

9310209(3)
PD-AAC-686

Date: NOV 12 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: Members of the Research and Development
Committee

FROM: TA/PPU, Carl R. Fritz *C.R.F.*

SUBJECT: Approved Project Identification Document

Attached is a copy of a Project Identification Document (PID) which has been approved by the Assistant Administrator for Technical Assistance for project design and the drafting of a Project Paper (PP):

Project Title: Managing Planned Agricultural and Rural Development

Project Number: 931-11-190-209

Initial FY: 76

Responsible Office: TA/DA

If you have any comments, questions or issues which you would like to see addressed in the PP, please send them directly to the responsible office listed above with a copy to TA/PPU. They should be received by that office within two weeks/~~one month~~, so that the comments can be addressed by the drafter.

The draft PP will be submitted to the Research and Development Committee for review and comment. However, we encourage your comments as early in the design process as feasible so that the project can be responsive to Agency concerns.

Attachment: a/s

cc: TA Technical Office

MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 6, 1975

TO : AA/TA, Mr. Curtis Farrar

FROM : TA/PPU, John N. Gunning

SUBJECT: PID Clearance

Project Title: Managing Planned Agricultural and Rural Development

Begins FY 1976.

1. The PID complies with the following AA/TA instructions if the appropriate block is checked. Otherwise, comments are attached.

- a. Main points of Program Guidance #3 covered.
- b. AA/TA budget review comments have been incorporated or adequately appealed in the narrative.
- c. Proposed funding is within limits described in TA Bureau FY 76/77 Program Submission to PPC and/or as amended by current OYB.
- d. Dates of PP development, approval and project initiation are realistic and consistent with the Program Submission.

2. This PID has been in TA/PPU and staff work is incomplete because of TA/PPU work pressure, or Tech office work pressure. We recommend you return the PID for further review prior to your final decision.

3. We recommend the following action:

a. Approval

(1) subject to _____

b. Disapproval or delay for reasons specified in attached.

4. AA/TA Action

Approved

Subject to CW

Disapproved

Curtis Farrar
Signature

11/7/75
Date

I. Summary of the Problem and Proposed Response

There continues to be an unsatisfactory rate of progress in solving the problems of agricultural and rural development, despite intensified and expanded efforts by the major donor agencies and LDC governments.

These increased efforts include:

- a. Attempts at comprehensive sectoral analysis and systematic planning of agriculture and rural development, supported by sector loans, and often, increased domestic allocation of resources.
- b. National or regional commodity campaigns
- c. Improvements in technological packages and delivery of services
- d. Improved marketing arrangements, and
- e. Greater concentration upon the equity considerations of assisting smaller farmers, improving infrastructure and service and maximizing employment opportunities in the agriculture and rural sectors.

These efforts impose increasing burdens on local agricultural and other rural institutions and managers who are usually ill-prepared to perform their responsibilities because of inappropriate or insufficient training.

This project will continue an attack on the problem initiated in FY 71 under the Agricultural Management KPA and will draw predominantly on the results of one area of activity under a prior TA/DA project. Its purpose is to directly improve the ability of in-country LDC training institutions to improve the management abilities of middle and lower level LDC Agricultural Managers and

and through them to improve the performance of ministries and other agricultural agencies and organizations and ultimately the farmers they serve. This will be accomplished by (a) synthesizing, improving and tailoring to specific country needs, the training materials already /developed; and (b) by assisting selected LDC training and research institutions in two countries in the utilization of this material through a program of training and consulting assistance to operating organizations and institutions responsible for agriculture and rural development within the countries concerned.

Outputs Required:

1. General and country-adapted training methods and materials, incorporated into training courses of suitable length and content.
2. Methods and mechanisms for accelerated diffusion and utilization of the foregoing, tested through applications in at least two developing countries.
3. Trained agricultural managers capable of performing more effectively in post training situations.

Technical Resources Required:

A contractor knowledgeable about basic agricultural development problems in LDCs and particularly skilled at assisting LDC trainers in developing and conducting an easily replicable problem solving type training program for middle level managers which is relevant to their operational environment and which they are capable of absorbing through a training program of a "short course" nature

and of subsequently applying in their own work situations. The approximate dollar costs and man months of effort for the proposed four year project are set forth in II below. Obligations will begin in the 4th quarter of FY 76 and be completed in FY 79.

