implement a USDA/AID information program. This position, along with four other long-established positions, became the IADS Information Services Group. At the present time, total public affairs activities in IADS represent less than one man-year of work, due to pressure of other work.

THE FUTURE

General Public

1) Hometown releases. Departing and returning technicians should prepare a press release (using special form) for use by his hometown newspaper and Congressman to explain the world food problem in personal terms.

2) More USDA agency releases. We should encourage agencies to produce their own press releases and other information materials to tell the USDA/AID story.

3) We should produce, in 1969, two TV features (in cooperation with the Office of Information); one on "agriculture and economic development" and one on "U.S. exports and LDC agricultural development."

4) We should prepare several major papers in 1968, for release at appropriate times including:

   a) role of communications in agricultural development

   b) "second generation" problems of agricultural development

   c) self-help and P.L. 480.

5) We will attempt in 1969 to answer an estimated 3,500 public requests for information more effectively, with fewer delays, with the filling of our "publications clerk" position, vacant since April 1968.

7) A special package of teaching aids on agricultural development of LDC's could be prepared with help of AID and National Education Association.

Key People

1) Add to regular mailing list "international personnel" in universities, foundations, agribusiness, trade groups, and other institutions.

2) Send selected materials directly to key officials of LDC's -- Ministers of Agriculture, Finance Ministers, etc.

3) Send selected materials to key members of Congressional Committees.

AID Agricultural Backstop Officers' Comments, Questions, Suggestions

TC&S services were discussed with AID agricultural technicians in the various bureau backstop offices. A list of representative activities performed under TC&S for AID was given each man some days in advance to give him an opportunity to review the type of activities involved. The definition of TC&S, as stated in the General Agreement between USDA and AID of January 1966, was read and discussed at the beginning of each meeting. We then discussed the inventory of activities and various questions, examining the present strengths and weaknesses of the services provided, and considered ways to improve these services. Following are their comments, questions, and suggestions.

Comments

1. TC&S services provided were reasonably prompt, of good quality, and accurate. Similar services may be obtained other places, as from land grant colleges, commercial concerns, and F.A.O.; but the USDA is the most economical, convenient and practical source. AID technical personnel had no particular tangible rating system for services, and they considered USDA technicians as colleagues working together in the common field for the common agricultural cause. USDA personnel do tend to be stateside oriented, and the U.S. technician in the LDCs must adapt the information to his country.

2. Technicians obtained the best and latest information when they routed their requests through central channels. Otherwise they sometimes asked for an older source of information.

Most technical inquiries for informational materials received by AID/W were forwarded to Ruth Lancetti, WOH/ARDS, who forwarded them to USDA. In the past most overseas technicians wrote direct to Ruth Lancetti. Some used a two-way memorandum, with an information copy to the Agricultural backstop office. Other technicians contacted IADS in USDA and still others went direct to individuals in the services involved (ARS, ERS, etc.).

3. Volume of service might be more or less than stated in the USDA reports, in the opinion of the technicians contacted. It was estimated that USDA provided about a total of one month's services per year for AID technicians returning from Ghana and Nigeria. Similar estimates from other countries by AID would be helpful. The largest percentage of AID personnel expressing their opinions on TC&S activities felt that a detailed statistical report on number of telephone calls, letters, etc. would cost more than its value, and hence they would not advise this system. A few individuals felt that these records should be kept and expanded to include sending monthly bills for services to each bureau technical office. It was felt that this might have the effect of reducing requests by some AID personnel if they knew the cost. Some felt that a sample probe should be made for one month, checking the number of telephone calls, letters, etc. from monthly reports of services of USDA. The general feeling was that relatively simple but descriptive records should be kept.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

4. Examples of TC&S activities cited by USDA placed considerable emphasis on PASA preparation and support. The AID agricultural personnel felt that USDA technicians should provide more technical assistance in this activity than they had personally observed in the past.

5. Questions from former PASA contacts and participants will continue to come in for many years after the initial contact, but it is reasonable to expect them to reduce in volume as time passes.

6. Preparation and publication of scientific papers for journals of LDCs, news articles for U.S. farm publications regarding PASA and AID work overseas have been listed as activities. It was recognized that these could be important and could require considerable time. Opinions as to the value of monthly newsletters mailed to participants varied.

7. Charges of 3.8 man years for the "Production Indices" was pointed out by several technicians as being very reasonable.

8. Most people contacted stressed that importance should be emphasized in providing proper credit for publications, speeches, and other communications prepared for public use by USDA with AID funding.

9. Because pre-PASA work was so prominently mentioned in the listings of TC&S activities of the various services, it resulted in considerable discussion. The opinion was expressed that officials of a country of origin must understand what they want done by the team and by the individual technician. Sometimes inadequate preparation and utilization of PASA personnel resulted from inadequately

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

prepared PIO/Ts. In some countries the team works for the host country Ministry of Agriculture, which is a very good arrangement.

10. Services that have been particularly helpful for technicians both in AID/Missions and AID/W have been the supply of seeds and publications, and the exchange of letters between technicians in AID and USDA for specialized information. LA indicated that they had made practically no requests for information and USDA bulletins prepared in English, but have used RTAC publications prepared in cooperation with USDA and AID. Of most help in U.S. to some personnel have been the one- or two-day visits to USDA each time the technician was in Washington between tours.

11. A common criticism was that many AID personnel are not familiar with the scope of services performed by USDA.

Questions

1. Would a central office in AID/W through which all official requests may be channeled improve services? Should all AID contacts with USDA be via IADS? Should the technician put all requests on a requisition basis?

2. Should all requests for publications from the field and copies of correspondence between USDA personnel and LDC scientists be routed through the Agricultural Technical Support Office to keep that office better informed of field activities? Bureaus that include several countries could often refer information which has been requested from one country to neighboring countries.

3. Should one AID man be assigned as a liaison person for all TC&S work and AID/USDA relationships, such as preparation of scientific papers and reports prepared on PASAs?

4. Should prior approval be required for services on special items not specifically requested by AID; for example, papers for professional meetings or publications, or special AID articles of USDA publications?

5. Should AID pay for cost of consultation with non-sponsored visitors from LDCs? (Note: If sponsored by international organizations, AID has a financial obligation. What are considered international organizations -- F.A.O., Near East Foundation, Ford Foundation, or what?)

6. Could financing of TC&S be through PL 480 funds? or figured on the basis of a percentage of the PASA cost?

7. Would a schedule of charges for services be feasible? Could a bill for services be sent along with the report and service? (Not generally considered practical.) Charges for some items might seem high to the AID technician and he might decide that the service was not essential enough to justify the cost.

Suggestions

1. Include a statement of man months spent on each service listed in the USDA inventory, as is done now in some cases.

2. Amend PASAs to provide additional time when required to complete the project, including terminal report, rather than charging post-PASA work to TC&S. Pre-PASA work should be funded in the PASA.
3. Instruct missions to make requests for services more definite.
4. Circulate a memo from time to time with updated information to let AID/W and AID/Mission technicians know what services are available and where they may be obtained.

L. W. Herrick
Feb. 1969

HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN ON THE FINANCING OF USDA ACTIVITIES IN SUPPORT OF AID

The Agriculture Appropriation Committees of both Houses have always been extremely conscious of the Department's activities in support of Foreign Assistance programs and quite concerned about the diversion of resources from domestic agricultural programs to international programs.

This concern is expressed annually when the IADS representatives appear before them to testify on agricultural development activities, and requires repeated assurance that program activities are financed completely by reimbursements from AID.

This criteria for USDA service to the foreign assistance efforts was clearly delineated in the following discussion excerpted from the FY 1965 Hearings before the House Appropriations Sub-Committee on Agriculture (pages 686-688), IADS' initial appearance before the Committee.

> "Mr. Whitten. A 1,700 reduction in manpower. Why do we have this cut when we have 448 men designated to assist foreign countries in agriculture?"
>
> "Mr. Whitten. I realize you didn't write the budget, Mr. Drosdoff, but you make a very good statement about what all this means to other countries. Can you see any reason for us cutting down our attention to American agriculture by 448 man-years so as to allow us to do this? Is it worth that much?"
>
> "Mr. Drosdoff. I don't think that is the intention. Unless there are special ceiling allocations, or unless AID provides the positions to do the jobs which they are requesting us to do, we won't be able to do it.
>
> "Our policy is--and I think it is directed in the legislation--that the domestic programs are not to be handicapped by our participation in the overseas program. It is understood that, unless AID provides the funds and makes some special arrangements to get ceiling allocations for their overseas programs, which they are requesting, we just won't be able to meet these requests."

Similarly, the Senate Sub-Committee on Agriculture expressed concern about the diversion of staff and funds from domestic programs to assist the LDC's improve and diversify their agriculture (excerpts from pages 668 and 670).

> "Senator Holland. I want to ask you a question about the International Agricultural Development Service. This agency was established by the Secretary's Memorandum 1541 of August 2, 1963. I note on page 182-B of your justifications which covers appropriations for the operation of that agency, this statement:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

"All of the activities of the International Agricultural Development Service are financed by allocations from the Agency for International Development, or AID.

"Is that statement true as it appears there? There are no appropriations for that agency in the agriculture budget?"

"Mrs. Jacobson. I would like to say for the record that we believe so far this financing for the International Agricultural Development Service has worked very well, that the Department has no intention in this operation of shortchanging any of the legally authorized domestic programs of the Department."

