

PD-ABP-630 95266

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECT DATA SHEET		1. TRANSACTION CODE <input type="checkbox"/> A = Add <input type="checkbox"/> C = Change <input type="checkbox"/> D = Delete	Amendment Number <u>3</u>	DOCUMENT CODE <u>3</u>
2. COUNTRY/ENTITY LIBERIA		3. PROJECT NUMBER <u>669-0153</u>		
4. BUREAU/OFFICE AFR <input type="checkbox"/> 06		5. PROJECT TITLE (maximum 40 characters) <u>Rural Development Training</u>		
6. PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION DATE (PACD) MM DD YY <u>1 13 08 4</u>		7. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION (Under 'B' below, enter 1, 2, 3, or 4) A. Initial FY <u>7 7</u> B. Quarter <u>4</u> C. Final FY <u>8 4</u>		

8. COSTS (\$000 OR EQUIVALENT \$1 =)						
A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY			LIFE OF PROJECT		
	B. FX	C. L/C	D. Total	E. FX	F. L/C	G. Total
AID Appropriated Total						
(Grant)	(460)	(500)	(960)	(2800)	(2930)	(5730)
(Loan)						
Other U.S.						
1. PVO	10	60	70	80	824	904
2.						
Host Country					693	693
Other Donor(s) & Sources				194	525	719
TOTALS	470	560	1030	3074	4972	8046

9. SCHEDULE OF AID FUNDING (\$000)									
A. APPRO- PRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	C. PRIMARY TECH. CODE		D. OBLIGATIONS TO DATE		E. AMOUNT APPROVED THIS ACTION		F. LIFE OF PROJECT	
		1. Grant	2. Loan	1. Grant	2. Loan	1. Grant	2. Loan	1. Grant	2. Loan
(1)	600	690		3905		975		5730	
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
TOTALS				3905		975		5730	

10. SECONDARY TECHNICAL CODES (maximum 6 codes of 3 positions each) <u>790</u> <u>000</u>	11. SECONDARY PURPOSE CODE <u>210</u>
12. SPECIAL CONCERNS CODES (maximum 7 codes of 4 positions each)	
A. Code	
B. Amount	

13. PROJECT PURPOSE (maximum 480 characters)

To train agricultural subprofessional workers for transfer of agricultural technology, methods and knowledge.

14. SCHEDULED EVALUATIONS Interim MM YY MM YY Final MM YY 	15. SOURCE/ORIGIN OF GOODS AND SERVICES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 000 <input type="checkbox"/> 941 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>935</u>
--	--

16. AMENDMENTS/NATURE OF CHANGE PROPOSED (This is page 1 of a _____ page PP Amendment.)

This amendment will extend the life of project by 21 months and increase A.I.D.'s contribution by \$1,825,000.

17. APPROVED BY	Signature 	Date Signed MM DD YY <u>06 08 83</u>	18. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID/W DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION MM DD YY
	Title Mission Director USAID/Liberia		

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I Project Background	1
II Project Description	4
Curriculum	4
Technical Assistance	6
Program Development and Guidance	6
Participant Training	7
Maintenance	8
Operating Costs	8
Project Evaluation and Design	9
End of Project Status	9
Other Donor Involvement	11
III Budget and Financial Plan	11
IV Implementation Plan	18
Cooperative Agreement	18
CUC Responsibilities and Administrative Procedures	18
Financial Management and Records	18
Technical Assistance	19
Procurement	19
Evaluation and Design	19
Monitoring and Reporting	20
V Implementation Schedule	21
Appendix A: Detailed Illustrative Budget for Amendment Period	23
Appendix B: Methods for Calculating RDI's costs for facilities and services shared with CUC	30

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

CARI	Central Agricultural Research Institute
CUC	Cuttington University College
EEC	European Economic Community
GOL	Government of Liberia
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MPEA	Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs
NEF	Near East Foundation
OPG	Operational Program Grant
PECUSA	Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
RDI	Rural Development Institute
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development Mission to Liberia

- 1 -

The Rural Development Training Project (669-0153) was authorized on August 20, 1977, as a \$2,900,000 OPG to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States (PECUSA) to establish the Rural Development Institute at Cuttington University College. On July 9th, 1981, the Acting Assistant Administrator for Africa authorized a \$300,000 amendment to the project and a further amendment was authorized on August 12, 1982, to increase funding by additional \$705,000, bringing AID's life-of-project contribution to \$3,905,000.

This proposal would amend the project to increase AID funding by a further \$1,825,000 and extend the life of project to November 30, 1984. By this time AID will have decided whether to proceed with a second phase to the RDI Project (the design of which will be funded under this amendment). The amendment will also change the mode of implementation from an OPG with PECUSA to a Cooperative Agreement with Cuttington University College (CUC).

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The purpose of the RDI Project is to "train agricultural sub-professional workers for transferring agricultural technology, methods and knowledge." This was to be accomplished by establishing the Rural Development Institute (RDI), a two-year, post-secondary training program for sub-professional agriculturalists. In November, 1982, an evaluation of the project was completed which found that, despite numerous accomplishments in attaining its purpose, RDI suffered from major shortcomings. Presently, it cannot keep its doors open without continued donor assistance. Moreover, a follow-on project is needed if RDI is to become a viable, self-sustaining institution. As explained below, it was decided that too many questions existed to proceed with the design of a Phase II project at present. The present amendment will extend the life of project to keep RDI operating until the parties concerned can develop a clearer picture of RDI's future and a Phase II project can be designed with more certainty.

Among the project's accomplishments so far is the establishment of a curriculum and training program for a two-year, Associate Agriculture degree with majors in plant science, animal science, rural technology (agricultural engineering) and soil science. Students carry 18 classroom-hour credits which are supplemented with practical classes in the field. The physical plant of RDI has been largely completed. Its present facilities consist of six dormitories, eight staff houses, six classrooms

and administrative and faculty offices. Sufficient dormitory space exists for the projected maximum enrollment of 200 students. Most significantly, RDI has produced three classes of graduates, totaling 219 students. Of the 126 graduates in the first two classes, 85% are known to have found relevant employment in the agricultural field.