Assumptions:

1. That managerial competence is an essential component of improved institutional performance.

2. That USAIDs and selected LDC agricultural institutions (both training and operating) will collaborate in the agricultural management improvement efforts of this project.

3. That the acceptance of and need for management training assistance by LDC agricultural institutions is substantial now and will continue to increase, so that there will be a non-TAB funded market for the training products to be produced by the project once they have been tested and proven of value in LDC country situations.

Related Activities:

The Agricultural Development Council has been active in this area. The Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA), working under a grant from the LA Bureau, has developed a methodology for agricultural program management. IICA is working in seven countries and have requests for their services in eight more. Representatives of these two organizations have participated in the evaluation of the work done to date under a prior TA/DA project and have recommended its utilization in the manner provided for in this project. Close coordination will be maintained with

these and other organizations concerned with Agricultural Management and with AID Missions such as Ghana, Kenya, Philippines, and Indonesia who have related ongoing or proposed country level programs and projects to which the output of this project can be related.

Alternatives:

Alternatives are to:

1. Discontinue activities in the specific area and disseminate the results of past work in "as is" form for such use as AID Missions, LDC governments and others care to make of it.

2. Incorporate this project into a broader integrated attack on what have been identified as the several principle constraints impeding improved management of agricultural development.

(Note: As outlined here, this project will address these other dimensions only in the context of training to improve the human resource base).

Alternative one has been set aside because in our opinion, and that of the review team, it will not achieve an adequate return on the work accomplished to date. Alternative two is more attractive and more in keeping with the original approach taken in the key problem area analysis and work program from which this project is derived. However, our current staff resources do not permit us to develop and manage a multi-faceted project of this nature. Since the training activity proposed herein is capable of either standing alone or being woven into a broader program at a later date we believe it appropriate to begin, or more appropriately

continue, the activity proposed herein in the limited context indicated without foregoing the possibility of integrating it into a broader spectrum of program activity, based either in TA/DA or elsewhere in the Agency.

Beneficiaries:

The direct beneficiaries of this program will be the LDC Agricultural Managers whose capabilities will be enhanced by the training. Farmers and others in rural areas who are the target of government programs handled by these managers will benefit from the improved institutional performance which should result.

Spread Effects:

Institutions and individuals (both LDC and U.S.) involved in the development and use of these materials will continue to train agricultural managers and planners and to develop trainers and consultants. The materials will be used by other institutions which will be added to the network of institutions concerned with problems of managing agricultural development. Development of information materials and manpower exchange between institutions will further spread the results of the project.

II. Financial Requirements and Plans

Estimated costs of this four-year (including the FY 76 Interim Quarter) project is \$1,900,000 with projected obligations as shown below.

Tentative Budget

	<u>FY 76</u> <u>Amount (\$000)</u>	<u>MM</u>	<u>All Other</u> <u>Amount (\$000)</u>	<u>MM</u>
Personal	210	117	626	291
Fringe Benefits	53		158	
Overhead	106		312	
Travel	35		108	
Per diem	13		35	
Contract Services	19	7	63	23
Workshops & Conf.	10		66	
Other Direct Costs	<u>22</u>		<u>64</u>	
Total	<u>468</u>	<u>124</u>	<u>1432</u>	<u>314</u>

TOTAL (all years) \$1,900,000.

III. Development of the Project

This project will commence the field application of training methods and materials developed under TA/DA project 720-936, Agricultural Management.

The Project Paper will be developed in accordance with the findings and recommendations of an Agency Review Committee which has just completed a review of the output of the earlier project activity. Some involvement of Regional Bureau personnel may be required in Project Paper preparation, but this should be minimal in view of the relatively intensive effort already put forth by key Bureau personnel on the Review Committee. We expect to submit the Project Paper for R&D Committee consideration o/a 1 December, 1975.

