

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| Introduction | i |
| Glossary of Initials | ii |
| I Summary Conclusions and Recommendations | 1 |
| II Current Situation | |
| A. Program | 4 |
| B. Staff | 4 |
| 1. Role of the Professional Agriculturalists | 5 |
| 2. Analysis of Agricultural Positions and Employees | 7 |
| 3. Problems | 10 |
| 4. Quality | 12 |
| 5. Conclusions | 12 |
| III The Future -- AID and ISTC | 14 |
| A. Organization | 18 |
| B. Staffing | 19 |
| C. ISTC | 21 |
| IV AID Personnel Systems and Agricultural Staff | 22 |
| A. Classification of Positions | 22 |
| B. Assignment/Placement | 22 |
| C. Recruitment | 23 |
| D. Women | 24 |
| E. International Development Intern Program | 25 |
| F. Career Development and Training | 26 |
| 1. Training | 27 |
| a. Development Studies Program | 27 |
| b. Academic and Other Formal Training | 28 |
| 2. Seminars, Professional Meetings, and Travel | 28 |
| 3. Details and Assignments to Other Agencies and Institutions | 28 |
| 4. Assignments to Non-Agricultural Positions | 29 |
| G. Promotions and Expectations | 29 |
| H. Intergovernmental Personnel Act Appointments | 30 |
| I. Joint Appointments | 31 |
| <u>Annexes</u> | |
| 1. AID Development Assistance (\$\$) | 33 |
| 2. " " " (% figures) | 34 |
| 3. Agriculture, Rural Development & Nutrition Assistance | 35 |
| 4. Economic Support Fund Assistance | 37 |
| 5. Agricultural Development Policy Paper (Extract) | 38 |
| 6. DS and Regional Bureau A/RD/N Positions & FY79 Program | 40 |
| 7. AID Direct Hire Personnel -- Foreign Service and GS | 41 |
| 8. AID Agricultural Positions and Employees | 42 |
| 9. AID New Hire -- Foreign Service Agriculturalists | 43 |
| 10. Promotions of AID Foreign Service Agriculturalists | 44 |
| 11. Salaries and Compensation | 45 |
| 12. OPT Proposed Job Standards | 46 |

Introduction

The numbers and functions of technical personnel in AID have changed over the years as the agency has moved to intermediaries for studies, some elements of project design, and most aspects of project implementation. Defining the role of direct-hire professional technical staff, deciding their numbers within reduced personnel ceilings, and developing other sources of short- and long-term help have been subjects for continuing study over the years. Particular attention has been given to staff support in agriculture because of the large portion of AID funds in that sector, the severe shortages of qualified agricultural personnel, and the special interest of BIFAD and Congress. Earlier studies did not provide a truly satisfactory basis for dealing with either technical staffing in general or in the limited agriculture sector. The problem has been exacerbated by an unstable personnel structure resulting from major reductions in personnel since 1969 and frequently changing policy, procedural and staffing directions.

This study comes at a time when IDCA, AID and ISTC are re-examining U.S. assistance programs and AID's operating style and procedures with the objective of providing more aid through smaller staffs with higher technical and managerial competence. Also, this study was undertaken almost concurrently with a similar study under the auspices of AID's Technical Program Committee for Agriculture. The inter-relationship of the several studies and policy reviews is unclear. However, it is hoped that this report for BIFAD will contribute in a small way to AID's continuing efforts to improve the composition of its agricultural personnel resources.

This report attempts to (a) describe the present situation in AID with regard to professional agricultural manpower in both quantitative and qualitative terms, (b) discuss future directions for agricultural staffing in AID and ISTC, (c) discuss problems in the AID personnel system, (d) describe options for obtaining agricultural manpower, and (e) make recommendations on various aspects of the problems under (b) and (c) above.

BIFAD, AID, ISTC, IDCA, USDA, and outside organization staffs have provided background papers, extensive statistical data, substantive suggestions, and advice, all of which have been drawn upon in completion of this study. Their help is greatly appreciated.