These accomplishments notwithstanding, RDI cannot yet stand on its own. The most pressing problem facing RDI is operating funds. The original Project Paper made no specific plans as to how the recurrent costs of the institute were to be met after the end of the project though it stated that "recurrent costs are not expected to be a problem" (p.25). It was apparently expected that the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and Ministry of Education would be willing to fund most of these costs. This has not been the case for several reasons. Most importantly, the GOL's financial crisis has barred it from taking on the major responsibility for funding RDI. Moreover, MOA's role in the project and its level of contribution during the life of project were never firmly established prior to the project's approval and the involvement of the MOA in the project was never as great as anticipated in the original design (though, to date, the GOL has committed \$293,000 to the project). RDI's present financial position is critical. Over the past two years, the two projects amendments totalling \$1.005 million, ad hoc contributions from PECUSA and deliberate delays in paying bills have enabled RDI to keep operating. Presently, RDI has received limited funds to maintain the institution during January and February, 1983, and has had to rely on advances from CUC to open its door for the new semester in March.

Likewise, the project has given inadequate attention to staff development. The administrative staff has been Liberianized with the exception of the Director himself. The Liberian staff includes the Deputy Director, an office manager and his two assistants, a librarian and registrar. Liberianization of the faculty, however, has not proceeded as far. At present, RDI has 10 full-time faculty members of which only five are Liberians. Moreover, RDI has had to rely on four to five part-time instructors. The part-time faculty has been found to be unsuitable because they offer no opportunity for contacts with students outside of class and rarely relate or coordinate their subject matter to the content of the practicals. The evaluation concludes that training is required for eight persons to supplement the present faculty, up-grade the skills of present instructors and Liberianize positions held by expatriates.

While the construction of the physical plant was pursued with

more vigor, additional facilities are still needed including staff housing, offices, and a library. Equipment, supplies and vehicles are also in short supply.

The November 1982 evaluation also recommended several changes in RDI's program and administration. The evaluation found that the training was somewhat academically oriented, with too much emphasis given to classroom learning at the expense of teaching practical skills. Likewise the soil science and rural technology majors were found to be too specialized for the level of training that RDI is supposed to provide. Whether an associate degree is appropriate for RDI graduates is also a matter of debate which will have to be addressed during the extension period. In addition, the exact relationship and responsibilities of CUC and the MOA vis-a-vis RDI are still unresolved. To date, the MOA has had little input to the design and development of curriculum or other matters of RDI policy that would likely affect the relevance of RDI training to Liberia's needs.

Likewise, CUC's role in administering RDI has remained problematical. As an institute of CUC, RDI has to conform to certain of the college's administrative and academic procedures. However, the evaluation highlighted the concern that too close a conformance to CUC regulation would threaten to divert RDI from its original purpose as a vocational, skills-oriented institution, not an academic one. Moreover, this relationship raised many financial issues for the evaluator including charges made to RDI for the use of CUC facilities and the use of RDI facilities by CUC without compensation. Also, while RDI students use a portion of CUC's farm for training purposes, RDI has incurred costs from the farm out of proportion to the Institute's use.

The OPG mode has been found to be less than optimal for implementing the project. Communications between the four involved parties, USAID/Liberia, CUC/RDI, PECUSA and AID/W have proven to be cumbersome. As the funds have been managed by the PVO in the U.S., CUC and the USAID Mission have found it hard to stay abreast of RDI's financial position.

A final factor is the ongoing fiscal and economic crisis facing Liberia. As was noted above, the Government's severe fiscal problems prevent it from taking over greater financial responsibilities for RDI. At present, no reliable estimate can be made when the GOL will be able to assume financial responsibility for RDI. Also, the present economic slump and government hiring freeze will make it difficult for new RDI graduates not already in government employment to find jobs. Over the short-term RDI must adjust to this situation by shifting its emphasis from pre-service training to in-service training. Over the longer

term, some of the fundamental assumptions underlying RDI training must be re-examined, notably: What is the long-term demand for mid-level agriculturalists? How effective are RDI graduates at meeting the project's purpose of "transferring agricultural technology, methods and knowledge", both in terms of the training they receive and the kind of position they fill upon graduation? What is the most appropriate level of training for a mid-level agricultural worker? These questions will be the focus of a final evaluation and will be incorporated into the design of Phase II.

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this amendment is to maintain the operation of RDI during a 21-month interim period. This period will allow the issues regarding the design of the Phase II project to be resolved. Specifically, the time frame for the GOL's fiscal recovery may hopefully become more apparent during this period. Also it will allow time for the GOL to clarify what role it sees RDI playing in its agricultural development strategy. Under this amendment, an evaluation will be funded to examine the impact of RDI graduates on the project's goal of effecting the transfer of agricultural technology. The design of the Phase II project will also be funded. The amendment will in the interim period support the operation of RDI, finance technical assistance (expatriate staff), operating costs, participant training and maintenance. No major physical additions will be made to the Institute during this period. However, changes or improvements in program and administration that can be made and do not demand a major expenditure of resources will be implemented during the interim period. To the extent possible, the recommendations of the 1982 evaluation will be put into force where appropriate.

Curriculum: The only significant change presently envisaged in curriculum is focusing training on two "majors": Plant science and animal science. As noted in the November 1982 evaluation, majors in agricultural engineering and soil science were found to be too highly specialized for the kind of positions for which RDI graduates are trained. All students will specialize in either plant or animal science while taking courses in agricultural engineering and soil science to complement their area of speciality.

More extensive changes will be made in teaching methodology. The final evaluation of Phase I found that RDI was too classroom oriented and did not concentrate sufficiently on imparting skills through practical training. This judgement was shared by at least

some employers of RDI graduates and by many RDI faculty members. The required load of classroom hours did not leave the students sufficient time or energy to devote themselves adequately to practicals.