9310209(4)
PD-AAC-686

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Mr. Carl Fritz, TA/PPU

DATE: Jan 15, 1976

FROM : Jerome French, TA/DA

SUBJECT: Development Administration Project Paper #931-11-190-209
Managing Planned Agricultural and Rural Development Phase I:
(GTS-KPA #6)

Issues raised concerning the subject proposal at the R&DC meeting held January 14, 1976 are presented as follows with TA/DA responses. The meeting was chaired by Mr. John Gunning, Asst. Director, TA/PPU. R&DC members present at the meeting for discussion of the project were:

Mr. William M. Feldman, LA/DR
Mr. Woodrow Leake, AFR/DS
Mr. Von Yoder, ASIA/TD/RD

Others attending the meeting were representatives from TA/DA (Messrs. Chapman, Worthington, Tinnermeir, French) and TA/PPU (Ms. Vaitaitis).

Mr. French introduced the project paper and made the following comments relating to previously identified Regional Bureau concerns.

1. The project is a follow-on to TAB Agricultural Management Project 931-11-720-936. The latter project was reviewed last October by a team chaired by W. Averill former Deputy Director TA/AGR; Mr. Kenneth Sherper, AFR/DS; Ms. Grace Langley, NESA/TECH; Mr. Abe Weisblat, Director Research and Training Network, Agricultural Development Council; and Mr. Francisco Nadal, Head of the Agricultural Management Team of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences in Costa Rica.

In developing the new PF TA/DA was particularly concerned with implementing the review team's recommendations to: a) provide sufficient funds and time to carry out an effective in-country testing of the product of the previous project in two countries, and b) that the test effort reach sufficient numbers within those countries to make a significant impact on their agricultural development programs.



2. Mr. French pointed out that the new project is not aimed simply at presenting a training program, but rather to create in two countries a self-sustaining system for continuous improvement of the management effectiveness of both the individuals and the organizations in which they serve. (See pp 31-35 of the project paper) This, together with point 1 above, explains why it is so extensive and expensive in character.

3. TA/DA recognizes the dilemma of concentrating its efforts in only two countries in order to have a significant impact in them versus the equally pertinent need to achieve a multi-country spread effect. The office has tried to provide for the latter in the PP through provision for involvement of a regional institution in each region which can serve as a mechanism for broader dissemination and application of the methodology.

4. The project also provides for creation of a field support capability for immediate application in other LDCs in response to regional bureau/USAID requests without jeopardizing work to be accomplished in the two test countries.

The following summarizes the points raised by regional bureau representatives following Mr. French's remarks and the explanation made thereto.

1. Issue: Mr. Feldman pointed out that the PP focuses on middle and lower level managers and implies that higher level agricultural managers in LDCs have generally had sufficient prior exposure to modern management techniques to be supportive. We have to be careful not to assume too much and must assure that top managers of the test countries will in fact be sufficiently supportive of the effort. This support is essential for success of the project.

Response: Mr. French stated this will be a criterion in country selection. The six-week pilot training program conducted in July-August of 1975 was designed to actually involve top-level managers in the last two weeks of the training as participants. This procedure proved very successful and is one promising means of ensuring the support of decision makers in the test countries.

2. Issue: Mr. Feldman raised the possibility of bringing into the project training institutions in the two countries in which the project is being tested if this would not complicate relationships too much to be practical.

Response: Training institutions in the two countries will be brought into the project. The intention is to work with institutions which are already established. We will avoid setting up a separate new training institution but train trainers from existing local training facilities to conduct the training and to strengthen those institutions' capability to the point where the new agricultural management training program introduced will be established on a self-sustaining basis. This will be done directly by the contractor in each of two pilot countries selected and will be extended to other interested countries through the collaborating regional institutions. Thus the country, collaborating institutions and the regional institutions are not the same and have different roles. The regional institution will be involved at the beginning of the project and will work closely with the U.S. contractor on country testing of the materials through the mechanism of the advisory committee. Regional workshops to be held at the regional institutions will be used to exchange information and experience and disseminate project results.

3. Issue: Mr. Feldman commented that the project paper seems to express undue apprehension that indigenous cultural and social factors might impede using the techniques involved. Mr. Feldman, while recognizing these legitimate concerns, expressed confidence in the pertinence of the subject, the usefulness of the materials developed by the predecessor project and the ability of a competent contractor to apply them. He felt that in Latin America at least there is sufficient concern for better management in agriculture that such factors would not be a critical impediment.

Response: The review team evaluating the earlier project emphasized the need for adequate testing to establish a satisfactory degree of cross-cultural applicability including testing in at least one non-English speaking country. TA/DA attempted to reflect the review team's concern in the new PP. However, as stated in the PP we do not believe different cultural and social factors will seriously impede acceptance and use of the methodology.