GLOSSARY OF INITIALS

| | |
|-------------|--|
| ADO | Agricultural Development Officer |
| AE | Agricultural Economist |
| AFR | AID Bureau for Africa |
| AIS | Agency for International Development |
| AID/W | AID/Washington |
| A/RD | Agriculture/Rural Development |
| A/RD/N | A/RD/Nutrition |
| ASIA | AID Bureau for Asia |
| BIFAD | Board for International Food & Agriculture Development |
| BS-10 | Backstop 10--Agriculture positions in AID |
| CDSS | Country Development Strategy Statement |
| DA | Development Assistance |
| DH | Direct Hire (AID employee) |
| DOD | Department of Defense |
| DS & DSB | AID Bureau for Development Support |
| DSB/ AGR | DSB Office of Agriculture |
| DSP | Development Studies Program |
| EMS | AID Bureau Executive Management Staff |
| ESF | Economic Support Fund |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GC | AID Office of the General Counsel |
| GDO | General Development Officer |
| IADS | International Agricultural Development Service |
| IBRD | International Bank for Reconstruction and Development |
| IDCA | International Development Cooperation Agency |
| IDI | International Development Intern |
| IPA | Intergovernmental Personnel Act |
| IQC | Indefinite Quantity Contract |
| ISTC | Institute for Scientific and Technical Cooperation |
| JCAD | Joint Committee on Agricultural Development |
| LAD | AID Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean |
| LDC | Less Developed Country |
| NE | AID Bureau for the Near East |
| OMB | Office of Management and Budget |
| OPT | AID Office of Personnel and Training (Personnel Management) |
| PASA | Participating Agency Service Agreement |
| PDC/FFP | Aid Bureau for Private & Development Cooperation/Food for Peace |
| PER | Performance Evaluation Report |
| PM | Project Manager |
| PPC | AID Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination |
| PSC | Personal Services Contract |
| RDO | Rural Development Officer |
| RSSA | Resources Support Services Agreement |
| TPCA | Technical Program Committee for Agriculture |
| USDA | U.S. Department of Agriculture |
| USDH | U.S. Direct Hire personnel |

I. SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study does not attempt to provide a manpower analysis of AID's needs for professional agricultural personnel. A detailed analysis could not be made with available data. In the absence of such an analysis, it is not possible to conclude with certainty that the current number of agricultural positions is either adequate or inadequate. However, this report does conclude that AID's problem in agricultural manpower is one of quality more than numbers. "Quality" is a function of technical competence, appropriateness of assignments, and performance in meeting job requirements. Two caveats should be noted: (1) while overall quality may be only "average," AID is not without Agriculturalists whose performance ranges from Very Good to Outstanding; and (2) there are probably "quality" problems in all of AID's technical specialties and other skill groups. The present unsatisfactory situation requires early action.

Following are a number of conclusions:

1. Increasing aid levels, with continued emphasis on agriculture and rural development programs benefitting the poor will require highly qualified DH professional Agriculturalists, most of them "generalists" rather than "specialists." The current number of full-time agricultural positions (260-280), if filled by good staff and supplemented and complemented by rural development and project design positions and short-term outside help, may meet AID's program requirements, even at higher levels of aid. However, there are immediate problems with (a) the often long unfilled vacancies (approximately 10-15%), (b) deficiencies in employee qualifications, experience, attitude, personality, and performance, (c) less than satisfactory working relationships between agriculturalists and other occupational groups and between agriculturalists and elements of AID management, and (d) low morale among agriculturalists.

2. The factors mentioned above have affected the quality of AID agricultural programs and the professional image AID projects in the agricultural community in the U.S., international circles, and LDCs. It is not possible to say with any assurance whether and to what extent these factors may also have influenced the size and composition of AID's agriculture and rural development programs. There probably has been some effect (not necessarily adverse) at the margin of the overall program, possibly with a larger impact on some country programs.

3. Uncertainties in personnel numbers, systems, practices, and other factors have made it difficult for AID to cope with agricultural manpower problems. In particular, career development and training have been neglected. However, recent efforts by AID management, OPT, and TPCA offer some hope that deficiencies can be corrected and problems eased.