Another aspect of practical training which is missing is exposure to real world conditions and contact with the Liberian small farmer who will be the students' ultimate client. While students are taught agriculture at a post-secondary level, it is essential that they learn to communicate their knowledge to subsistence farmers with lower educational levels.

Teaching methodology needs to be reoriented to place priority on practicals and the imparting of appropriate skills. One step that will be taken immediately is to reduce the minimum course load from 18 hours to 15-16 hours to allow students more time for practicals. Other steps to be taken will have to be instituted more gradually. These proposed changes will have to be developed by the new RDI Director in consultation with the other interested parties - CUC, AID and prospective RDI employers, especially MOA. One innovation which will be developed during the extension period will be an internship program sponsored by the European Economic Community (EEC). Under the program, students will spend three months during the summer break with the MOA, a parastatal, a county agricultural development program or private corporation in a position comparable to one that a graduate would fill. The internship will take place during the students' second year, during the rainy season when most agricultural activity takes place.

Another innovation will be the establishment of a farmer involvement program. The program will have three objectives. The first is to bring students into contact with small holders so they can learn to communicate with farmers and practice extension techniques. Secondly, the program will give students exposure to real world conditions off campus so to learn first hand what problems small holders face. Finally, the farmers should benefit by learning new, better agricultural techniques. The program would be initiated by meetings held between a small group of RDI staff and students with select groups of farmers in nearby villages to exchange information on RDI and farmers' problems. After establishing these initial linkages, a committee of two representatives each from five or six local villages would be established to facilitate regular contacts with local farmers, "field day" visits by farmers to RDI and the Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI) to see new techniques demonstrated, and visits by students to local farms. Groups of students might also establish demonstration plots near the participating villages.

This program presents perils and must be implemented carefully. First, local farmers will be wary about letting

students on to their fields - and with good reason as careless or ill-disciplined students could do considerable damage to the farmers' livelihood. Also, techniques to be extended must be well proven since farmers will be understandably dubious about taking advice from young, inexperienced students. Finally, the program would have to be closely coordinated with the local extension service so to prevent any confusion among farmers. It would be preferable that the local extension agent take part in designing the program and participating when possible on field trips.

A variety of other steps will be considered by the RDI Director in developing the institute's teaching methodology. These will include changing or adjusting the present semester system to one more in tune with the crop cycle which would provide students more comprehensive skills training in the various stages of preparation, planting, maintenance and harvesting. The Director will also review the weight given in grading to practicals and competency testing and the degree of involvement of instructors in designing and monitoring the practicals. The number of students in each practical should be reduced where necessary so that students have sufficient exposure and practice in each skills.

Various alternatives should be explored for exploiting the resources of the CUC farm to provide a more integrated and comprehensive experience for students.

Technical Assistance: During the interim period of this amendment USAID will fully fund 2 expatriate staff members including the Institute's Director and finance in conjunction with the Near East Foundation three additional staff members. If possible, CUC will contract with an American university or college for the services of a Director. This would serve as the first step in building a sister-school relationship which would be expanded under a Phase II Project. Should expatriate staff need to be recruited to replace present faculty, they would also be recruited through the sister school contract. The Director will also have available to him the services of 3 person/months short-term technical assistance. The programming of this technical assistance will be flexible so that the Director will be able to call on expertise as the needs arise. Likely areas for such assistance would be on curriculum development and teaching methodology, staff development or administrative and financial management. Again, if RDI enters into a sister-school relationship, the sister institution would be used to recruit the short-term consultants.

Program Development and Guidance: One of the concerns highlighted in the November 1982 evaluation was that RDI's orientation was becoming increasingly academic, in part because it is administered

as part of an academic institution, CUC. However, Cuttington recognizes that, as a vocational training institutions, RDI has a distinct institutional goal: To train mid-level technicians in accordance with the needs of Liberia's agricultural sector and development strategy. In the short-term, this will mean largely performing in-service training for the MOA and other government organizations.

Thus, RDI requires program guidance of a unique sort since it must reflect the technical needs of the agricultural sector and should conform to government's policy and long-term strategy for agricultural development. This guidance will be provided through two mechanism. First, an Advisory Committee will be created of employers of RDI graduates to guide the development and content of curriculum, teaching methodology and academic policy. Among the institutions represented will be the MOA (by the chief training officer and various technical officers), the MPEA (by the Assistant Minister for Planning), a county level Agricultural Development Project, an agricultural parastatal, and the private sector. Also on the committee will be the RDI Director, and representatives from CUC, USAID and the RDI student body. Likewise, the Central Agricultural Research Institute (CARI) should also be represented so that the committee can be apprised of the latest technologies available, and at the same time, establish linkages between RDI and CARI. It should meet quarterly.

To give RDI direction on broader non-technical issues of institutional development, representatives of the MOA and MPEA will be added to the CUC's Board of Trustees (as is already the case with the Ministry of Education).

Participant Training: One of the major short-comings in the RDI project has been the lack of a staff development plan. Liberianization of RDI's staff is a necessary step to making the institute self-sufficient. It will also serve to reduce its recurrent costs. Because of the long lead time involved, staff development should not be delayed until the beginning of a Phase II project.

RDI has already selected two of its faculty members to receive M.Sc. degrees. However, since the interim period will run only 20 months, it will not be possible for the candidates to complete their training under this extension. Thus, while their training will be initiated under this proposal, its completion will be contingent on a follow-on project being approved, the identification of another sources of funding (either AID or non-AID) for the final segment of their training or a further extension of this project. Otherwise, the candidates will have to terminate their training by November 30, 1984. One candidate, who will be studying agricultural economics, will also be sent to a three month intensive preparation course at the Economics

Institute of the University of Colorado at Boulder.

Maintenance. No construction will be undertaken during the interim period. However, major maintenance and repair, which have been neglected because of lack of fund, will be performed under the amendment.