4. Issue: The cost of the project seems high. Mr. Feldman suggested savings might be achieved by working more through regional institutions where capability exists and by reducing the number of U.S. contract personnel or using organizations such as USDA who already have agricultural programs.

Response: Because of the different approach taken from that employed in existing training programs, TA/DA feels use of people who developed and thoroughly understand the methodology to support the in-country application phase is very important. The PP provides for training host country trainers and transferring full responsibility to them as quickly as possible. The intention is to share results with the regional and country institutions involved and let them take over as quickly as possible.

5. Issue: Mr. Feldman noted that speed-up in project implementation could be effected by selection of the countries simultaneously with contract negotiations.

Response: Mr. French stated that TA/DA desired full regional bureau participation both in developing criteria for country selection and in making selections. While preliminary work could be done in the interim, the contractor should not be faced with a fait accompli but rather allowed to participate in the final selection. TA/DA agrees that bureau knowledge of country specific conditions will be a valuable aid to country selection. One immediate decision which will have to be made if the project is approved will be to decide how to reply to the request from the Government of Guyana, endorsed by the USAID, that it be given priority consideration as one of the two pilot countries.

6. Issue: It was suggested by Mr. Leake that if two countries only are involved, the project might better be done by the regional bureau concerned.

Response: It could be done this way if only one region were involved, however, TA/DA's intention was to select countries in two different regions. The need for agricultural management training has been highlighted by all regional bureaus and restriction to one region would preclude effective cross-regional interchange. If any of

the regional bureaus would like to incorporate the work into their own programs, e.g., the existing agricultural management activity in Ghana, TA/DA would be happy to cooperate in that effort. USAID Manila has already approached us about doing so there.

7. Issue: Mr. Leake also noted that one-factor solutions to development problems, i.e., training, are insufficient and feasibility of new training techniques is best tested within an integrated agricultural development program. Also considerable training of indigenous agricultural managers has already been accomplished through prior AID and other donor programs in a number of countries.

Response: TA/DA agrees that one factor solutions are not effective. The training is task and problem oriented. It is designed to help managers implement multifaceted programs. TA/DA expects to make the existence of complementary factor inputs a criterion in the selection of test countries.

Mr. Gunning noted the lack of full attendance and recommended that TAB circulate a supplementary memorandum outlining issues raised by the regional bureaus, the TA/DA replies, and inviting comments for the consideration of the AA/TA. He suggested the project paper would be fully adequate when supplemented by whatever comments the bureaus may make and would not require rewriting. This recommendation was accepted by the members present.

Although no formal note was taken Mr. Von Yoder of the ASIA Bureau indicated the ASIA Bureau recommendation for approval.

It is TA/DA's conclusion from the discussion in this meeting that the other Bureaus represented had no fundamental objections to the PP. TA/DA concludes that the PP is acceptable to them when supplemented by the responses to issues raised in the R&DC meeting, as recorded herein.

TA/DA agrees the PP does not require rewriting and recommends this issue paper be circulated to regional bureaus for comments as suggested by Mr. Gunning. If no formal objections are received within one week from the circulation of the PP, TA/DA recommends it be forwarded to the AA/TA, Mr. Farrar, for his approval.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

FVA

9310209⑤
PD: AAC-686

TO : R&DC Members

DATE: Jan 23, 1976

FROM : Carl R. Fritz, TA/PPU *Cyf*

6 p.

SUBJECT: Project Paper #931-11-190-209
Managing Planned Agricultural and Rural Development
Phase II

Attached is a supplementary memorandum prepared by TA/DA which covers discussion of the subject Project Paper at the R&DC meeting held January 14, 1976. Issues raised and responses provided are summarized herein.

It is intended to submit the Project Paper with PROP Face Sheet to Mr. Farrar for approval after one week from the date of this memorandum. Your optional comments are solicited, to be incorporated in the Action Memorandum for Mr. Farrar's consideration.

A copy of the Project Paper was forwarded to you with the R&DC agenda memo of January 6, 1976.