4. The problems require actions which will impact significantly on quality only in the long-term (i.e., 5-10 years). For the short-term AID must look for more help from the Title XII institutions and other sources.

Principal Recommendations

1. AID should attempt to develop a systematic, but practical approach for relating programs to requirements for A/RD and non-A/RD personnel.

2. The functions and responsibilities of Agriculturalists and their intra-Mission and intra-AID/W relationships (as discussed in Sections II and III) should be fully discussed at the highest levels within AID and modified or reaffirmed so that they are understood not only by the Agriculturalists but also by skill categories. Agriculturalists should be placed within bureaus and most, if not all, missions so that they can actively participate in all aspects of strategy, policy, program, and project development, implementation, and evaluation. There should be increased interaction, cooperation, and collaboration between Agricultural, Rural Development, Project Development, and Program office staffs. Job descriptions should be reviewed to assure that they reflect functional and organizational arrangements and the expectations of Mission and AID/W management.

3. There should be an early determination by OPT and the bureaus of firm numbers of positions for FY 80, FY 81, and possibly FY 82, qualifications required, and availability of existing staff. Action should be taken to expedite recruitment for well qualified candidates to fill vacancies for which AID employees are not available.

4. The recruitment and placement processes should be improved to reduce hiring delays and to assure timely assignment of highly qualified personnel to key positions in the short-term and to all positions over time. Title XII institutions should be asked for help on recruitment and screening of candidates and on increasing employment of women.

5. Career development should be given greater attention. Short- and long-term, formal and non-formal training, details and IPAs, and cross-discipline assignments should be institutionalized, with more training offered to and required of employees. Employees should be counseled on assignments, performance, training, and realistic advancement (promotion) possibilities.

6. Employees with advancement potential should be identified as early as possible in their tenure with AID so that they can be given appropriate training and assignments. Agriculturalists should be given the same merit consideration for senior assignments as other skill groups.

7. After the 1979 Promotion Panels have completed their work, the promotion system should be reviewed to determine its responsiveness to agricultural manpower requirements and career advancement. If the system does not provide qualified employees for FSR-2 and 3 positions, consideration should be given to outside recruitment for both career and temporary appointments at these grades.

8. The numbers, qualifications, and training of IDIs should be kept under continuing review. (See Section IV E.)

9. The unsatisfactory status and prospects of GS Agriculturalists in FSR positions needs early attention by AID management.

10. AID should attempt to use IPAs (up to four years) more extensively than at present as a means of improving AID's technical competence. The agency should work with BIFAD and JCAD on defining problems and need for flexibility and incentives, in the systematic identification of established and other positions which can be filled with IPAs, and in the recruitment of qualified university staff.

11. Short-term agricultural technical help should be obtained from Title XII institutions to the extent available and from USDA. AID, BIFAD, and JCAD should continue to develop procedures (e.g. Grants, Cooperative Agreements and contracts) under which AID/W and Missions can establish long-term arrangements with individual universities or consortia for provision of advisory services for strategy, program, and project development and for evaluation.

12. If ISTC is approved by Congress, AID and ISTC should agree on mechanisms for coordination, provision of technical help, guidance, and training, and handling other matters of mutual interest.

13. The recommendations in this report should be reviewed in 1980 after completion of the PPC study of procedures and style of AID operations in the 80s and receipt and review of the FY 82 DCSSs.

II. Current situation

A. Program

AID's agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition (A/RD/N) programs are funded from three sources--Development Assistance (Section 103 of Foreign Assistance Act), the Sahel Development Fund (Section 112 of the FAA), and the Economic Support Fund. A specific amount is appropriated for Section 103 activities, but there is no functional breakdown in the appropriations for the Sahel and the ESF. However, all three accounts are justified on the basis of country projects, and amounts can be changed and new projects can be undertaken only after notification to Congress. Regular DA, Sahel, and ESF funds are not usually mixed in a single country program.

For FY79 the Section 103 and Sahel appropriations for A/RD/N activities were about \$669 million or 55% of a total of \$1,218 million. The ESF received about \$1,939 million for nine countries, of which \$145.3 million or 7.5% was for A/RD programs.