Operating Costs. The project amendment will also fund some of the recurrent costs of running RDI. These will include local salaries, vehicle and equipment maintenance, utilities and general services. As the GOL provides a greater contribution towards RDI's recurrent costs, AID's recurrent cost financing will be cut back.

It is AID policy not to fund recurrent costs under project assistance unless specific criteria are met. These as set out in AID's 1982 Policy Paper on recurrent costs include:

- a) that a policy framework for recurrent costs exist or be developed;
- b) that the host country be unable to assume the recurrent cost financing at present;
- c) that the development impact of funding recurrent costs be greater than alternative capital investments; and
- d) that a carefully phased plan exist for eventually shifting the entire recurrent burden to the host country.

In the case of this extension, these criteria are met. As both CUC and the GOL recognized that eventually they will have to assume RDI's recurrent cost, the policy framework is not an issue. Likewise, there can be no doubt that neither the GOL nor CUC have the resources at present to meet these costs. Without AID's assistance in meeting recurrent costs, RDI could not stay open and the projects' original investment would be lost.

Given the present fiscal crisis confronting Liberia, it is USAID's policy to minimize the recurrent cost burden on the government. Thus, new investments are being deferred where possible because of the additional burden that they would impose on the GOL. In this situation, recurrent cost financing under this proposal will not divert funds from potential new investments but, rather, will support USAID's policy of minimizing the GOL's recurrent cost burden during this crisis period.

Finally, over the extension period AID's recurrent costs

financing will be phased down. If a Phase II project is approved, it will incorporate a plan for the complete phase-out of AID's recurrent cost financing by the end of the follow-on project. If no such follow-on is approved, than CUC and the GOL will have to assume these costs by December, 1984.

One step that will make this phase out easier is the reduction of RDI's operating costs. RDI's Director should be looking at ways of reducing these costs. At present, the cost of one year's schooling at RDI is approximately \$4,400 per student (assuming an enrollment of 180 students). While it is hard to identify an equivalent training institution with which to compare costs, RDI is expensive relative to other forms of training available in Liberia including training at CUC. Even the College of Agriculture at the University of Liberia is less expensive -- \$3145 per student/year. The Director, possibly with the assistance of a short-term consultant, should investigate possible ways of limiting operating costs.

Project Evaluation and Design: In addition to those components of the project implemented through the cooperative agreement, two elements of the project will be implemented by AID directly: A final evaluation and the design of a Phase II project. The final evaluation will be a critical element in the preparation of the PID for the follow-on project and for the actual PP design itself. The topics to be examined in the evaluation are elaborated below under "End of Project Status."

The project design team for Phase II should consist of a vocational agriculture/extension specialist, and financial/administrative specialist in addition to the Mission's project design officer and rural sociologist. Among the issues which will have to be addressed are the demand for RDI graduates; extension liaison; curriculum and teaching methodology; RDI's staffing requirements; and a long-term plan for financial viability.

End of Project Status: As noted above, the purpose of this proposed amendment is to maintain the operation of RDI and continue the training of mid-level agriculturists during a period of fiscal crisis and economic uncertainty. While a long-term plan for RDI's financial viability is developed, few additions or changes to RDI are contemplated under this proposal. Thus, there are relatively few end-of-project targets by which to evaluate the success of this amendment beyond the continued operation of RDI. However, there is an extensive range of subjects which the final evaluation team should examine in preparation for the design of the Phase II project.

The major end-of-project targets are as follows:

- The training of an additional 150 mid-level agriculturalists as a minimum.
- The reduction of minimum class room hour course load from

18 hours to 15-16 hours to allow greater emphasis on practicals.

- The reorientation of curriculum to concentrate on plant and animal sciences with soil science and agricultural engineering becoming support courses.
- The establishment of an advisory committee of employers of RDI graduates which meets regularly and is consulted on RDI's academic policies.
- The establishment of a farmer involvement program.
- Further education of at least two present RDI faculty members in line with the staff development needs of the Institute.
- The operation of a system of fair and equitable allocation of costs between CUC and RDI for the facilities and services they share.
- The establishment of a recruitment policy by which at least two-thirds of RDI incoming classes are private or public sector employees receiving in-service training.
- The maintenance of at least an 80% employment rate among RDI graduating classes.

Other topics which the evaluation team should examine in preparation for design of the Phase II project are:

- The extent to which RDI graduates are in a position to contribute towards the project's goal of transferring agricultural technology. While it is doubtful that the graduates will have had any measurable impact in such a short time, the evaluators should examine where RDI graduates are employed, what type of work they do and the relevance of RDI training to their work.
- The long term demand for RDI graduates. Given economic trends, what will be the employment prospects for future RDI graduates?
- The curriculum and teaching methodology. Besides its relevance to future employment, how appropriate and effective are the curriculum and methodology?
- RDI's and CUC's capability to administer the cooperative agreement including the ability to handle procurement, contracting, etc.
- The state of RDI facilities and the need for additional construction.

- RDI's role in meeting the MOA's training requirements and MOA's relationship to RDI.
- RDI's entrance standards and selection process
- The state of vehicles and equipment and the need for maintenance or replacement.
- RDI's staffing requirements by department and level of training.
- The prospects and means by which RDI can achieve financial self-sufficiency, and alternative sources of support.

Other Donor Involvement: Besides AID funding, RDI will receive financial support from various other sources during the extension period. The GOL is expected to support a major portion of RDI's operating costs. The EEC is expected to initiate a major, three-year assistance program starting in FY-83/84. This program will fund the construction of a rural technology building, purchase vehicles and classroom and field equipment, and initiate the off-campus internship program. The Near East Foundation will partially fund three long-term technicians to fill faculty positions and will provide certain other supplies. A break down of these contributions can be found in the Budget and Financial Plan, Section III.

III. BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLAN

Through February, 1983, AID has contributed \$3.905 million to the RDI Project. The GOL has contributed a total of \$293,000. The PEC has contributed \$515,000 in cash, including \$210,000 in "bridge funding" that has financed RDI operations pending the approval of this proposal. A further contribution of \$390,000 has been made in kind. The Near East Foundation has supported three faculty positions and provided other assistance, contributing \$60,000.