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Mr. Carl Fritz, TA/PPU

DATE: Jan 22, 1976

FROM : Jerome French, TA/DA 

SUBJECT: Development Administration Project Paper #931-11-190-209
Managing Planned Agricultural and Rural Development Phase II
(GTS-KPA #6)

Issues raised concerning the subject proposal at the R&DC meeting held January 14, 1976 are presented as follows with TA/DA responses. The meeting was chaired by Mr. John Gunning, Asst. Director, TA/PPU. R&DC members present at the meeting for discussion of the project were:

Mr. William M. Feldman, LA/DR
Mr. Woodrow Leake, AFR/DS
Mr. Von Yoder, ASIA/TD/RD

Others attending the meeting were representatives from TA/DA (Messrs. Chapman, Worthington, Tinnermeir, French) and TA/PPU (Ms. Vaitaitis).

Mr. French introduced the project paper and made the following comments relating to previously identified Regional Bureau concerns.

1. The project is a follow-on to TAB Agricultural Management Project 931-11-720-936. The latter project was reviewed last October by a team chaired by W. Averill former Deputy Director TA/AGR; Mr. Kenneth Sherper, AFR/DS; Ms. Grace Langley, NESA/TECH; Mr. Abe Weisblat, Director Research and Training Network, Agricultural Development Council; and Mr. Francisco Nadal, Head of the Agricultural Management Team of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences in Costa Rica.

In developing the new PF TA/DA was particularly concerned with implementing the review team's recommendations to: a) provide sufficient funds and time to carry out an effective in-country testing of the product of the previous project in two countries, and b) that the test effort reach sufficient numbers within those countries to make a significant impact on their agricultural development programs.



2. Mr. French pointed out that the new project is not aimed simply at presenting a training program, but rather to create in two countries a self-sustaining system for continuous improvement of the management effectiveness of both the individuals and the organizations in which they serve. (See pp 31-35 of the project paper) This, together with point 1 above, explains why it is so extensive and expensive in character.

3. TA/DA recognizes the dilemma of concentrating its efforts in only two countries in order to have a significant impact in them versus the equally pertinent need to achieve a multi-country spread effect. The office has tried to provide for the latter in the PP through provision for involvement of a regional institution in each region which can serve as a mechanism for broader dissemination and application of the methodology.

4. The project also provides for creation of a field support capability for immediate application in other LDCs in response to regional bureau/USAID requests without jeopardizing work to be accomplished in the two test countries.

The following summarizes the points raised by regional bureau representatives following Mr. French's remarks and the explanation made thereto.

1. Issue: Mr. Feldman pointed out that the PP focuses on middle and lower level managers and implies that higher level agricultural managers in LDCs have generally had sufficient prior exposure to modern management techniques to be supportive. We have to be careful not to assume too much and must assure that top managers of the test countries will in fact be sufficiently supportive of the effort. This support is essential for success of the project.

Response: Mr. French stated this will be a criterion in country selection. The six-week pilot training program conducted in July-August of 1975 was designed to actually involve top-level managers in the last two weeks of the training as participants. This procedure proved very successful and is one promising means of ensuring the support of decision makers in the test countries.

2. Issue: Mr. Feldman raised the possibility of bringing into the project training institutions in the two countries in which the project is being tested if this would not complicate relationships too much to be practical.

Response: Training institutions in the two countries will be brought into the project. The intention is to work with institutions which are already established. We will avoid setting up a separate new training institution but train trainers from existing local training facilities to conduct the training and to strengthen those institutions' capability to the point where the new agricultural management training program introduced will be established on a self-sustaining basis. This will be done directly by the contractor in each of two pilot countries selected and will be extended to other interested countries through the collaborating regional institutions. Thus the country, collaborating institutions and the regional institutions are not the same and have different roles. The regional institution will be involved at the beginning of the project and will work closely with the U.S. contractor on country testing of the materials through the mechanism of the advisory committee. Regional workshops to be held at the regional institutions will be used to exchange information and experience and disseminate project results.

3. Issue: Mr. Feldman commented that the project paper seems to express undue apprehension that indigenous cultural and social factors might impede using the techniques involved. Mr. Feldman, while recognizing these legitimate concerns, expressed confidence in the pertinence of the subject, the usefulness of the materials developed by the predecessor project and the ability of a competent contractor to apply them. He felt that in Latin America at least there is sufficient concern for better management in agriculture that such factors would not be a critical impediment.