A/RD funds are used for rural infrastructure, agricultural inputs, credit, energy as well as for the more traditional institution development/technical assistance projects, however differently the latter may be defined by AID and BIFAD. Since most projects have both capital and technical assistance elements, analysis by sub-category from available statistics is difficult. Similarly, there is no clear distinction between agriculture and rural development projects since the latter usually have elements of the former. However, of the \$802 million in FY79 A/RD activities, \$397 million, or almost 50%, (by some measures, a larger amount, as much as 60%) were for agricultural inputs, credit, rural roads, land development, settlement, management and conservation, water development, and rural electrification and energy. It is expected that these amounts will increase in absolute and percentage terms in FYs 80 and 81. (More detailed program data is contained in Annexes 1-4.)

The proposed FY80 and 81 programs are still under review, and no attempt has been made to analyze their content. IDCA has proposed an increase of \$33 million in FY80 and an additional \$205 million in FY81 for Section 103 and Sahel A/RD/N programs, but these may include new initiatives not clearly in the traditional agriculture/rural development area.

B. The Staff--Present

AID's need for professional agricultural staff is undisputed. However, there is no consensus within the agency's management or the agricultural community on such matters as

(a) the duties and responsibilities of such personnel in AID/W and the field, (b) the types and qualifications of agriculturalists, (c) their numbers, (d) their location in Washington and Mission organizations, (e) their relationship to other sectoral, program direction and support staffs, (f) the quality of their performance, (g) sources of outside talent for full-time and short term assignments, (h) inequities in the system, etc. This and other Sections will discuss these aspects of the agricultural manpower problem.

1. The Role of the Professional Agriculturalists

AID's professional agricultural staffs are organized somewhat differently in the several bureaus and in missions. In the Bureau of Development Support (DS) there is a Deputy Assistant Administrator for Food and Nutrition with three functional offices--(i) Agriculture, (ii) Rural Development and Development Administration, and (iii) Nutrition. In the Bureaus for Africa (AFR) and Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) there are Offices of Development Resources (DR) which include, under a Deputy or Assistant Director, combined Agriculture and Rural Development Division. The DR offices also contain geographic project development divisions and other resources which are involved in design and implementation of agriculture projects. In the Bureau for Asia (ASIA), there is an Agriculture and Rural Development Division under the Office of Technical Resources. In the Bureau for Near East (NE) there are (i) an Agriculture Development Division and (ii) a Sector Planning and Rural Development Division in the Office of Technical Support. Both ASIA and NE have Offices of Project Development with geographic divisions and other staff who participate in A/RD project design and implementation. In all of the geographic bureaus Nutrition is handled with Health (and Population in NE and ASIA). Table 1 contains a breakdown of A/RD/N staff by bureau, with FY70 program levels.

(There are a few Agriculturalists in PPC and PDC/FFP. In the former they work on agency policy formulation and program/project review in agriculture and rural development and on general economic analysis. The Agricultural Economist in PDC/FFP has responsibility for certain aspects of PL 480 Title II programs.)

Field organizations also vary: in smaller missions the agriculturalist(s) reports to the Director. In several missions Agriculture is under an Office of Technical Services or an Office of Multisector Activities, often headed by a General Development Officer. In all but five of the larger missions, Agriculture and Rural Development are in the same office, usually headed by an Agricultural Development Officer (ADO). In the other five missions, Agriculture and Rural Development are separate. As in AID/W, Nutrition is grouped with Health, (which, in some cases, also includes Population).

The differences in organizational arrangements and numbers are functions of history, staff availability, personalities, and bureau and mission management perceptions of their programs. The differences aside, the functions of the Agricultural staffs, as described in Agency Handbooks, are essentially the same. They include participation in program and sector strategy development, advice on policy, and participation in project design, analysis, review, implementation, and evaluation.