The cost of the project during the interim period will be \$2,808,000 of which AID will contribute \$1,825,000. Funding from other sources including tuition, the GOL, and other donors will be \$983,000 or 35% of the amendment's cost. During the interim period the GOL will contribute \$400,000 towards RDI's operation costs (\$100,000 in FY 82-83 and \$300,000 in FY 83-84). The Near East Foundation will provide support for three faculty positions and other assistance, totalling \$103,000. Tuition will provide an estimated \$73,000 and CUC will pay further \$15,600 to defray certain costs. EEC assistance will amount to \$391,000.

Most of AID's funding will be disbursed through a cooperative agreement with CUC. In addition, certain funds in the second fiscal year will be disbursed by the USAID Mission directly to finance the final evaluation and the design of Phase II.

The November 1982 evaluation raised several questions about charges incurred by RDI, especially those paid to CUC for various services it provides to RDI and for the Cuttington farm. Since the evaluation, a system of assessing these costs and RDI's share of them has been devised by CUC's resident financial advisor. This includes overhead paid to CUC for the portion of time (estimated at 30%) which CUC President and various administrative officers devote to RDI. Also, CUC has compensated RDI for the facilities it used such as RDI dormitories and faculty housing. (See Financial Management and Records under Section IV, Implementation Plan, below.) The Cuttington Farm now has its own accounts separate from RDI. The only farm-related expenses incurred by RDI will be the salaries of the Farm Manager and Animal Science Compound Manager, both of whom teach at RDI. Table I shows the total AID contribution over the life of project. Table II details the budget for AID's contribution for the period of this amendment. Table III summarizes the total life of project budget. A detailed breakdown of the budget for the interim period is attached as Appendix A.

TABLE I: AID'S LIFE OF PROJECT CONTRIBUTION
(in \$000's)

	To Date 8/30/77 to 2/28/83	This Proposal 3/1/83 to 11/30/84	Total
A. Technical Assistance	\$1553	\$259	\$1812
B. Commodities	272	89	361
C. Participant Training	165	85	250
D. Construction	1050	-	1050
E. Overhead and Sub-agreements	58	80	138
F. Operating Costs ^{1/}	655	1034	1689
G. Contingency and Inflation	152	229	381
H. Evaluation and Phase II Design	-	50	50
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
Total	\$3905	\$1825	\$5730

1/ Includes CUC overhead which is considered a direct operating cost.

TABLE II: ILLUSTRATIVE BUDGET FOR AMENDMENT PERIOD: AID CONTRIBUTION

I. Cooperative Agreement

A. Technical Assistance	FY 83	FY 84	Total
1. Director's Salary	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$100,000
2. Animal Sc. Prof. Salary	25,000	25,000	50,000
3. Salary top-off (3 NEF-funded faculty)	20,000	20,000	40,000
4. Short-term T.A. salaries	10,000	3,500	13,500
5. Long-term travel, R&R	14,000	14,000	28,000
6. Long-term HHE, Storage	9,000	9,000	18,000
7. Short-term travel	6,000	3,000	9,000
Sub total	\$134,000	\$124,500	\$258,500

B. Commodities

1. Household equipment and furnishing: Replacement	10,000	10,000	20,000
2. Office Equipment	7,500	-	7,500
3. Curriculum and Texts	1,000	-	1,000
4. Tractor	18,000	-	18,000
5. Spare parts for vehicles	3,000	1,200	4,200
6. Office Supplies	6,500	7,000	13,500
7. Training Supplies	20,000	2,000	22,000
8. Motorcycles (two 120cc)	2,500	-	2,500
Sub total	\$68,500	\$20,200	\$88,700

C. Participant Training

1. Economic Short Course	5,000	-	5,000
2. M.Sc. X 2	40,000	40,000	80,000
Sub total	\$45,000	\$40,000	\$85,000

TABLE IIContinued

	FY 83	FY 84	Total
D. Overhead and Subagreements			
1. PECUSA	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$40,000
2. Sister Institution	20,000	20,000	40,000
Sub total	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>\$80,000</u>
E. Operating Costs			
1. Faculty Salaries	81,000	81,000	162,000
2. Teaching Assistants	51,000	51,000	102,000
3. Administrative Staff	59,000	59,000	118,000
4. Laborers, Drivers	84,000	84,000	168,000
5. CUC Overhead	68,000	68,000	136,000
6. Advisory Committee	6,000	-	6,000
7. Grounds & Building Maint.	10,000	-	10,000
8. Auditor	7,500	-	7,500
9. Vehicle Operation & Maint.	60,000	-	60,000
10. Utilities	120,000	94,300	214,300
11. General Services	50,000	-	50,000
Sub total	<u>\$596,500</u>	<u>\$437,300</u>	<u>\$1033,800</u>
F. Contingency (10%)	\$91,000	\$66,000	\$157,000
G. Inflation (10%)	-	\$72,000	\$72,000
Total	<u>\$975,000</u>	<u>\$800,000</u>	<u>\$1,775,000</u>

continued.....

TABLE III LIFE OF PROJECT BUDGET

(In \$000)

	To Date (8/30/77 - 2/28/83)	This Proposal (3/1/83 - 11/30/84)	Total
A. Technical Assistance	1613	362	1975
USAID	1553	259	1812
NEF	60	103	163
B. Commodities	272	228	500
USAID	272	89	361
EEC	-	139	139
C. Participant Training	165	92	257
USAID	165	85	250
EEC	-	7	7
D. Construction	1050	106	1156
USAID	1050	-	1050
EEC	-	106	106
E. Overhead and Subagreements	58	80	138
USAID	58	80	138
F. Operating Costs	1928	1515	3443
USAID	655	1034	1689
PVO ²	980 ³	74	1054
GOL	293	336	629
EEC	-	71	71

Cont'd - TABLE III PROJECT BUDGET

G. Contingency and Inflation	152	376	528
USAID	152	229	381
PVO ²	-	15	15
GOL	-	64	64
EEC	-	68	68
H. Evaluation and Phase II Design		50	50
AID		50	50
 TOTAL	 <u>\$5238</u>	 <u>\$2808</u>	 <u>\$8046</u>
<u>Donor Totals:</u>			
USAID	3905	1825	5730
NEF	60	103	163
PVO ²	980	89	1069
GOL	293	400	693
EEC	-	391	391

¹ Includes CUC overhead which is considered a direct operating cost.