As long as the Department can assure the Committees that the supporting activities don't detract from domestic program interests they are willing to support this activity. During the FY 1967 House Hearings, Congressman Whitten, Chairman of the Appropriation Sub-Committee, raised the usual question and was given assurance that program financing and responsibilities were unchanged. He concluded that year's IADS hearings with the following comment (excerpt from page 147).

"Mr. Whitten. Thank you, sir. We appreciate your appearance here. We realize that this is a program which you perform at the request of another agency. Many of the problems here, if problems exist, would be generated by the other agency.

"If this work is to be performed by our Government under any program, I do not think there is any question but that the people in the Department of Agriculture are best qualified to carry it on."

The admonitions of the appropriations committes not to divert funds to unauthorized purposes were given added weight by their action against agency appropriations. During the FY 1967 hearings, the committees learned that several agencies absorbed costs for the Rural Community Development Service, within their appropriation. Their reaction was to reduce each agency's appropriation by an amount equal to its "unauthorized" transfer and explained their actions on page 16 of the Committee Report No. 1446. (Similar action was taken against other agencies -- ASCS, C&MS, FHA and SCS -- that absorbed costs within their appropriations.)

A reduction of $78,000 has been made under this heading in view of unauthorized transfers made in the current year to the Rural Community Development Service ($66,000) and the National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber ($12,000). These transfers were made from funds authorized by the Congress last year for specific research purposes. Through the years, the Committee has relied upon officials of the Department to keep it informed in advance of proposed shifts in the use of funds specifically authorized by the Congress for certain purposes. It was surprised to discover these two transfers during the hearings and

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

was disturbed to find that the long-standing working arrangement between the Department and the Committee in this regard had been disregarded. Since this agency was able to operate during the current fiscal year without the funds which were transferred for other uses, they have been eliminated for the coming fiscal year.

The chastening experience has made the various USDA agencies extremely conscious of subsidizing activities with appropriation funds. Suggestions that services be performed for AID without charge, regardless of the scope or cost, are rejected on the basis of the above cited committee directives.

Attachment No. 33

EXAMPLES OF TECHNICAL CONSULTATION AND SUPPORT SERVICE

An illustrative listing of the type of activities performed by the USDA during FY 1967 is shown in the attached statement prepared to cover the larger program agencies involved in this activity. More detailed description of activities undertaken in FY 1968 and proposed for FY 1969 is included in the annual work plan descriptions accompanying the budget submissions. In addition, there are included program and functional statements outlining the nature and scope of activities provided by FAS and IADS.

TC&S
1967

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Example of TC&S work performed by the Agricultural Research Service for AID in 1967 FY are:

I. Technical information

- Responded to over 3,000 requests directly from developing countries for information and publications. Time involved on each request varied from less than one hour to several days if a research report need to be prepared.

- Responded to over 175 official requests of AID personnel for information and publications. Again time involved on each request varied depending on the nature of the request.

- Responded to over 1,000 telephone requests for information of AID/W personnel to ARS.

TC&S
1967

II. PASA preparation and followup

- Recruitment of personnel for PASAs has been increasing very rapidly within the past few years. It is not unusual for 40 or 50 letters to be sent out to individuals asking if they would be interested in a PASA position, either short- or long-term, or for a vacancy within FAO. For instance, recently an oilseed production expert was requested for a six-month PASA assignment in Central America. This resulted in the Crops Research Division sending individual letters to some 20 scientists within and outside of USDA. These letters have to be written individually and cannot be reproductions.

- Developed a PASA proposal, suggested by AID, on utilization of urea as a protein source for livestock feeds. It is estimated that 400 man hours were diverted to this effort; however, the PASA did not materialize.

- Corresponded with scientists of LDC's contacted during short term PASA work. ARS has furnished a large number of short-term consultants under PASAs. When these consultants return, their jobs are not completed and there is a continued dialogue between them and the scientists in the countries visited. This, in most cases, lasts over a period of several years.

- Responded to requests from many former AID participant trainees. In the foreign training area, ARS has assisted in training a large number of AID-supported foreign participants. When these individuals return to their home countries, they continue to contact our people for information and guidance. This is direct correspondence and does not come through an AID mission or AID/W; however, it is associated with AID programs within countries. ARS scientists know that if they have served as consultants, or have assisted in training foreign participants, they should consider this on a continuous basis as a part of their duties.

TC&S
1967

III. Seeds, Biologics.

- Sent samples of approximately 1,400 different varieties of plant and seed materials to over 50 developing countries in response to U.S. AID Mission and AID/W requests. Released approximately 100 sets of cacao clonal material to developing countries pursuing cacao breeding programs.

- Furnished the following inoculants:

Nicaragua (AID)	- 23	cultures for tropical legumes
India (AID)	- 6	cultures - peanut
	9	cultures - lathyrus
	10	peat inoculants - soybean
Iran (AID)	- 12	cultures - forage legumes
Nigeria (AID)	- 1	peat inoculant - cow pea

These were taken from a large reference collection maintained by SWC/ARS of Rhizobium strains, containing over 1,200 cultures of nodule bacteria for most of the world's cultivated legumes.

- Responded to requests for copies of standards and regulations in the area of veterinary biologics; material on cultures and reagents; sources of supply for veterinary biological material; and packets of materials on production procedures for brucella antigen, blue tongue, hog cholera serum and virus, and tuberculin. Nine AID requests for biologics -- available only from ARS -- were filled.

TC&S
1967

IV. General Consulting

- Briefed 75 AID Mission personnel and PASA personnel of other agencies in their preparation for overseas assignments.

- Provided Dr. L. Steiner, ARS, authority on Mediterranean fruit fly, for 8 days, in Tunisia and Morocco advising AID on a control program. AID paid per diem in local currency; salary was not reimbursed.

- Consulted with 35 visitors (in one ARS division) from 10 developing countries involving market quality programs, technical information on storage, transportation and maintenance of quality of agricultural products. (Not under the participant training program). This activity involves considerable planning and preparation, including "set-up" of a demonstration using new and improved equipment. Preparation time is frequently equal to the duration of the visit -- from one to several hours. Some 20 publications are usually provided. At least one follow-up occurs after the visitor returns to his home country in the form of a request for supplementary information and publications. ARS has 20 divisions.

- Responded to several requests by AID to provide technical advice regarding proposed AID sponsored research on crops. Some examples are:

  (a) Participated in discussions of a proposed AID contract project on oilseeds.

  (b) Reviewed proposal for weed control in less developed countries.

- Responded to the following AID related requests;

  13 actions for the importation of soils to be tested at the request of AID

  2 actions for the importation of plant materials from El Salvador

  3 disease surveys on cacao

  1 disease identification in Peru

  1 study and evaluation of plant quarantine for the Dominican Republic

V. Papers, articles

- Prepare a paper and participate in a symposium to be held at the Pakistan Academy of Science. This will involve a study by Dr. Bowers of the ARS soil-salinity laboratory of the bicarbonate problems of soil covering six geographic areas. An analysis of some 50 soil samples (3 weeks per sample) will be required to determine extent sodium problems comparable to those encountered and solutions for which have been prescribed in the U.S.

- Published a paper entitled, "Sodium Hazard of Irrigated Waters as Influenced by Leaching, Fraction, and by Precipitation on Solution of Calcium Carbonate." Comments from some five countries state that information in this publication has been of great help in coping with problems in Pakistan, Israel, Iraq, Lebanon, and Kenya.

- Assisted AID personnel in gathering material for special projects and publications. For example, Herrin Cubuer/AID reviewed files and interviewed staff of ARS for several days in preparing a paper titled "Use of Introduced Wheat Variety Norin 10."

- Prepared article for Science, "Agricultural Production in the Developing Countries", indicating how yields could be improved by the application of U.S. technology modified to fit local conditions.

VI. Research

- Analyzed and interpreted 87 soil and 20 water samples (1 week per sample) for India, Egypt, Turkey, Taiwan, Yugoslavia, Southern Rhodesia, Afghanistan, Algeria, Brazil, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lebanon, and Thailand laboratories. In each case, recommendations are made to scientists in these countries as to how they might best cope with their problems. In some cases this involves transmission of various reprints from existing files, but in other cases it is necessary to develop studies unique to the problems with which these countries are concerned.

- Tested 40 cultures for effectiveness on lathyrus species sent from India (AID) (requiring 1 man month).

- Investigated adaptability of U.S. techniques of inoculating legume seeds to problems of developing countries.

TC&S
1967
attachment

Agricultural Research Service

EXAMPLES OF AID
Requests for Technical Information

Number	Country	Information Requested
AID-186	Pakistan	Any publications that are available that deal with the extraction of oil from soybeans on a relatively small scale.
-	Ecuador	Publications relating to the cultivation and production of plants from which perfume oils are extracted, including Patchouly.
-	India	List of references on lathyrism.
AID-195	Pakistan	Information on manufacture of paper.
AID-218	Philippines	Gardening information; use of gibberellic acid in gardening.
AID-320	Honduras	Information on pepper: culture, seed sources, importers, and sources of information on marketing and prices.
-	Vietnam	Manufacturers of: Rotary tillers, 7 to 10 HP, diesel driven; Portable pumps, direct connected to an air-cooled engine, lowheads 5 to 50 ft.
AID-67-29	Argentina	Any available publication on technology, markets, etc., of dehydrated alfalfa.
	Liberia	Bibliographic information on gibberellins.
	Laos	Information regarding apple varieties.