AID's Agricultural Development Policy Paper issued in June 1978 stated that successful implementation of the Agency's policy in the sector "...requires an increased level of mission personnel professionally trained in most, perhaps all, of the five functional categories, to enable them to develop sound projects and manage high calibre technical assistance..." (Annex 5) The five functional areas were listed as

1. Asset distribution and access (land tenure and local participatory institutions);
2. Planning and policy analysis;
3. Development and diffusion of new technology (research, education, and extension);
4. Rural infrastructure (land and water development, energy, including rural electrification, and rural roads);
5. Marketing and storage, input supply, rural industry, and credit.

While Missions vary from one or two Agriculturalists/RD specialists in the smaller ones to as many as 8 or 9 in the larger ones (with Indonesia and the Philippines as exceptions on the high side), few Missions have the in-depth skills to cover the full range of the five functional areas listed above. In fact, many do not have or need any direct hire specialized staff competence.

In the early '70s AID developed the concept of the technical generalist, technical specialist, and project manager. At the present time, the agency's professional agricultural personnel can be classified in these three groupings, plus that of agricultural economist. Many agriculturalists who previously served in DH project staff positions became ADOs or Assistant ADOs, Project Managers, or Advisors/Specialists as AID moved almost exclusively to intermediaries for project implementation. Unfortunately, the agency did little to prepare such personnel for their new responsibilities.

The ADO title has replaced the earlier title of Food and Agriculture Officer. The ADO is expected to be able to deal broadly with sector strategy, analyze and conceptualize programs and projects, manage and monitor project implementation, evaluate project results, and relate to host government and other donor officials. He should be strong in oral and written expression. His education and experience should be broad, the former at least at the MS/MA level. The Project Manager and Advisor are expected to participate in project design, management, and evaluation and the advisor/specialist also provides technical advice, mostly in-house but also to the host government. Ideally, the Project Manager and Advisor/Specialist have many of the skills of the ADO, including post-graduate degrees, often at the Ph.D. level.

2. Analysis of Agricultural Positions and Employees

An analysis of AID direct hire (DH) agricultural staff is difficult by any criteria. Although there is considerable information in the computer on jobs and employees, it is not always current, complete, or accurate. Staffing patterns may not reflect recent changes by bureau or Mission management. Certainly they will not reflect management's current thinking or future planning. Mission ceilings frequently change within regional bureau totals, and staff composition changes as a consequence of this and other considerations, many of them very subjective. Position classifications are often changed to reflect individual personnel availabilities. Some jobs are in a "hold" status, others will be terminated with departure of incumbents. An agricultural position (Backstop-BS-10) may be filled by an employee with a different personal BS (e.g., General/Rural Development). Similarly, a BS-10 employee with an agricultural background may fill a Program, Capital/Project or General/Rural Development Officer job. Retirement or resignation is imminent for some, recruitment is underway for others and IDIs are in various stages of their two-year training programs and scheduled to fill vacant positions. Thus, at any given time the situation is so fluid that a precise picture with firm numbers is impossible. Further, short of personnel file checks, it is not possible to determine with certainty the educational qualifications of agricultural staff. This is particularly the case on graduate degrees. For example, PhDs for agriculturalists are often listed as "Economics" with a major in Agriculture, or "Economics" without even a minor in Agriculture. Other graduate degrees may say "Agriculture-General" when they probably have a functional major.

Computer runs during October, 1979, show as many as 279 agricultural positions and only 217 employees. This implies that there are 62 vacancies, but a further screening (admittedly imprecise) indicates the possibility of as few as 30 real vacancies. Vacancies will be filled by re-assignments and from the

approximately 20 Agriculturalists being processed for new hire and the approximately 35 IDIs completing their training between the Fall, 1979 and Summer, 1981.

Some random facts about the Agricultural jobs/employees:^{1/}

a. The 57 BS-10 employees in AID/W have the following top Agricultural degrees:

PhD - 24
MS - 16
BS - 11 plus non-Ag MA

Non-Ag degrees:

PhD - 3 (may include Agricultural Economics)
MS/MA - $\frac{3}{57}$

b. The 160 BS-10 employees in the field or on complements have the following top Agricultural degrees:

PhD - 29
MS - 65 plus 5 non-Ag PhDs which may include Ag.Econ.
BS - 45 plus non-Ag PhD (1) and MAs (5) which may include Ag. Econ.