² Represents both PECUSA and CUC.

³ Includes "inkind" contributions.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Cooperative Agreement: This project amendment will be implemented through a cooperative agreement between USAID/Liberia and CUC except for the design of the Phase II Project and the final evaluation which will be financed by project funds controlled directly by the Mission. The cooperative agreement will provide for substantial involvement by USAID in the direction and implementation of the project in accordance with AID policy and procedures for such agreements. USAID will be consulted regularly in the development of academic and other relevant policies by RDI. USAID will also furnish assistance in implementation matters as needed in such areas as procurement and contracting. The GOL, while not a party to the agreement, will also play a major role in the development and institutionalization of RDI during the interim period. The MOA, as the head agency of the GOL in dealings with RDI, will be consulted regularly on all major policy issues and developments affecting the nature, level and quality of training at RDI. Also, prior to the signing of the cooperative agreement, or as a condition to first disbursement of amendment funds, CUC must receive a letter from the MPEA giving MPEA and MOA concurrence with this amendment. The major responsibilities of USAID/Liberia, CUC and the GOL under this amendment are spelled out below.

CUC Responsibilities and Administrative Procedures: CUC will enter into the cooperative agreement on behalf of RDI and will have the primary responsibility for implementation of this amendment including contracting for technical assistance and procurement of goods. The specifics of contracting, procurement, and financial record keeping are spelled out in separate sections below.

CUC will develop general policy and administrative guidelines for the operation of RDI with the participation of the USAID Mission and the MOA acting on the behalf of the GOL. The President of CUC and its Board of Trustees will appoint the Director of RDI in consultation with USAID and the MOA. The Director of RDI will benefit from AID and GOL guidance on program policies and administrative procedures that will strengthen RDI in accordance with its separate institutional goals. RDI's academic policies and administrative procedures will conform to those of CUC where appropriate.

The Director of RDI will also be responsible for the recruitment of faculty, subject to the appropriate regulations and procedures of CUC, including requirements that positions be advertised and that candidates be approved by the President and Office of Academic Affairs of CUC.

Financial Management and Records: Funds under this amendment will be disbursed directly to RDI by AID. RDI will submit requests for quarterly advances to the USAID

Mission along with justification for the funds requested and an accounting of expenditures and accruals of the previous quarter in accordance with AID standard provisions for Grants. The Institute will maintain its own bank account and the RDI business office will maintain its financial records separate from CUC's. A letter of understanding between CUC and RDI will spell out the procedures by which RDI will issue checks and maintain its records so that they are compatible with CUC's own financial accounting system, and make regular reports to CUC on its financial position.

RDI will retain the services of a separate auditor from CUC who will perform audits on an annual basis.

RDI will reimburse CUC for its direct and indirect costs of supporting the Institute. A fair and accurate method has been devised by the RDI business office and CUC for allocating the costs of shared support services such as electricity, water, food and medical coverage. CUC will also be compensated for the indirect administrative overhead costs it incurs in the administration of RDI as an institute of CUC. Likewise, RDI will receive payment from CUC for the college's use of any RDI facilities. The formulas for calculating the charges to RDI are attached as Appendix B of this proposal. The USAID Controller has reviewed RDI's financial management procedures and finds them acceptable.

Technical Assistance: CUC will contract for all technical assistance to staff RDI's faculty. It may contract with an American institution to provide an RDI director. Alternatively, it may use PECUSA or some other entity to help identify a suitable candidate and contract with that person directly.

The Director will be responsible for identifying requirements for short-term technical assistance. He will develop scopes of work for the short-term consultants (which will be approved by USAID). These consultants would be recruited through the sister-school if such a relationship is created. Otherwise, USAID may provide assistance in developing the scopes of work and locating potential candidates. CUC may also use PECUSA to locate candidates or execute contracts.

Procurement: CUC will be responsible for the local procurement of commodities. For off-shore procurement CUC may contract with PECUSA or a local institution acceptable to USAID. USAID will also render assistance with procurement when necessary. The source and origin of commodities must conform to the requirements of AID's standard provision for grants.

Evaluation and Project Design Teams: USAID will contract for the final evaluation and the Phase II PP design team. Funds for these teams will not be included under the cooperative agreement.

Monitoring and Reporting: The RDI Director will be responsible for keeping CUC, USAID and the GOL apprised of the project's progress. This will be accomplished formally through annual work plans and semester progress reports.

The first work plan will be submitted to CUC, USAID and the MOA by the acting Director within a month of the signing of the cooperative agreement. This plan should spell out actions to be undertaken during the spring, 1983, semester including the placement of faculty members to be trained, procurement and any changes in curriculum or other major teaching innovations. Likewise, an end-of-semester progress report will be due within a month of the end of the semester reporting on the status of work under the project and comparing actual accomplishments with implementation objectives for this period.

Upon the Director's arrival he will be expected to submit plans in August of each year of the project outlining the objectives of the upcoming school year. Likewise, at the end of each semester he will deliver a report on progress to date. In December, 1984, he will submit a final report on the project.

Meetings of the Advisory Committee will also be used to inform the interested parties of progress being made under the project.