Number	Country	Information Requested
AID-67-22	Guyana	(a) Information concerning the storing, grading, and packaging of agriculture produce, (b) Information on machines and instruments used in fruit and dairy technology.
AID-67-10	Tanzania	Suggestions concerning storage structures that could be used for storing corn, beans, and peanuts under sealed and air-tight conditions.
-	Madgascar	Information on (1) peanut grading equipment; (2) rice fertilization by air..
-	Dominican Republic	(a) Information on Ramie (b) Information on where seeds of various varieties can be obtained.
-	Ghana	Plans for simple cotton spinning wheel and simple hand-powered cotton gin.
AID-67-61	Morocco	Technical information concerning growth habits, production techniques, management practices and suitability to irrigation for grass forage varieties grown under similar climatic conditions in the United States.
-	Zambia	Information on multi-wall paper bags for storing grains.
AID-67-73	West Pakistan	Information on storage and processing of garlic, tumeric, and ginger.
-	Philippines	Request for samples of sorghum and wild rice for trials in three regions of the Philippines.

Attachment #2

EXAMPLES OF TC&S

AID Requests Received in Fiscal Year 1967

Number	Country	Information Requested
AID-172	Japan	(a) Process to eliminate the undesired beany flavor of soybean milk, or a process to mask it. (b) Good flavored hydrolizates obtained by digesting soybean milk with enzymes.
AID-186	Pakistan	Any publications that are available that deal with the extraction of oil from soybeans on a relatively small scale.
-	Ecuador	Publications relating to the cultivation and production of plants from which perfume oils are extracted, including Patchouly.
-	India	List of references on lathyrism.
AID-195	Pakistan	Information on manufacture of paper.
AID-218	Philippines	Gardening information; use of gibberellic acid in gardening.
AID-320	Honduras	Information on pepper: culture, seed sources, importers, and sources of information on marketing and prices.
-	Vietnam	Manufacturers of: Rotary tillers, 7 to 10 HP, diesel driven; Portable pumps, direct connected to an air-cooled engine, lowheads 5 to 50 ft.
AID-67-29	Argentina	Any available publication on technology, markets, etc., of dehydrated alfalfa.
-	Liberia	Bibliographic information on gibberellins.
-	Laos	Information regarding apple varieties.
AID-67-22	Guyana	(a) Information concerning the storing, grading, and packaging of agriculture produce. (b) Information on machines and instruments used in fruit and dairy technology.

Number	Country	Information Requested
AID-67-10	Tanzania	Suggestions concerning storage structures that could be used for storing corn, beans, and peanuts under sealed and air-tight conditions.
-	Madagascar	Information on (1) peanut grading equipment; (2) rice fertilization by air.
-	Dominican Republic	(a) Information on Ramie (b) Information on where seeds of various varieties can be obtained.
-	Ghana	Plans for simple cotton spinning wheel and simple hand-powered cotton gin.
AID-67-61	Morocco	Technical information concerning growth habits, production techniques, management practices and suitability to irrigation for grass forage varieties grown under similar climatic conditions in the United States.
-	Zambia	Information on multi-wall paper bags for storing grains.
AID-67-73	West Pakistan	Information on storage and processing of garlic, tumeric, and ginger.
-	Philippines	Request for samples of sorghum and wild rice for trials in three regions of the Philippines.

Work Related to TC&S
1967

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

The following activities benefited the foreign economic assistance programs in the LDC's and were performed without cost to AID.

- In work of maintaining plant introduction stations in Miami and Puerto Rice, ARS prepared and released a publication on cacao clones (ARS 34 - 37 - 4) - first of its kind in the world.

- ARS prepared and published 50,000 copies of a booklet, "Science and Food for Freedom", describing problem of world hunger and showing the role of research in solving it. At request of USIA, a condensation of the booklet is being prepared for distribution overseas.

- ARS has over 500 coffee accessions in Miami available to developing countries. About 50 are screened for 18 known races of rust.

- A cooperative effort to assist AID is the research and development time which resulted in a multi-walled paper bag for shipment of corn meal to Brazil. Much of the research and testing was oriented toward the AID program in Brazil. Currently, all of the CSM (corn-sorghum flour-milk) high protein food is shipped in this container, worldwide.

- Southern Utilization Research and Development Laboratory in New Orleans developed an insect-proof textile bag for shipment of foodstuffs, grain, etc. Test shipments to India will be made in this container in cooperative efforts with AID. Annual efforts in these two examples are roughly approximated at $80,000, for which no claim was made under the TC&S funding and yet was of direct principal benefit to the LDC's and the respective AID Missions and programs.

- PL 480 research Grants are used to fund research which is making it possible for LDC's to learn to help themselves. An estimated 2,000 young people have been given scientific training while assisting in research projects. Many will become the scientific leaders in their countries. These grants also help support indigenous research institutions in the developing countries, and some of the research they carry out, although primarily of benefit to U.S. agriculture, assists in their own agricultural development.

- PL 480 Research Grants to less developed countries include: Brazil 18, Colombia 13, India 236, Pakistan 25, The Philippines 3, Korea 5, Taiwan 13, Peru 4, Uruguay 11, for example. A total of 654 PL 480 research grants have been made to developing countries out of a total of 843.

- Some examples of PL 480 research projects are:

  Survey of viral diseases of pulse crops,
  diseases of rice,
  hybrid vigor in breeding rice,
  wheat marketing in low income areas,
  use of antibiotics to control plant disease,
  virus diseases of tropical fruits,
  breeding insect-resistant farm crops,
  controlling rice pests,
  developing dairy cattle for tropical regions,
  improving nutrition of sorghum foods by adding amino acids,
  parasites of grasshoppers,
  breeding forage crops for dryland farming and,
  groundwater development.

- ARS' Western Utilization Lab spends many hours in consultation with private industry-domestic and foreign - who are interested in producing WURLD wheat for LDC's. None of this time is charged to AID.

- Prepared, published and distributed to LDC's a recipe book for bulgar.

- Members of the Administrator's staff frequently find it necessary to devote many hours to foreign visitors or attending conferences with AID and IADS. There is no provision for this time being included in reports submitted to AID or IADS.

- Attached are excerpts from weekly news notes from the Deputy administrator and from Division Directors illustrating the heavy involvement of top ARS management in AID related programs.

TC&S
1967

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

Examples of TC&S work performed by the Economic Research Service for AID in 1967 FY are:

- Participated in development of PASA s before signing. One of the two ERS members of the Colombia pre-PASA survey team was under TC&S (the other was borrowed from another country PASA under arrangements between the USAID Missions). His assignment required five days of work before departure -- in consultation, organizing the team, planning the approach, and reviewing background material. The survey, including travel time, required 30 days. In the first month after returning to Washington, the Team Leader and the ERS economist each devoted more than 10 days to conferences and discussions to clarify and amplify the report and help establish and implement the PASA. After this, another day was spent in consultation with PASA candidates from other agencies, and participation in two Colombia Committee meetings. This economist is now one of the "experts" on Colombia, participating in review of the PM, self-help provisions of the P.L. 480 agreement, and other work.

- Participated in the orientation program for some 200 USDA/PASA team members before they depart for their posts. The subjects covered in the one hour sessions include the role of agriculture in economic development, factors affecting agricultural productivity, and economic information relative to the countries of destination. Initial preparation included about two days in developing a basic discussion paper, and occasional revision. Each session requires about two hours preparation in collecting handout materials on countries, and relating the discussion to the departing technician's assignment.

- Prepared a paper and presented it to the CENTO Conference in Turkey in September at the request of AID. Preparation of the paper, (including review and clearances) required more than five days; travel and participation in the Conference another five.

- Responded to Mr. Kagan's request to estimate import needs of PL 480 recipient countries over the next five years, to determine P.L. 480 needs in 29 AID-recipient countries. This study projected production, consumption and trade under alternative levels and related the import requirement to these production and consumption levels. It also was concerned with the amount of commercial exports in relation to P.L. 480 commitment. This study provided the basis for determining the level of P.L. 480 that would be needed in each country to maintain the projected consumption used in this study.

- Initiated work on supply and distribution tables for a number of commodities for 63 countries for 5 years (in response to a letter from Erven J. Long of AID). We agreed to do tables for grain for about 20 countries and these were largely completed for 10 countries. The work was interrupted because the person requesting the tables was transferred. AID has now indicated an interest in having these tables completed, so work has commenced again.

- Constructed agricultural and food production indices. This project includes 72 countries for this year, and is to be completed by December 15, 1967. This phase of the work is entirely for AID since we will not commence indices for our own regional publications until the first of February.

- Prepared a paper on agriculture for the U.S. contribution to the Working Materials for the Colombo Plan Conference. This required about five days of professional time. The author was then invited to be a member of the U.S. team attending the Conference, under the leadership of the AID Deputy Administrator. This required 11 working days. More time will be devoted to reporting and subsequent reliance upon his experience after he returns.

- Prepared a 1967 publication on "Examples and Ideas for Using Farm Management Analysis in El Salvador." This publication has been supplied to other Latin American countries through USDA/PASA teams to strengthen the basis for farm management analysis to increase individual farmer's profit. Data representing actual farm operations were used to illustrate how to locate weak points in a farm business and to determine changes in practices and enterprise selection that might result in increased income to the farm family. Alternative land use plans, and crop, dairy and livestock enterprises were also discussed and demonstrated.