Non-Ag degrees:

PhD - 3)
MS/MA - 10) may include Ag. Econ.
BS/BA - 4)
Non-Ag degrees - $\frac{4}{160}$

c. The average age of 217 BS-10 employees is about 46 years.

d. 29 Mission employees in non BS-10 jobs have Ag. degrees (1 PhD, 9 MS, 19 BS). They include 2 Directors, 2 Assistant Directors, 3 Project/Capital Development Officers, 2 Environmental Protection Advisors, 3 Assistant Program Officers, 3 General Development Officers, and 1 Family Planning Officer.

e. 11 AID/W employees in non BS-10 jobs have Ag. degrees (6 MS, 5 BS). They include 2 Desk, 1 Family Planning, and 1 General Development Officers.

^{1/} The BS-10 employee figures used in this report will vary from 212-220. Most information is as of September 30, 1979.

f. Length of Service with AID of 213 BS-10 Employees

| | <u>Less than 6 years</u> | <u>6-9 years</u> | <u>10-15 years</u> | <u>16 or more years</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
| R-1/2/3 GS-15+ | 30 | 7 | 31 | 24 | 92 |
| R-4/5 GS-13/14 | 78 | 9 | 26 | 8 | 121 |
| | <u>108</u> | <u>16</u> | <u>57</u> | <u>32</u> | <u>213</u> |
| IDIs | 35 | | | | |

g. Expected Mandatory (or earlier voluntary) BS-10 Foreign Service Retirements:

| | | |
|---------|-------|--------------------------|
| 1979 | - 7) | |
| 1980 | - 6) | Most at the R/2/3 levels |
| 1981 | - 12) | |
| 1982-83 | - 8) | |

h. There are now BS-10 employees in 55 Missions and Regional Offices (AFR-24, ASIA-8, LAC-17, and NE-6) out of a total of 70, some of which are in a phase-out status.

i. The approximately 218 BS-10 employees break down as follows: ADOs/Asst.ADOs-78, Agricultural Economists-48, and Project Managers/Advisors/Specialists-92.

j. AID/W now has seven IPAs in A/RD/N specialties, as follows:

| | | |
|----------------------|-----------|-----|
| Appointed Positions | - DSB/AGR | - 1 |
| | DSB/RD | - 1 |
| | ASIA/ARD | - 1 |
| Reimbursable Details | - DSB/N | - 2 |
| | DSB/RD | - 2 |
| | DSB/AGR | - 1 |

k. AID (DSB/AGR) used only 5 of its Experts-Consultants for a total of 40 days in FY79, in part because of legislative restrictions and in part because of access to other arrangements

l. AID had about 9 long term Personal Service Contracts in A/RD activities during FY79, all apparently financed with program funds.

m. During FY79 AID/W used under USDA RSSAs about 166 person-months of professional agriculturalist services. Experts under these RSSAs worked in DS and AFR offices and/or did short-term field assignments. Some of the experts worked full-time for AID. About 435 person-months of advisory and project services were provided by USDA and TVA under RSSAs. Personnel under these agreements worked in USDA and TVA offices

and facilities. In addition, two USDA Agricultural Economists and one Soils Advisor worked in three Missions under Operating Expenses funding.

Additional statistical information is contained in Annexes 6-10.

3. Problems

During the past decade the roles of technical personnel in AID has changed, the planning and programming processes have become more sophisticated, and LDC professional competence has improved significantly. These factors have increased the need for more highly qualified professional agricultural manpower in AID. At the same time some of the more experienced staff retired or resigned, and outside recruitment was restricted. (New hiring has raised the number of Agriculturalists from about 150 in FY76 to almost 220 at the end of FY79.) AID's problem is not unique. The International Agricultural Development Service (IADS) studies have concluded that there continues to be a particularly acute worldwide shortage of agricultural professionals with experience in establishing and managing agricultural development strategies, organizations, and programs. Thus, some of AID's staff needs are the same as those of U.S. intermediaries, international organizations, and LDC governments.