Response: The review team evaluating the earlier project emphasized the need for adequate testing to establish a satisfactory degree of cross-cultural applicability including testing in at least one non-English speaking country. TA/DA attempted to reflect the review team's concern in the new PP. However, as stated in the PP we do not believe different cultural and social factors will seriously impede acceptance and use of the methodology.

4. Issue: The cost of the project seems high. Mr. Feldman suggested savings might be achieved by working more through regional institutions where capability exists and by reducing the number of U.S. contract personnel or using organizations such as USDA who already have agricultural programs.

Response: Because of the different approach taken from that employed in existing training programs, TA/DA feels use of people who developed and thoroughly understand the methodology to support the in-country application phase is very important. The PP provides for training host country trainers and transferring full responsibility to them as quickly as possible. The intention is to share results with the regional and country institutions involved and let them take over as quickly as possible.

5. Issue: Mr. Feldman noted that speed-up in project implementation could be effected by selection of the countries simultaneously with contract negotiations.

Response: Mr. French stated that TA/DA desired full regional bureau participation both in developing criteria for country selection and in making selections. While preliminary work could be done in the interim, the contractor should not be faced with a fait accompli but rather allowed to participate in the final selection. TA/DA agrees that bureau knowledge of country specific conditions will be a valuable aid to country selection. One immediate decision which will have to be made if the project is approved will be to decide how to reply to the request from the Government of Guyana, endorsed by the USAID, that it be given priority consideration as one of the two pilot countries.

6. Issue: It was suggested by Mr. Leake that if two countries only are involved, the project might better be done by the regional bureau concerned.

Response: It could be done this way if only one region were involved, however, TA/DA's intention was to select countries in two different regions. The need for agricultural management training has been highlighted by all regional bureaus and restriction to one region would preclude effective cross-regional interchange. If any of

the regional bureaus would like to incorporate the work into their own programs, e.g., the existing agricultural management activity in Ghana, TA/DA would be happy to cooperate in that effort. USAID Manila has already approached us about doing so there.

7. Issue: Mr. Leake also noted that one-factor solutions to development problems, i.e., training, are insufficient and feasibility of new training techniques is best tested within an integrated agricultural development program. Also considerable training of indigenous agricultural managers has already been accomplished through prior AID and other donor programs in a number of countries.

Response: TA/DA agrees that one factor solutions are not effective. The training is task and problem oriented. It is designed to help managers implement multifaceted programs. TA/DA expects to make the existence of complementary factor inputs a criterion in the selection of test countries.

Mr. Gunning noted the lack of full attendance and recommended that TAB circulate a supplementary memorandum outlining issues raised by the regional bureaus, the TA/DA replies, and inviting comments for the consideration of the AA/TA. He suggested the project paper would be fully adequate when supplemented by whatever comments the bureaus may make and would not require rewriting. This recommendation was accepted by the members present.

Although no formal note was taken Mr. Von Yoder of the ASIA Bureau indicated the ASIA Bureau recommendation for approval.

It is TA/DA's conclusion from the discussion in this meeting that the other Bureaus represented had no fundamental objections to the PP. TA/DA concludes that the PP is acceptable to them when supplemented by the responses to issues raised in the R&DC meeting, as recorded herein.

TA/DA agrees the PP does not require rewriting and recommends this issue paper be circulated to regional bureaus for comments as suggested by Mr. Gunning. If no formal objections are received within one week from the circulation of the PP, TA/DA recommends it be forwarded to the AA/TA, Mr. Farrar, for his approval.

AID 1350-1X (7-71)	DEPT. OF STATE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	1. Cooperating Country TAB	Page 1 of 1 Pages
		2. PIO/T No. 931-11-190-209-73-	3. <input type="checkbox"/> Original or Amendment No. <u>1</u>
PIO/T	PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ORDER/TECHNICAL SERVICES	4. Project/Activity No. and Title 9310209 (6) Managing Planned Agriculture PD-AAC-686	