3

- Previewed the needs of Brazil for agricultural economic research, and recommend projects suitable for implementation cooperatively by the Brazilian States and Federal Government at the request of Brazil USAID. This service was performed under TC&S rather than the USDA/PASA because the economist involved is paid largely from TC&S funds. Preparation required about six days. Travel and working time in the country was 30 days. Reporting in conference and individually upon return involved about two days, and preparation of written recommendations about eight days. The experience has resulted in program memorandum and self-help provision reviews and numerous visits and calls.

- Reviewed with AID the Country Program Memoranda for most less developed countries. This activity has become more intensive.

4

- Provided considerable followup work after short term PASA work.

  ERS has been involved in several short-term assignments to less developed countries at the request of AID. Although ERS has been reimbursed for the time spent away from Washington, there has been considerable time spent in preparation and in follow-up, which has been charged under TC&S.

  1. Mr. Fox went to Afghanistan on a World Bank Mission to evaluate the agricultural sector of the Third 5-Year Development Plan.

  2. Mr. Farstand went to Turkey as leader of the ad hoc working party on Van-Rizaiyeh Development Program.

  3. Mr. Naive went to India to evaluate the possibilities of achieving the grain production goals proposed in the AID program memorandum.

  4. Mr. Willett is currently in Indonesia with an Asian Development Bank Mission to evaluate production possibilities in that country.

- Responded to requests for information on analyses (from AID and IADS) on less developed countries. Examples of these types of requests are taken from the branch monthly reports for three months of this year.

  January

  a. Mr. Chugg and Mr. Logan attended several meetings called by IADS regarding the rice situation, and proposed development programs for South Vietnam. Considerable time was spent in getting together statistical and other information required for these meetings.

  b. Mr. Logan reviewed a paper prepared by Mr. Dalrymple, IADS, dealing with problems of South Korea.

  c. Miss Long furnished area and production statistics on wheat, rice and barley crops in Japan for IADS.

  d. Met with Lyle Schertz of IADS to discuss general agricultural conditions in Ecuador. Furnished pertinent publications.

  e. Met with and assisted Dr. F.T.D. Siqueira, an advisor to AID in Brazil, who is presently studying U.S. agricultural research methods.

February

a. Mr. Logan spent a very considerable amount of time in assisting IADS with various problems faced in Vietnam.

b. Mr. Pike worked with Mr. Ransom (IADS) in connection with developing a "self-help" section for inclusion in a proposed P.L. 480 agreement with Indonesia.

c. Provided background data on the Dominican Republic to Marshal Fox, IADS.

d. Reviewed and commented on AID paper on economic development.

e. Provided general source information on Ecuador to Jim Gehr, IADS.

f. Conferred with Mr. Wagner, AID, who solicited information on fertilizer production in Turkey and background information on use of fertilizer in Turkey.

g. Conferred with Mr. Walter B. Epps, Batelle Memorial Institute, Washington Office, on rubber and oil palms in Liberia, in context of AID contract.

h. Met with Joseph Mintzes, Director, U.S. AID Mission, Congo (Kinshasa).

i. Conferred with Mr. Kerns, AID, on grain storage in East Africa and the statistical set-up in that area.

March

a. Mr. Logan worked with Charles Schwartz of AID reviewing data in connection with a South East Asia rice survey.

b. Mr. Barry worked with Mr. William Johnson of the East Asia Agricultural Division, Technical Services in connection with supplying AID with information and data on the production of coconuts and coconut products in the Philippines.

c. Miss Long provided Mr. Sechniger of AID with information on agricultural investment in Japan.

d. Reviewed Brazilian developments with Lance Hooks, market news specialist for the Brazilian PASA team.

e. Reviewed Colombian situation with Dr. James Haynes, agronomy advisor to USAID Colombia.

f. Provided information to Mr. Howard Ream, State AID desk for Brazil, on beef price controls in Brazil.

g. Reviewed errors in production data for corn in Latin America published in Front Lines magazine with Mr. Kagan of AID.

h. Supplied IADS with basic agricultural data for Paraguay and Brazil.

Work Related to TC&S
1967

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

The following activities benefited the foreign economic assistance programs in the LDC's and were performed without charge to AID.

ERS has conducted several research projects on the effects of PL 480 in recipient countries. These include India, Israel, Turkey, Greece, Spain, and Colombia. These were financed with PL 480 funds.

In carrying out the Department's responsibilities on PL 480, ERS analyzes the changing monetary and financial situations of developing countries and assists in program formulation through inter-agency as well as Departmental meetings. This work has also permitted analysis of such operations as the effects of shifting from foreign currency sales to long-term credit sales to the developing countries, thus having a direct application to USAID policies for foreign economic development.

A series of agricultural supply demand studies have been carried out in many of the developing countries. These are financed by PL 480 currencies. These studies include Mexico, Peru, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, and the Philippines. They have wide acceptance. For example, the Malaysian study is used as a textbook at the University of Kuala Lumpur. The Philippine study became the basis for their Five-Year Plan.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

The Federal Extension Service is called upon to respond to numerous inquiries to provide large quantities of materials and to consult with both Americans and officials from developing countries. Many of the contacts are referrals by AID, IADS, USIS and Peace Corps. Also there are many from the developing countries who come on their own or are referred by foundations, state universities and other agencies of government.

All of the Federal Extension Service is available in responding to requests which range from how to start a youth club to highly technical questions on agricultural production.

Neither individuals or divisions of FES have kept detailed records. However, individual offices have estimated the number of inquiries received. Many of the offices based their estimates on a count of letters requesting information received and answered during 1967.

As indicated on the attached table, it is estimated that over 5,800 requests were answered in 1967. While some requests were routine, others required hours of telephoning, searching files and additional correspondence. Attached also are examples of requests received for publications.

Federal Extension Service

FES Divisions and 4-H Club Foundation	Estimated Requests Answered in 1967 Per Month	Per Year	Total
AST&M	25	300	
Home Economics	15	180	
4-H	25 letters alone	300	
4-H Foundation		1,200	
ER&E	4 per week or 20 per month	240	
Information-Wolcott	5 per month	60	
MUS	15	180	
CRD	10	120	
Total			2,580
Office of International Extension			
OIE - Matthews	50 (25 letters-25 phone calls)	600	
OIE - Smith	80	960	
OIE - Strow	65 (45 letters-20 phone calls)	780	
OIE - McGary	50 (letters 30-phone calls 20)	600	
OIE - Noordhoff	10	120	
OIE - Framstad and Rose	10	120	
OIE - Office	2 phone calls per week	104	
Total			3,284
			5,864

Other Activities, including publications and preparation of materials

	1967 hours to date
Administrator's office	130
Division of Information programs	208
Division of AST&M	240
Total	578

This approximates 14 man weeks

TC&S
1967

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Examples of TC&S work performed by Farmers Home Administration for AID in 1967 FY are:

- Answered approximately 450 requests regarding program information and credit advice. These requests come from former foreign trainee participants, others working on credit programs in LDC's and inquiries from within the United States as to our overseas programs.

- Prepared two refresher courses at national, state, and county offices for AID direct-hire personnel. Briefed ten AID Mission staff members prior to assignment.

- Recruited eight credit men for Colombia, Paraguay, and Dominican Republic PASA's before the PASA's were completed; therefore not charged to PASA.

- Assisted Ohio State University in conducting their 14-week credit course by furnishing men from the national, state, and county offices.

- Prepared four policy analysis papers on supervised farm credit.

Work Related to TC&S
1967

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

The following activities benefited the economic assistance programs in the LDC's and were performed without cost to AID.

In training foreign participants in county offices of the agency, FHA does not record travel costs for on-site farm visits, but assumes this as part of the agency's travel costs. This involves visits with participants to FHA borrowers and applicants to demonstrate the supervised credit program.

Consulted with 10 private groups interested in LDC credit programs.

TC&S
1967

FOREST SERVICE

Example of TC&S work performed by the Forest Service for AID in 1967 FY are:

- Responded to over 300 requests for seed in 1967..all from AID or directly from LDC's. FS estimates that each request took one man-day to fill..in many cases this involved a FS staffer collecting seed by hand.

- Filled about 1,000 requests (from less developed countries) for general and technical information, educational and working materials, publications (in bulk), photogrammetric supplies, etc..FS shipped $3,000 worth of supplies and publications to LDC's.

- Reviewed and evaluated 15 to 20 United Nations Development Program requests. Each requires two to three man-days of a specialist's time with summarized comments transmitted to AID for combining with comments of other agencies.

- Consulted on seven AID and LDC project proposals. Each of the resulting 15 to 20 meetings involved three or four FS professionals for a half day, plus preliminary correspondence, collection of background information and preparation of final technical review and action recommendations.

- Recruited technical specialists for several short-term consultancy details that did not progress beyond the first stages of request for assistance.

- Recruited ten specialists for both short-term consultancy missions and long-term assignments to UNDP/SF projects in LDC's throughout the world.