Most of AID's Advisor/Specialists with strong professional qualifications are in DS where they manage AID's centrally-funded research projects and other DS projects and provide support to regional bureaus and field missions. Some of those classified as Advisors in the regional bureaus and Missions have limited qualifications and may be professionally "out-of-date". Many Project Managers have little management training or experience and/or background in the subject fields of the projects they manage. Many ADOs and Assistant ADOs do not have the education, experience and disposition to meet AID's professional technical needs in an inter-disciplinary context or to relate to their LDC and American university and intermediary counterparts.

In the case of the Agricultural Economists, the situation is somewhat better. While the educational background of some of the Agency's agricultural economists is in pure economics and many have had little agricultural experience, most of them are relatively young, are quite articulate, and are able to think broadly about agricultural and RD problems and their relation to other development problems. For these reasons, many ADO jobs are being filled by Agricultural Economists.

There have been several consequences of AID's problem of competence in the agricultural as well as other technical fields. There has been increased use, and possibly over-dependence, on outside, mostly short-term, help to do work, principally program planning and project design, some of which should be performed by AID staff. Sometimes this outside help is arranged on an ad hoc basis without a clear understanding of its purpose, and, as a consequence, may produce work not considered satisfactory by the agency. There is often a lack of continuity. The project development process is necessarily delayed, much to the disappointment of all concerned. In some instances Mission Directors have employed contract or PASA personnel in lieu of DH staff or have asked contract/PASA personnel assigned to project implementation to do analysis and liaison tasks normally carried out by DH employees.

Important from an organizational standpoint, a vacuum in the agricultural field has been filled by Project Development Program, Rural/General Development Officers, and others in the Missions and AID/W with good academic qualifications who usually are younger, better versed in development theory, the economic, political and social environment and host country constraints, more knowledgeable about agency procedures and requirements, more adaptable to changing circumstances, less traditional and more experimental, and more articulate. The Basic Human Needs/New Directions strategies and the more complex program documentation requirements have created or increased tensions between these generalists (economists, social scientists, financial analysts, programmers, and project designers) and the specialists (professional technical staff, especially the agriculturalists).

The problems of working relationships come to a head in the preparation and review of strategy and program documents and project proposals/papers and in project implementation. It is expected that technical personnel will participate in all aspects of planning, programming, and to "chair" project committees. In actual fact, some (much?) of the management of the project development and implementation processes may be done by Program and Project Development Officers who are also more active than the technical officers in Mission and Bureau review meetings. The issues may relate to policy and strategy (e.g. production vs. equity, agriculture vs. rural development), the technical feasibility of projects, drafting skills, or personalities. For whatever reasons, Mission Directors and Assistant Administrators are perceived to favor the generalists over the technical professional in the decision making process. (In the IBRD the reverse appears to be more prevalent, with the Projects staffs exercising great influence on Bank programming. This may vary from region to region

but the fact that three regional Vice Presidents have technical and/or projects backgrounds is an important element in the equation.

4. Quality

The quality of AID's agricultural staff is difficult to assess. Academic achievement is a criterion, but it must be qualified by how recent the degree is and whether the person's technical knowledge is current. On degrees alone, 64% of 217 BS-10 employees have post graduate degrees in agriculture (about 25% at the PhD level), and an additional 7% have post graduate degrees which may include Agricultural Economics.

The other criteria for assessing quality are ability to conceptualize and analyze, to write and speak effectively, to represent their profession in inter-disciplinary fora, to represent AID in relations with host governments, other donors, and U.S. intermediaries, and to manage AID programs. The AID Performance Evaluation Report (PER) system, including the promotion panels, is the only formal basis for judging quality, though it is very imperfect. Peer views of and by AID's agriculturalists are generally higher than management's, but in both instances the PERs will be on the high side. The 1978 panels recommended 27 (or about 15%) of the FSR-3/4/5 BS/10 employees for promotion. Only 4 received promotions. In 1977 27 were recommended, but only 5 received promotions. In 1976 56 were recommended for promotion (out of 120 FSR-3/4/5 reviewed) but only 5 were promoted. (Promotions are discussed in Section III.)