DISTRIBUTION	5. Appropriation Symbol 72-11x1023	6.A. Allotment Symbol and Charge 402-31-099-00-20-51	6.B. Funds Allotted to: <input type="checkbox"/> A.I.D./W <input type="checkbox"/> Mission
	7. Obligation Status <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative Reservation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementing Document		8. Funding Period (Mo., Day, Yr.) From 9/20/76 to 9/20/78
	9.A. Services to Start (Mo., Day, Yr.) Between 9/1/76 and 9/15/76		9.B. Completion date of Services (Mo., Day, Yr.) 3/20 1980
10.A. Type of Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A.I.D. Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Cooperating Country Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Participating Agency Service Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Other			
10.B. Authorized Agent			

Estimated Financing		(1) Previous Total	(2) Increase	(3) Decrease	(4) Total to Date
\$1.00=					
11. Maximum A.I.D. -Financing	A. Dollars	185,000	777,000		962,000
	B. U.S.-Owned Local Currency				
12. Cooperating Country Contributions	A. Counterpart				
	B. Other				

13. Mission References	14. Instructions to Authorized Agent SER/CM/COD is authorized to negotiate a full 30-month contract with Governmental Affairs Institute. Incremental funding of \$777,000 is provided herein and covers Phase II described in the original PIO/T.
------------------------	--

15. Clearances - Show Office Symbol, Signature and Date for all Necessary Clearances.	
A. The specifications in the scope of work are technically adequate TA/DA; <i>E. Thomas Chapman</i> 8/26/76	B. Funds for the services requested are available TA/PPU; <i>Mary Mozynski</i>
C. The scope of work lies within the purview of the initiating and approved Agency Programs TA/DA; <i>Charles C. Briggs</i> 8/26/76	D. <i>Helen Vaitaitis</i> TA/PPU; <i>H. Vaitaitis</i> 9/26/76
E.	F.

16. For the cooperating country: The terms and conditions set forth herein are hereby agreed to	17. For the Agency for International Development Signature: <i>John Gunning</i> , Asst. Title: Director, Programs, TA/PPU	18. Date of Signature 9/1/76
Signature and date:		
Title:		

1310209 (7)
PD-AAC-686

September 22, 1976

MEMO TO: CM/COD/TAB; Ms. Virginia Perelli

THRU: TA/PPU; Mr. John N. Gunning

FROM: AA/TA; Samuel E. Butterfield
TA/DA; E. Thomas Chapman

2p.

SUBJ: Managing Planned Agriculture - Governmental Affairs
Institute (GAI) Proposal of 27 August 1976

This memorandum is intended to assess the adequacy of the GAI proposal in light of AID's approved project paper of 15 December 1975, entitled Managing Planned Agriculture. Attached is a clarifying PIO/T for your signature.

1. The GAI proposal is consistent with and can accomplish the purposes of the PP for Phases III and IV (see p.4 of PP).
2. The GAI proposal leaves \$75,000 within the life-of-project funding total forecast in the PP (i.e., \$1.9 million) to do Phase V, which will complete the project. There also seems to be \$40,000 identified as institutional grant funds in the proposal of GAI which would apply to the dissemination purposes of Phase V. However, that is not yet clear. It will not be possible to tell what, if anything, will be needed for Phase V for another 18 months or more. By that time we should have some sense of the probability of success of Phases III and IV and, related thereto, some sense of field mission and regional bureau interest and readiness to fund a fair share of additional country efforts. TA/DA will be responsible too for pursuing this matter during the next two years.
3. The GAI proposal has deleted, at AA/TA request, the Advisory Committee proposed in the PP. This was done because it became clear that much of the substance of the committee work could be accomplished as part of the regular annual evaluations and because the tight 27 month time frame for accomplishment of Phases III and IV would require the proposed committee of otherwise busy and widely scattered experts to respond on call and very rapidly to GAI draft papers. Our experience with such high level committees is that they cannot do that. Yet, unless the committee could do so it would jeopardize the contractor's ability to meet his contractual responsibilities and probably

would result in a reasonable claim for additional time and money to complete the work. For these reasons we concluded that the Advisory Committee provisions should be set aside. The Advisory Committee was not something of great interest to our regional bureau colleagues.

4. The GAI proposal adds three months each to Phases III and IV, and as a consequence \$485,000 to the contract total of \$1,335,000 projected in the original PIO/T. Of this, \$40,000 for the grant referred to above may be incorrectly included, but this is not yet clear. This and other matters of precise scope and price will be negotiated by SER/CO with GAI.

5. We would appreciate your approving the attached PIO/T, which reflects the adjustments noted above.

Attachment: a