- Prepared formal "presentations" as follow up to survey reports. FS spent two man-months preparing one formal report (with charts, photos, maps, flip charts, handouts, etc.) for just one project last year. Not covered by PASA funds.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

TC&S
1967

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Examples of TC&S work performed by the Soil Conservation Service for AID in FY 1967 are:

- Provided information on types of irrigation, and supplied engineering handbooks for Pakistan.

- Responded to requests for information on irrigation methods, publications on improving soils, instruction on spreading water for Egypt.

- Gathered and sent sprinkler irrigation technical data to Brazil.

- Supplied information on soil testing for India.

- Developed plans and programs for AID conservation programs in India, Turkey, Senegal and Vietnam -- before signing of PASA's.

- Arranged and supplied refresher training for 8 AID direct-hire people in 1967 with up to one month of training in SCS offices. For example, 3 weeks of training were arranged in Utah for Robert P. Rooney, AID technician serving in Pakistan.

- Provided technical advice and assistance in response to (a) letters for AID personnel requesting engineering advice or materials, (b) telephone calls or appointments with technical divisions to discuss technical aspects of overseas programs.

- Provided seed of 38 varieties of legumes and 12 grass varieties for testing being done at the Nicaraguan National Research Station. The species had been collected in tropical areas around the world by the National Plant Materials Center in Beltsville, Maryland.

- Provided background material and information to those going out on short term details. Meetings covered technical aspects of the TDY.

Work Related to TC&S
1967

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The following activities benefited the economic assistance programs in the LDC's and were performed without cost to AID.

SCS converted many of their field handbooks to the metric system thus permitting a wider range of applicability and utilization in the less developed countries.

This past year, SCS published a leaflet entitled "Soil and Water Conservation Around the World." Printed in three languages, 13,000 copies were distributed at the Boy Scout Jamboree, and several thousand more copies are being used to explain conservation to visitors from LDC's. Neither the manpower to prepare the publication, nor the printing, were charged to AID.

Each month SCS sends to 70 men working in technical assistance programs abroad -- the latest publications, technical information, and professional news -- a total of several thousand publications each year. This not only keeps the specialists informed, but also keeps their morale high -- they know they are not forgotten.

SCS devoted its August issue of Soil Conservation magazine to "international aid in conservation." Some 7,000 agricultural professionals read articles on AID-sponsored projects in Nigeria, Tunisia, Algeria, Nicaragua, and Thailand.

In the last 10 years, over 3,500 people from over 100 countries have received training under SCS supervision. But their training goes far beyond the classroom. Trainees accompany SCS technicians in areas similar to their own country. They are given handbooks, technical guides, drawings and specifications at no charge. Many discuss their particular conservation programs with top technical and administrative SCS officials in Washington.

No charge is made to AID funds for the time SCS employees spend helping these nationals from LDC's except when it entails taking the employee away from his regular job. As a result, about one-third of the training time is provided without charge to AID.

ANALYSIS OF TC&S ACTIVITIES

of

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

February 1969

ANALYSIS OF TC&S ACTIVITIES OF INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICE

The following material was prepared in order that interested individuals in both AID and USDA might obtain a better understanding of the work performed by IADS for AID. The material focuses most heavily on those activities financed by TC&S funds. However, information on PASA's and Training is also included to provide the reader with a perspective of IADS' total activities.

Activities related to the implementation of USDA PASA's constitute by far the predominant portion of the IADS/TC&S workload. PL 480 self-help has involved some time. However, as the descriptions of the work which follow indicate, this work has been limited. Much more could have been done and, in fact, should have been done to effectively implement the legislation. Staff time was simply not available.

In order that the reader might have a grasp of the increasing IADS workload, a table indicating the increasing number of USDA PASA's and PASA technicians is attached. This table also includes a tally of the PL 480 self-help agreements signed during the past 2 years.

USDA technicians on PASA's have been separated into two categories- (1) Latin America and Vietnam and (2) Total excluding Latin America and Vietnam. This was done because some IADS staff working on Vietnam and Latin America have been financed by line items in PASA's. Thus the workload on the IADS staff financed by TC&S funds is more

accurately reflected in the category "total excluding Latin America and Vietnam." And it is this category that has increased sharply in the last two years. USDA technicians on PASA's are up over 20 percent and short term USDA consultants have more than doubled.

INDICATORS OF IADS WORKLOAD

Number of PASAs Implemented

1967 F	69
1968 F	74
1969 F (1st 6 mo.)	73

USDA Technicians on PASAs

	Total	Latin America and Vietnam	Total Excluding Latin America and Vietnam
January 1, 1967	173	70	103
January 1, 1968	246	132	114
January 1, 1969	240	114	126

Short Term Consultants Recruited

July 1 to Dec. 31, 1966	52	32	20
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1967	54	23	31
July 1 to Dec. 31, 1968	62	14	48

Self Help Agreements Signed

CY 1967,	January-June	12	
	July-December	16	
			28
CY 1968,	January-June	27	
	July-December	18	
			45

DESCRIPTION OF WORK PERFORMED

by

IADS STAFF

February 1969

ADMINISTRATOR

DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR

The Administrator and Deputy Administrator work interchangeably in meeting the responsibilities of the Office of the Administrator (OA).

OA administers and coordinates USDA programs of foreign economic development: technical assistance, training, PL 480 self-help, and international nutrition improvement. It formulates policies and plans, mobilizes the resources of the Department for AID, represents the Department on matters pertaining to foreign development, formulates procedures to carry out USDA's responsibilities to AID, and reviews and evaluates all USDA/AID activities.

While practically every agency of the Department is heavily involved in technical assistance and training, self-help work is concentrated within IADS and the international nutrition work is carried out by a 3-man professional PASA team in IADS headed by Dr. Aaron Altschul.

The Administrator is Chairman of the Department's International Development Sub-Committee, which regularly reviews all USDA international development work, identifies problems and solutions, and determines ways to improve this activity.

The Administrator's office handles the usual responsibilities of such an office with respect to policy direction and program administration. Of particular importance has been the work of the Administrator's office in stimulating interest throughout the Department in agricultural development. This has involved working with the Administrators of the many agencies to encourage them to give high priority to agricultural development efforts including placing in their own offices the responsibility for their AID work, and encouraging their best employees to serve on PASA's as part of an overall career with their agencies.

As a result of these efforts, there has been increased awareness among USDA personnel of the importance of foreign technical assistance and the potential career benefits associated with participating in the AID programs.

Also the Administrator's office has purposely carried out a continual dialogue among PASA teams, Mission personnel and other AID personnel in order to anticipate problems and changing program directions. This has been helpful in identifying priority areas as well as easing difficulties associated with shifting priorities in the development programs. It has also been of importance to the morale and attitudes of PASA teams.

ASSISTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

(Program Area)

Prepare IADS and Departmental PPB Submissions (15% of time)

Prepares Agency and Departmental Program and Financial Plan required by BOB -- detailed document of about 50 pages covering each agency's technical assistance work with update every six months. Prepares Program Memoranda outlining current programs, justifying USDA activities in support of AID programs, and explaining changes in the level and direction of programs. Coordinates agency program and budget submissions relating to AID-funded work.

General Staff Support Functions (30% of time)

Formulates policies and procedures concerning working relations with AID and with USDA technical services. Responds to Congressional inquiries on AID-funded work, and reviews legislation and legislative proposals affecting AID-USDA work. Helps prepare congressional presentations explaining and justifying USDA support of AID programs.

AID Country Program Reviews, and other Joint Evaluations (30% of time)

Coordinates USDA agencies' participation in the reviews, including preparation of staff papers identifying issues that should be considered. Personally participates in reviews, including country program reviews, the current joint program and budget reviews, and ad hoc program evaluations; e.g., Brazil and El Salvador. Reviews 25%-30% of all incoming PASA reports to evaluate progress toward objectives as stated in the PIO/T's. At the request of AID/ARDS, reviews and evaluates USDA proposals for research relating to agricultural development.

Staff Specialist in Fields of Agricultural Marketing, Development Administration, and the General Development Process (15% of time)

Works with AID/PPC on development administration staff papers and programs. At request of AID/WOH and AID/PRR, counsels on agricultural marketing needs in LDCs. Helps recruit USDA technicians for PASAs in these specialized fields as requested by AID and IADS Regional Coordinators, and provides program guidance for them.

Forward Planning and Program Development (10% of time)

Prepares staff papers identifying trends and issues in agricultural development to be used as basis for AID-USDA policy formulation. Acts as USDA representative on AID interagency committee on providing technical assistance to non-AID countries. Represents IADS on invitation in AID sponsored and other seminars concerning such topics as the future of foreign aid, development administration for agriculture, and systems approaches to agricultural programs. At AID's request, reviews UNDP and related agricultural development proposals, and helps draft U.S. position papers on them.

ASSISTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR

(Operations Management)

Program Coordination and Administration (5% of time)

Serves as program coordinator for world-wide projects, not within regional or other staff areas (soil salinity and plant and seed materials, technical assistance projects.)

Budget Preparation and Submission (15% of time)

Directs the preparation of IADS and USDA agency budgets for AID and Congressional consideration. Reviews budget proposals and actual plans for consistency with AID-USDA policies, objectives and priorities. Develop agency Congressional presentations.

Program Implementation (30% of time)

Monitors the continual implementation of approximately 30 Training and TC&S programs involving about 200 positions in IADS and other USDA agencies, and recommends any appropriate shifts in funding based on changes in workload or performance. Performs analysis and evaluation of USDA technical assistance program activities and recommends improvements in implementation. Participate in special ad hoc reviews.