V. Implementation Schedule

<u>Action</u>	<u>Agents</u>	<u>Completed by</u>
Cooperative Agreement Signed	CUC/USAID	June 10, 1983
Condition Precedent met	RDI/MPEA	June 10
Provisional Work Plan Submitted	RDI	June 30
Director recruited	CUC, RDI, PECUSA	July 15
Director Arrives	RDI	August 15
Semester begins	RDI	August
First Year Work plan Submitted	RDI	September 15
Initial meeting of Advisory Committee	RDI	October 15
Initial meeting of Farmer Involvement Program	RDI	October 30
PIO/T issued for Evaluation Team	USAID	November 30
Semester ends - Graduation	RDI	November
End-of-semester Progress Report	RDI	December 30
Contract for Evaluation Team Executed	AID/W	January 30, 1984
Evaluation Begins	Contractor, RDI, USAID, MOA	March 15
Evaluation Completed	Contractor RDI, USAID, MOA	April 7
Evaluation Reviewed and Approved	USAID, RDI, CUC, MOA	April 30
PID for Phase II Submitted	USAID	May 15
PID Approved	AID/W	June 15

Implementation ScheduleContinued

Semester ends	RDI	June
PIO/T issued for PP Design Team	USAID	June 21
End-of-Semester Report Submitted	RDI	July 15
Contract for PP Team Executed	AID/W	July 30
Annual Work Plan Submitted	RDI	August 15
PP Design Team arrives	Contractor	August 21
Semester starts	RDI	August
PP Draft completed	Contractor, USAID, RDI, MOA	September 30
PP Reviewed and Approved	RDI, CUC USAID, MOA MOA	October 30
PACD		November 30
End of Project Report	RDI	December 30

APPENDIX A.1: Detailed Illustrative Budget for Amendment Period: 1983

	<u>AID</u>	<u>NEF</u>	<u>CUC</u>	<u>GOL</u>	<u>Total</u>
A. Technical Assistance					
1. Long Term salaries, etc	95.0	50.0	-	-	145.0
2. Long-term travel, HHE, storage	23.0	-	-	-	23.0
3. Short-term salaries per diem	10.0	-	-	-	10.0
4. Short-term travel	6.0	-	-	-	6.0
Total	134.0	50.0			184.0
B. Commodities					
1. Household equipment, furnishings	10.0	-	-	-	10.0
2. Office equipment	7.5	-	-	-	7.5
3. Training Supplies	20.0	-	-	-	20.0
4. Tractor	18.0	-	-	-	18.0
5. Books and other supplies	10.5	-	-	-	10.5
6. Agricultural technology equipment	-	-	-	-	-
7. Soil science equipment	-	-	-	-	-
8. Animal science equipment	-	-	-	-	-
9. Pest control equipment	-	-	-	-	-
10. Vehicles	2.5	-	-	-	2.5
Total	68.5	-	-	-	68.5

APPENDIX A.1Continued

	<u>AID</u>	<u>NEF</u>	<u>CUC</u>	<u>GOL</u>	<u>Total</u>
C. Participant Training					
1. Faculty Development	45.0	-	-	-	45.0
2. Post-RDI Scholarships	-	-	-	-	-
D. Construction:					
Rural Technology Building	-	-	-	-	-
E. Overhead and Subagreements	40	-	-	-	40
F. Operating Costs					
1. Salaries and wages	275.0	-	-	-	275.0
2. Utilities	120.0	-	-	-	120.0
3. General Services	50.0	-	-	-	50.0
4. CUC Overhead	68.0	-	-	-	68.0
5. Local Travel	-	-	-	33.3	33.3
6. Grounds Maintenance	10.0	-	-	-	10.0
7. Vehicle Operation and Maintenance	60.0	-	-	-	60.0
8. Communications	-	-	-	10.0	10.0
9. Internship	-	-	-	-	-
10. Other	13.5	-	38.5	26.5	78.5
	<u>596.5</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>38.5</u>	<u>89.8</u>	<u>724.8</u>
G. Contingency (10%)	91.0	-	5.3	10.2	106.5
Grand Total	<u>975.0</u>	<u>50.0</u>	<u>43.8</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1168.8</u>

APPENDIX A.2: Detailed Illustrative Budget for Amendment Period: 1984

	<u>AID</u>	<u>NEF</u>	<u>CUC</u>	<u>GOL</u>	<u>EFC</u>	<u>Total</u>
A. Technical Assistance						
1. Long-term salaries, etc	95.0	53.0	-	-	-	148.0
2. Long-term Travel HHE storage	23.0	-	-	-	-	23.0
3. Short-term salaries, per diem	3.5	-	-	-	-	3.5
4. Short-term travel	<u>3.0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3.0</u>
	124.5	53.0	-	-	-	177.5
B. Commodities						
1. Household equipment, furnisher	10.0	-	-	-	-	10.0
2. Office equipment	-	-	-	-	5.0	5.0
3. Training supplies	2.0	-	-	-	-	2.0
4. Tractor	-	-	-	-	-	-
5. Books and other supplies	8.2	-	-	-	26.0	34.2
6. Agricultural technology equipment	-	-	-	-	22.0	22.0
7. Soil science equipment	-	-	-	-	10.0	10.0
8. Animal science equipment	-	-	-	-	19.0	19.0
9. Pest Control equipment	-	-	-	-	6.0	6.0
10. Vehicles	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>51.0</u>
	20.2	-	-	-	139.0	159.2
C. Participant Training						
1. Faculty Development	40.0	-	-	-	-	40.0
2. Post-RDI scholarships	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>7.0</u>
	40.0	-	-	-	7.0	47.0