Administrative Support of USDA/IADS Program (30% of time)

Develops and implements administrative policies and procedures pertaining to USDA technical assistance activities. Provides standards and procedures to USDA agencies for operational reports to permit effective management of agency activities. Advises agencies on administrative procedures involved in USDA-AID cooperation. Develops and prepares management reports required by AID, such as the semi-annual PASA Activity Report, and other reports required by USDA, BOB, Congress, etc. Supervises IADS and agency compliance with USDA administrative controls such as employment restrictions and foreign travel ceilings. Coordinates with FAS with respect to management services performed for IADS. Reviews and makes recommendations to Administrator on all IADS personnel and financial actions.

PASA Review (15% of time)

Reviews all PASA proposals prior to Departmental signature for compliance with AID/USDA directives, feasibility within current travel and personnel ceilings and restrictions, and for consistency with the programs objectives. Reviews PASA program reports for progress in achieving objectives.

Congressional Activities (5% of time)

Monitors all legislative actions concerning international development programs, reviewing and reporting on pertinent legislation and congressional activities.

REGIONAL COORDINATOR

Program Administration (20% of time)

Administers USDA technical assistance programs in the region, including administrative and technical support for PASA team leaders; supervising Washington regional staff; liaison with AID, USDA agencies, and host countries; preparing required reports; and representing the Department with respect to regional matters.

Program Development, Implementation and Supervision (60% of time)

Coordinates USDA activities in the development of technical assistance programs in the region. Reviews AID requests and determines extent of USDA participation. Frequently serves as team leader or member of project planning teams in the region. Maintains liaison with appropriate AID Bureau, other USDA and federal agencies, FAO, and private firms having an interest in the region. Represents USDA in negotiating agreements and PASA's. Coordinates the recruiting of technicians from within and outside the Department. Supervises travel arrangements, clearances, and personnel transactions for PASA technicians. Participates in orientation, briefing and debriefing of USDA PASA personnel. Reviews all PASA's in the region and distribution of funds under the PASA. Supervises USDA support of technical assistance teams in the region, including USDA agencies' support of their overseas technicians. Reviews team reports and works with AID and USDA agencies in solving team problems and refocusing team efforts if necessary. Advises administrator on current status of programs in the region. Conducts or arranges for periodic field visits. Reviews daily cables from the region and takes appropriate action.

Program Analysis and Evaluation (15% of time)

Conducts and/or arranges for surveys, analysis and evaluation of current and prospective technical assistance programs. Participates in AID Country Program Memorandum Reviews including development and presentation of issues, questions, and USDA positions.

Self-Help Analysis (5% of time)

Coordinates the development of the self-help measures to be included in PL 480 Title I agreements with countries in the region. Analyzes self-help reports from countries and Missions, and prepares country self-help compliance reports for the Congress.

PROGRAM ANALYSTS

Program Analyst is a more descriptive term for the functions performed by the International Economists. The Program Analyst is under the supervision of a Regional Coordinator and his functions are generally in support of the Regional Coordinator's work. The Analyst may also work on projects for the Office of the Administrator in areas where he has special knowledge. The analyst may also be required to function as the Coordinator in his absence.

PASA Development, Implementation of Support (40% of time)

In cooperation with USDA agencies and FAS budget officer, develops PASA budgets. Participates in recruiting personnel for PASA's, processes personnel papers and clearances, negotiates salaries, makes travel arrangements, and participates in orientations for PASA personnel. Reviews all details of PASA's prior to signing. Reviews distribution of funds in implementation of PASA's. Reviews approximately 35 cables per day from the region, taking appropriate action or bringing important ones to attention of the Regional Coordinator. Answers information requests from PASA members.

Program Analysis (25% of time)

Performs detailed analysis of LDC development programs, using data from ERS, ARS, PASA team reports, AID Missions and other sources. This analysis provides basic information for the evaluation of current PASA programs and for the determination of the probable effectiveness of new programs.

Self-help Analysis (20% of time)

Using results of analysis develops self-help measures to be included in PL 480 Title I agreements with countries in the region. Also participates in negotiations for inclusion of these provisions in PL 480 agreements. In doing this, draws from a wide range of sources within the USDA. Works with AID staff offices in finalizing provisions. In a limited way reviews self-help reports.

Projects for the Administrator's Office (10% of time)

Performs special projects for the Administrator's Office in areas where he has special knowledge such as private investment, marketing, and new varieties.

Liaison (5% of time)

Maintains liaison with AID, USDA agencies, other government agencies, and university and private groups involved in the region.

INFORMATION GROUP

General Coordination and Administration (10%)

Reviews reports, press releases, articles and other publications concerning AID, prior to USDA release or publication. Prepares, or coordinates preparation of, many administrative and program reports, including technical assistance section of the U.S. report to FAO, the USDA/AID section of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture, a weekly report on status of USDA/AID programs for the White House, a biweekly report to the Secretary concerning USDA/AID operations, and the self-help section of the President's PL 480 annual report to Congress.

Articles, Reports, Leaflets, and Speeches (10%)

Prepares, edits, and submits articles to USDA and AID publications, such as War on Hunger, Foreign Agriculture, and Farm Index magazines. Locates, reviews, reprints and distributes, to appropriate USDA and AID personnel, significant reports and articles from outside sources. Furnishes drafts, background information, and photographs to magazines, newspapers, and trade journals to stimulate interest in international development and explain agriculture's role in development. Prepares press releases on items of general interest for cooperative USDA/AID, and self-help part of PL 480 releases.

PASA Orientation (15%)

Coordinates orientation and briefings for personnel scheduled for AID assignment, including arranging for AID/FSI orientation with AID Training Centers. Conducts orientation briefings on reporting and information services available to the PASA employee.

PASA Reports (15%)

Edits, prepares layouts, arranges for photographs and artwork, and prepares PASA team reports for printing, and arranges for their printing.

Provides guidance to assist USDA/AID specialists in preparing quarterly, annual, consultant, and survey reports. Conducts pre-assignment report writing seminars for USDA technicians to help them concentrate on organization of material, give attention to significant details, and develop more effective recommendations.

Visual Services (5%)

Arranges TV and radio appearances for USDA and AID technicians returning from overseas assignments. This involves about 35 radio and TV appearances per year. Furnishes script writing support for TV and radio appearances and visual aid support for TV. Assists with exhibits and other visual material concerning LDC development.

Publication and Information Distribution (10%)

Reviews and selects materials for inclusion in the weekly AID Publications Packet sent to AID Rural Development Officers. Reviews and selects technical publications included in the USDA/AID Team Packet sent to about 200 PASA team members. Distributes significant articles and publications to about 300 people in Washington involved with AID programs. Prepares monthly IADS News Digest of current technical information in agricultural development: 1400 copies monthly are distributed within USDA and to AID Missions, USDA/AID teams, and university and foundation specialists.

Technical Information Requests (35%)

Answers requests for technical information from AID Missions (about 600 per year) and from PASA teams (about 400 per year). Less than one percent are channeled to other specialists. Answers over 3,000 additional requests per year for publications and general information from AID/W professionals, USDA, Peace Corps, other government agencies, foundations, universities, LDC officials, private business, libraries, and the general public. Fills requests from RTAC's for materials for translation. Reviews and selects USDA publications to recommend for translation by RTAC. Manages USDA/AID subject-matter files and library as source of technical information for USDA, AID, and other development agencies.

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF IADS

PASA'S

Nutrition and High Protein Group

Cooperate with AID/W and AID Missions in stimulating development and introduction of new foods designed to improve protein consumption in the developing countries.

Vietnam Agricultural Economics Team

Primary focus is analysis and planning in the agricultural area with special attention to rice and protein programs.

Vietnam Country Officer

Major responsibility is coordinating and servicing USDA Vietnam PASA involvement. Work covers broad range activities associated with placing men overseas from six different USDA agencies.

TRAINING

Coordinate all agricultural training activities for AID, UN, and other foreign participants. Liaison with AID on all training matters, representing the Department's agencies. Plan, prepare, and supervise training programs for participants based on recommendations of AID Missions, AID/Washington, and USDA agency representatives. Schedule and arrange all training -- by USDA agencies, academic institutions, trade associations, commercial firms, farmers, and others. Evaluate selected participant's training. Conduct orientation sessions for participants. Handle fiscal aspects of training programs, including: pay for participant's maintenance, travel and; book allowance, pay contractors; review and validate all vouchers, and general control of participant funds.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

December 15, 1967

TO: Members of the Operations Subcommittee

FROM: Lyle P. Schertz, Chairman

SUBJECT: TC&S, Training and PASA Administration

It is my understanding that we have agreed on the following in the last two Subcommittee meetings in which we discussed the November 29, 1967 memo on TC&S, Training, and PASA Administration.

A. PASA Overhead

1. Management support would be redesignated Management Services.

2. Program direction would be redesignated Program Support. This category of work would include PASA negotiation subsequent to initial approval.

B. Training

1. Authorized participants would include those sponsored by the UN and its specialized agencies, including but not limited to FAO, UNESCO, Development Fund.

2. Refresher training in the field for AID personnel could be reported under Training only in those instances when the agency system does not provide for field reporting of TC&S. If training is for agency personnel preparatory to or subsequent to assuming resident PASA duties, the activity should be considered as PASA overhead or TC&S, depending upon status of PASA approval.

C. Technical Consultation and Support (TC&S)

1. Efforts expended in reviewing UN Development Fund proposals are considered properly chargeable to TC&S.

The suggested definitions for the above activities are included as Attachment No. 1.

Reporting and Accounting

In the matter of reporting and accounting for TC&S and Training activities, we concluded that each agency would operate a system that provided as a minimum:

a. Monthly recording of time of program professionals and clerical support involved in TC&S and Training.

b. Exclude management services hours from man-hour reporting. For billing purposes this activity would be included as an additive percentage to direct costs computation.

c. Reporting of time and billing for costs should be on a work performed basis rather than budgeted amounts.

d. Outline of the suggested system is included as Attachment No. 2.

In line with our discussions each agency is requested to review the adequacy of their present system to meet the above needs and complete development of such a system no later than December 31, 1967.

George Waldman will be in contact with you to discuss your proposed system. In the interim if you have need to discuss the proposals or problems, feel free to contact either George on extension 2464 or myself.

We have decided that we can at this time do without the suggested January 1968 special report on AID activities by field staff. However, we feel that there is a real need for January reports by all Washington staff working on Training, TC&S, or program support portion of PASA overhead.

Also since our meetings we have discussed extensively the question of monthly man-hour reports of TC&S and Training. We conclude that the new emphasis on work measurement throughout the Department and the need for anticipating budget problems dictate the need for monthly reports in the last half of the fiscal year.

We discussed but I'm not sure that we finalized a decision with respect to the suggestion that each agency tally the participant man days of Training provided to sponsored trainees and compute the cost per man-day of training provided. Again in view of the Department's stress on work measurement we think that this will prove increasingly useful to all of us.

In view of the above points, we propose the following:

Man-hour Report of TC&S and Training:

Submitting to FAS/IADS quarterly reports for the first two quarters of the fiscal year (July-December) and monthly reports for the last 6 months. (January-June). Report should be submitted by the 15th day after the close of the reporting period.

Report of Participant Man-days of Training:

Furnishing FAS/IADS quarterly the number of participant man days of training provided and computation of costs per man-day of training provided. A suggested form is attached as Attachment No. 3. Submit the report by the 20th day after the close of the reporting period.

Report of Time Spent in AID Activities:

Furnish monthly report to FAS/IADS for each individual located in Washington working one-quarter or more time on (a) training, (b) TC&S, and (c) program support portion of PASA overhead. In those cases in which several individuals of an organizational unit work on a specific request requiring more than one man-week of time, the hours for each request may be identified against the organizational unit rather than the individual. This report would include a brief listing of the work involved in TC&S activities and who requested the work. A tentative form is attached as Attachment No. 4.

For January 1968 agencies are requested to provide a report for each individual in Washington performing training, TC&S, or program support portion of PASA overhead.

We suggest using the same form for January as suggested for the following monthly reports. It is requested that these reports be submitted to FAS/IADS the 10th day after the close of the reporting period.

If you have any serious problems with these suggestions, please call either George Waldman or myself.

December 15, 1967

Attachment No. 1

AID ACTIVITY
USDA PROGRAM DEFINITIONS

A. PASA Overhead:

Includes:

(1) Management services - personnel, budget, fiscal, administrative services, and supplies.

(2) Program support - PASA negotiation, recruiting, briefing and establishing project goals subsequent to initial approval. Correspondence with PASA personnel, consultation with IADS and AID personnel concerning PASA progress, guidance of PASA team members, visiting PASA personnel, preparation of reports, and responsibility for PASA team members and their accomplishments.

Such items as scientific analysis of plant materials, specialist consultation, research in the United States, equipment or facility design and special supervisory work would be considered as possible PASA line items and be negotiated as part of the PASA. Because of confusion over the meaning of the word backstopping we suggest that we stop using it.

B. Training:

Includes the following for AID participants and UN sponsored trainees:

(1) Developing and carrying out training programs.

(2) Preparation of prospectuses, training materials and related supporting data.

Note: AID participants are identifiable by an assigned PIO/P number; UN participants include those sponsored by its specialized agencies. Refresher training in the field for AID personnel can be reported under training only in those instances when the agency system does not provide for field reporting of TC&S.

Excludes:

(1) Training extended to men if they are not sponsored by AID or UN even if they are from a developing country and even if scheduled by IADS Training Division.

(2) Briefings and other preparation of PASA team members.

(3) Refresher training for AID personnel if agency system provides for field reporting of TC&S.

C. Technical Consultation and Support (TC&S):

Includes:

(1) Professional work and supporting secretarial and clerical work in response to inquiries and requests (not covered by training activities or by PASA program support) made by individual AID employees, PASA team members, members of IADS, and representatives of the LDC's.

Examples of such requests are consultations on proposed PASA's, recruiting expense involved previous to signing of PASA, assistance in review of AID Program Memoranda and UN Special Fund Development Projects.

Substantial projects (one man week or more) should be undertaken as TC&S only with the concurrence of IADS or AID/W.

Excludes:

(1) Work for which USDA has responsibility regardless of how closely the work is related to AID or IADS responsibilities. Work on PL 480 including self-help is an example.

(2) Management services or program support of PASA's and Training.

(3) Responding to requests from agency PASA team members which are directly related to agency PASA responsibilities.

December 15, 1967

Attachment No. 2

SUGGESTED SYSTEM FOR BILLING
AID FOR TC&S AND TRAINING ACTIVITY

Agency billings for TC&S and Training activities might be based on the monthly report of work performed by program professionals and their clerical support. Reimbursement requests could reflect either: (a) the actual position costs of the hours reported; or (b) the time reported multiplied by a fixed average hourly rate for professional and clerical support (periodically reviewed). The amounts derived from either (a) or (b) above would then be increased by adding the standard agency overhead percentage or by actually increasing the hourly rate to include the overhead rate and any other costs, except travel, incurred in these activities. Reimbursements for travel costs would be on actual cost basis. FAS/IADS should be advised of the system used.

This procedure would tend to simplify agency management and accounting for these AID activities by focusing primarily on the direct program performance in support of TC&S and Training activities.

December 15, 1967

Attachment No. 3

_____
(AGENCY OR OFFICE)

TRAINING PROVIDED AID-UN SPONSORED PARTICIPANTS AND FELLOWS

Quarter Covered _____

(a) Names of Participants of Team	(b) PIO/P No. or UN Fellow	(c) Dates Training Provided During Quarter 1/	(d) Total Man-days Training Provided 2/

Total Man-days of Training Provided by Agency _____

Training Costs of Agency _____

Costs Per Man-day of Training 3/ _____

1/ If actual training is provided on weekends or holidays this should be counted

2/ In computing total man-days for column (d), multiply total days shown in column (c) by number of participants shown in column (a).

3/ In computing costs per man-day training divide the training costs incurred by the total days training.

December 15, 1[illegible]

Attachment No. 4

____
(AGENCY OR OFFICE)

Report of Time Spent on AID Related Activities
for Month of ________________

Individual	Hours Involved: PASA Program Support	Hours Involved: Training	Hours Involved: TC&S	Listing of TC&S Activity	Person Making Request

NOTE: Include individuals located in Washington working one-quarter month or more time on the indicated AID related activities. In those cases in which several individuals of an organizational unit work on a specific request requiring more than one man-week of time, the hours for each request may be identified against the organizational unit rather than the individual. This report does not need to be typed. For example, xerox copies of the sheets prepared by the respective individuals are satisfactory for transmittal.

For the January 1968 report, report each member of Washington staff working on these AID activities.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20250

December 3, 1968

SUBJECT: Task Force on TC&S -- Progress Report

TO: AID-USDA Program Evaluation Steering Committee

The Task Force has had several meetings to develop a procedure for evaluation of this activity. It established as its principal objective the determination of how effectively have USDA resources been utilized in support of the AID foreign assistance program.

In this consideration, the Task Force will attempt to examine the performance of the past three years and identify means to evaluate service required and rendered. The scope of the study is quite varied and difficult to define because of the broad nature of activity. "TC&S services cover any service, in support of the foreign assistance program which cannot be characterized as a project or staff service which is normally performed in the U.S. on a continuing basis . . . ."

Records available to the Task Force include budget submissions which primarily identify costs and personnel devoted, illustrative reports of activities undertaken, and annual work plans for FY 1968 and 1969. From this material the Task Force will develop an illustrative inventory of activities undertaken by the various agencies of the USDA. A draft copy is attached to this report. The nature of TC&S activities within the USDA is quite varied and may be characterized as: Special services including specifically requested and definable activities; technical and program support which varies from the servicing of technical inquiries to recruiting for PASA teams; and general program and policy direction of USDA foreign assistance programs. The variety of services rendered, and the general method by which requests are forwarded, contribute to the difficulty in programming and accounting for this activity. This contributes to the problems in establishing a quantifiable method of evaluating this activity.