Cont'd - APPENDIX A.2: Detailed Illustrative Budget for Amendment Period: 1984

	<u>AID</u>	<u>NEF</u>	<u>CUC</u>	<u>GOL</u>	<u>EEC</u>	<u>Total</u>
D. Construction:Rural						
Technology Building	-	-	-	-	106.0	106.0
E. Overhead and subagreements	40.0	-	-	-	-	40.0
F. Operating Costs						
1. Salaries and wages	275.0	-	-	-	-	275.0
2. Utilities	94.3	-	-	25.7	-	120.0
3. General Services	-	-	-	70.0	-	70.0
4. CUC overhead	68.0	-	-	-	-	68.0
5. Local travel	-	-	-	33.3	-	33.3
6. Grounds maintenance	-	-	-	10.0	-	10.0
7. Vehicle operation and maintenance	-	-	-	60.0	-	60.0
8. Communications	-	-	-	7.0	-	7.0
9. Intership	-	-	-	-	61.0	61.0
10. Other	-	-	35.5	40.0	10.0	85.5
Total	437.3	-	35.5	246.0	71.0	789.8
G. Contingency (10%)	66.0	-	3.6	25.0	32.3	126.9
H. Inflation (10%)	72.0	-	6.2	29.0	35.7	142.9
Grand Total	800.0	53.0	45.3	300.0	391.0	1589.3

APPENDIX A.3: Detailed Illustrative Budget for Amendment Period: 1983 - 84 Totals

	<u>AID</u>	<u>NEF</u>	<u>CUC</u>	<u>GOL</u>	<u>EEC</u>	<u>Total</u>
A. Technical Assistance						
1. Long-term salaries, etc	190.0	103.0	-	-	-	293.0
2. Long-term travel, HHE, storage, etc.	46.0	-	-	-	-	46.0
3. Short-term salaries, per diem	13.5	-	-	-	-	13.5
4. short-term travel	<u>9.0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>9.0</u>
	258.5	103.0	-	-	-	361.5
B. Commodities						
1. Household equipment, furnishers	20.0	-	-	-	-	20.0
2. Office equipment	7.5	-	-	-	5.0	12.5
3. Training supplies	22.0	-	-	-	-	22.0
4. Tractor	18.0	-	-	-	-	18.0
5. Books and other supplies	18.7	-	-	-	26.0	44.7
6. Agricultural tech equipment	-	-	-	-	22.0	22.0
7. Soil science equipment	-	-	-	-	10.0	10.0
8. Animal science equipment	-	-	-	-	19.0	19.0
9. Pest control equipment	-	-	-	-	6.0	6.0
10. Vehicles	<u>2.5</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>51.0</u>	<u>53.5</u>
	88.7				139.0	227.7
C. Participant Training						
1. Faculty Development	85.0	-	-	-	-	85.0
2. Post-RDI scholarships	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>7.0</u>	<u>7.0</u>
	85.0				7.0	92.0

Cont'd - APPENDIX A.3: Detailed Illustrative Budget for Amendment Period: 1983 -

84 Totals

	<u>AID</u>	<u>NEF</u>	<u>CUC</u>	<u>GOL</u>	<u>EEC</u>	<u>Total</u>
D. Construction: Rural Technology Building	-	-	-	-	106.0	106.0
E. Overhead and subagreements	80.0	-	-	-	-	80.0
F. Operating Costs						
1. Salaries and wages	550.0	-	-	-	-	550.0
2. Utilities	214.3	-	-	25.7	-	240.0
3. General Services	50.0	-	-	90.0	-	140.0
4. CUC overhead	136.0	-	-	-	-	136.0
5. Local travel	-	-	-	66.6	-	66.6
6. Grounds maintenance	10.0	-	-	10.0	-	20.0
7. Vehicle operation and maintenance	60.0	-	-	60.0	-	120.0
8. Communications	-	-	-	17.0	-	17.0
9. Internship	-	-	-	-	61.0	61.0
10. Other	<u>13.5</u>	-	<u>74.0</u>	<u>66.5</u>	<u>10.0</u>	<u>164.0</u>
Total	1033.8		74.0	335.8	71.0	1514.6
G. Contingency	157.0	-	8.9	35.2	32.3	233.4
H. Inflation	72.0	-	6.2	29.0	37.7	142.9
Grand Total	1775.0	103.0	89.1	400.0	391.0	2758.1

STAFF HOUSING AND DORMITORY USE

Rural Development Institute has eight houses for faculty and staff. At the present time one house is reserved for the to-be-selected Director, six are occupied by faculty or staff and one is occupied by the Financial Consultant. One member of the faculty is housed off campus.

Based on the value of the houses and taking into consideration the prevailing market in the area a value of the houses has been established at \$3,000.00 per year. Our house had been previously occupied by the Chaplain at Cuttington University College and RDI was compensated at the price of \$3,000.00 per year.

The Financial Consultant occupying the one house is employed and paid by CUC and the Episcopal Church of Liberia. He also is doing considerable consulting work for RDI. His time is spent about 50% at CUC, 10% for the Episcopal Church and 40% for RDI. The salary of \$1,100.00 per month is being paid by CUC and the Church with no charge to RDI 40% of \$1,100.00 is \$440.00 per month and the use of the house is considered to be RDI's share of that compensation in exchange for services of the consultant.

Due to a shortage of dormitory space at Cuttington, one building of RDI is being used by CUC students. The furniture and other facilities are furnished by CUC and RDI is compensated for use of that dormitory building at the rate of \$50.00 per student per semester.

The remaining five dormitory buildings are used by RDI resident students. The charge to the student is included in their annual tuition and fee schedule.

Previous Page Blank

BUDGET ITEMS FOR OVERHEAD, UTILITIES
AND GENERAL SERVICES

The Budget Items shown as:

III	A - Overhead (Administration)	\$68,000.00
X	C - Utilities	120,000.00
X	D - General Services (Dining Halls, Library, Security, etc.)	70,000.00

These items were investigated by the Financial Consultant to Cuttington University College. An exhaustive cost analysis was completed on most of these operations by the Consultant.

In determining the actual cost, the Budget Items from Cuttington University College were analysed for the years of 1981 and 1982 and that information was broken down to a per student cost. The projections and budget for the college were made on the basis of an average student population of 600 students.

The actual cost were divided by 600 students and then multiplied by 180 students, which is the projected student population of Rural Development Institute for the years of 1983 and 1984.

The actual costs and projections were then rounded to the nearest \$1,000.00 for convenience of budgeting. There could be some minor variances in these figures due to changes in actual student population as the periods of the Budget develop.