To guide the reviewing groups in their consideration of this activity, the Task Force has developed the following set of questions to be answered:

a. Is the purpose of this activity understood? Is it adequately and clearly defined? How does it differ from the project services (PASA)? Is it clearly understood within AID? USDA? Are the USDA services adequately used?

b. How does TC&S relate to overall program objectives? How shall the foreign assistance objectives be defined? Limited?

c. What is the relationship between AID and USDA in the foreign assistance field? How do we differentiate between this program and the purposes of PL 480 program, Section 406, Self-help, etc.? Does USDA have responsibility to finance activities in this area?

d. What are the alternatives to the use of TC&S? Can the service be obtained from other sources? Are there additional services that might be provided? Some that can be eliminated? Can it be more precisely identified for planning and programming purposes?

e. How effective is the service provided? Does AID have a basis for evaluating service? Projecting demands? Identifying services requested? Received? Costs and comparisons for similar services?

f. What are the administrative arrangements for TC&S? Can they be improved? Are the procedures for requesting, supplying and reimbursing services adequate? Should requests be centrally controlled? How is workload identified? Requested?

g. What are the internal systems governing the establishment of charges? Can AID project workload? If not, how should minimum staffing requirements be established? How should they be supported? Should the degree of accounting and reporting vary in relationship to the scope of activity?

In seeking to find the answers to these questions, the task force will continue meeting with representatives of the various agencies involved in the joint endeavor. We will continue to probe existing procedures to determine whether the current arrangement has proved satisfactory and whether changes in methods of operation should be considered.

KENNETH HAINES
LEE HERRICK
GEORGE WALDMAN

Attachment #37

REPORT OF USDA TC&S ACTIVITIES - JULY-DECEMBER 1968

During the first half of FY 1969, the various USDA agencies performed a wide variety of Technical Consultation and Support services. These included responding to requests for technical assistance from the various AID Missions, Bureau personnel, AID contractors, LDC officials, etc. In addition, the agencies were actively involved in PASA recruitment, providing refresher training and consultation for returning technicians, assisting AID/W program and country evaluations.

Some of the more significant activities, by agency, are described below:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE - recruited technicians to serve on both resident and short-term PASAs in India (food consultant, corn milling consultant and insect control specialist), Ethiopia (desert locust), Pakistan (soils survey), Africa (survey for site relocation of tsetse fly research) and Vietnam (rice drying and grain marketing specialists). During this period, ARS reviewed and advised AID/WOH on a Handbook on Tropical Agriculture and was heavily involved in the Joint USDA/AID Program Evaluation.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE - provided technical assistance to AID/W in fields of agricultural economics including the continued preparation of Production Indices and Supply Utilization Studies. These two projects involved approximately 60% of the technical assistance rendered by the agency. The remaining time was devoted to providing information and ad hoc studies on such diverse subjects as: Evaluation of the impacts of new varieties of grain on the development process in five countries; Analysis of economic basis for capital development loans; Preparation of yield and acreage data for major crops and growth rates

in selected Latin American countries; Analysis of wheat trade in African countries and use of fertilizer and insecticides on various crops in Columbia and Ecuador. ERS technicians participated in the various country program memoranda review and provided country orientation and briefing for AID and PASA employees departing for assignments.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE - provided various PASA supporting activities including technical review on proposed Brazil and Pakistan PASA's. Furnished Vietnam team members information on cooperatives role in fish culture. FCS met with representatives of AID/W and the "National Association of the Partners of the Alliance" to develop a program of donating unutilized cooperative owned dairy equipment to Latin American countries. They assisted AID/W in the preparing of a speech and position papers for the OAS "Conference on Cooperative Development in Latin America" and responded to 15 requests from Missions, AID/W, LDC representatives and PASA teams.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION - recruited technicians assigned to Malawi credit and Tanzania teams and assisted in preparation of final reports. Planned for reactivation of Nigeria credit PASA. Involved in the development of the Brazil-Sao Francisco Valley project (AID-Interior-USDA project). The FHA Puerto Rican Office served as third country credit consultant to Latin American countries undertaking national credit training programs.

FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE - was involved in recruitment of PASA team members and consultants to serve in Pakistan, Congo, Brazil, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Philippines and Uganda and a chemical advisor for AID/W. FES also provided backstopping and consultation for Pakistan

watershed management and Tanzania livestock and land consolidation teams. They also furnished refresher training for returning AID Nigeria and Vietnam technicians and briefed AID technician leaving for Latin America. At AID/W request, the agency reviewed various publications including "Village Technology." FES also assembled 500 copies of the Agricultural and Home Economist manual. They continued preparation of a new version of the publication Home Making Around the World and Bibliography of Foreign Based Extension Research.

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE - performed continuing administrative management services for both IADS and the Departmental PASA personnel. In addition, their attache service supported the AID/USDA activities by making available their reports on the agricultural situation in foreign aid countries. However, no charges are included for this latter service.

FOREST SERVICE - arranged for assignment of resident forestry technicians to Laos and consultant in forestry and nursery program in Thailand. Responded to sixty-five (65) inquiries from Missions, AID/W and LDC representatives. Met with AID and industry representatives to develop a forest products utilization project for Paraguay.

INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICE - IADS TC&S activities were an outgrowth of its responsibilities to service the USDA international development program by directing and coordinating the Department's support of the AID program, including PASA, Training and TC&S efforts.

Activities related to the implementation of USDA PASA's activities constitute the major portion of its workload under TC&S.

During the first six months this activity reflected a material increase in workload over previous years. By December 31, a total of 73 PASA's were implemented which compares to a like number negotiated for the entire fiscal year 1968 period.

Increased activity was concentrated in Africa. This reflected an increasing emphasis on the agricultural development problems of this area. The Asia region similarly reflected an increase in emphasis with the reestablishment of Indonesia as an aid recipient nation and increased USDA participation in AID's program on soil management problems in India and Pakistan. There was also greater emphasis on the nutritional and food fortification problems of the LDC's.

More time was devoted by IADS staff to the recruiting of technicians to serve abroad. Significantly the increased activity was concentrated in the Africa and Asia regional areas in which the IADS staff is financed by TC&S. The number of on-board resident technicians for these regions totalled 80 comparged to 69 last summer, despite the BALPA reduction exercise. Similarly the recruitment of short-term consultants increased. During this six month period arrangements were made for 62 technicians to serve abroad, exceeding the numbers recruited in previous like periods.

As a continuing activity, the Department supported AID in its program evaluation activities. During this period IADS coordinated USDA's participation in 35 country program reviews, providing analyses, suggestions and "issue paper" as necessary for AID Administrator and

Regional Bureau review sessions. During this period IADS also coordinated the Department's side of the evaluation of the activities carried on by the Department for AID; IADS' administrative staff, particularly, was heavily involved in this work.

In addition to the annual country program reviews, there were numerous ad hoc requests to IADS for comment on AID programs. These requests came from PPC, PRR and WOH (ARDS); the requests have been concerned with: AID program direction and emphasis in agriculture; evaluations of ongoing AID research contracts and proposed studies involving agencies outside as well as inside USDA. At AID's request, IADS developed proposals for increasing the level and effectiveness of resources going into marketing and related problems as LDCs move from subsistence to commercial farming. IADS has also worked with WOH on Congressional reports on agriculture required under AID's legislation.

In cooperation with AID and State Department, IADS also continued to develop the USDA proposals for self-help included in the PL 480 agreements. These included obtaining general agreements on the provisions affecting India grain storage capacity and Indonesia's price and procurement policy necessary to encourage farmer rice production, especially during scarce periods.

As the Department's focal point for technical assistance, IADS provided day-to-day support to ongoing projects, as well as arranging for newly proposed activities. This necessitated keeping apprised of the daily communication from Missions, PASA teams, Embassies, etc., which

required action and response. In addition, there was constant exchange of information between IADS technicians and AID/W staff. Excluding the requests serviced by Information Services Group, it is estimated that more than 2,000 communications emanating from the Missions and PASA teams -- requiring responses.

The IADS staff assisted in the preparation and publication of USDA/AID technical reports, including those of the Pakistan soil and water conservation servey team, the West African rice survey team, the Tanzania livestock development team, and a report on the Paraguay sawmill industry.

Submitted at least 15 articles for AID's War on Hunger magazine and USDA periodicals in addition to a full range of public affairs work carried out cooperatively with AID's and USDA's information offices.

During the first half of FY 1969, the IADS Information Services Group responded to more than 2,000 requests for technical information from AID Missions, USDA/AID PASA teams, AID/W, USDA/W, other government agencies, LDC officials, and others in the agricultural development community. Provided preassignment orientation to 75 USDA/AID PASA team members. Reviewed, selected, and obtained 25,000 copies of 200 useful publications for weekly packets to AID Mission RDO's and 12,000 copies of 100 technical publications to USDA/AID PASA team members' weekly packets. Began an indexed library of books, development assistance reports, and other information (some 2,000 titles so far). Published and reprinted ten(10) USDA reports and other articles for USDA/AID distribution.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE - provided refresher training for AID technicians returned from Dominican Republic. The PASA support activities rendered included recruiting members for Tanzania team, briefed departing Columbia team leader, and assisted Associate Administrator in completing evaluation and report on Pakistan Study. During this period the SCS was heavily involved in the Joint USDA-AID Program Evaluation. They also responded to 21 inquiries from Missions and LDC officials.

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE - with representatives of AID, and Bureau of Census they serve on the Interagency Committee responsible for for planning and developing the International World Census of Agriculture projects. Planning involved establishing training and laboratory centers, curricula, selection procedures, etc. Other activities included PASA recruitment (Korea and Paraguay), and miscellaneous project support for Brazil and Bolivia teams. Responded to six (6) inquiries from AID Missions.