Outside comments on quality are mixed, and it is unfair to generalize. However, it is accepted that AID has some very good to outstanding professional agriculturalists, but the number is much smaller than it should be. Unfortunately, the professional image of AID's agriculturalists is generally low as perceived by themselves, by AID management, and by their peers in the U.S. and in LDC governments. The group desperately needs upgrading and improvement in quality over that of mere "technicians" and a lifting of morale. Part of the problem is self esteem and self improvement, but there is also a major task for AID management.

5. Conclusions

This report does not reach any conclusion on the adequacy of the number of Agriculturalists for program size and composition or on a comparison of the number of Agriculturalists with those for other technical specialities.^{1/} Annex 6 gives staffing and

^{1/} Education with only 4% of the program appears to have a large share of the technical personnel, more than the number for health (and nutrition) and population with 10% and 6% of the program, respectively. Using the imperfect measure of positions for FY79 program size, AFR and LAC appear to have significantly more A and RD staff than do NE and ASIA (Annex 6).

program figures by region, Annexes 1 and 4 have program figures by sector, Annex 2 has percentages of program by sector, and Annex 7 has positions and employees by sector or Backstop. Without detailed analyses it is unclear against what sectors the General and Project/Capital Development Officers and Engineers should be distributed. A number of GDOs are assigned to Rural Development projects, especially those with large capital and resource transfer elements. The same is not the case for other functional sectors (or at least not to the same extent). Although some A/RD staff claim that their workload is too heavy and as a consequence they cannot properly carry out all their professional responsibilities, others and management indicate that the numbers of Agriculturalists would be satisfactory if only quality were higher. Thus, it cannot be said that A/RD which takes 25% of total program resources (Annex 2) has or has not inadequate professional staff or a disproportionately small percentage of overall staff resources (Annex 7).

It is also hard to reach a judgment on the impact of the present staffing situation described above on program composition and quality. It has been stated that if AID had more and better qualified Agriculturalists and some senior personnel with agricultural backgrounds (a) the composition of programs would be different (e.g. more institution building projects and possibly larger A/RD/N programs) and (b) program quality would be better. The first contention is difficult to prove. Program composition, both between and within sectors, is a function of many factors which cannot easily be weighed. They include, inter alia, agency policies/strategies, foreign policy considerations, host country priorities, funding limitations, varied Congressional pressures, special outside interests and pleadings, regional bureau guidance, the interests and attitudes of senior AID officials, and staff availability and competence. These factors change from year to year. An outstanding ADO or a senior Mission or AID/W official with a technical background can have an influence on a country program, but it is uncertain whether the impact will be more than at the margin. At the same time, it is clear that with more competent staff there would be improved project design, analysis, review, implementation, and evaluation, i.e. a higher quality program.

III. The Future--AID and ISTC

IDCA's FY81 budget proposal to OMB contains several themes for U.S. development programs for the '80s.

1. "Agriculture and rural development is the focal point of our development strategy of growth with equity.

"The solution to this problem lies mainly in agricultural development...Agricultural development provides both food and income for the poor as well as export revenues for the developing nations. Agricultural and rural development is key to meeting the basic needs of the majority of poor people and to promoting broader economic growth.

"The instruments of assistance needed to overcome the many obstacles to rapid agricultural development must each be adapted to the particular task at hand. The multilateral development banks will continue as the main source of external capital for large-scale irrigation and other rural infrastructure, although they have recently expanded their activities in integrated rural development. Additionally, the World Bank Group serves as the principal source of external advice on questions of broad policy--a role that the United States also helps to fill, to a lesser degree, especially through use of the PL 480 Title III program. AID, allocating over half its budget to agriculture and rural development, will continue to concentrate on institution-building, on the introduction of high-yielding and innovative technologies, and on production services geared to the small farmer. Aid's technical assistance is complemented by that of the UN system, principally the UN Development Program (which devotes nearly 1/4 of its budget to agriculture) and the Food and Agriculture Organization. These agencies also work in many fields that our bilateral program does not address, such as marine fisheries and locust control.

"Capital and technical assistance are not enough; new knowledge must be created and diffused. ISTC will be the focal point of U.S. research efforts in this area. About 35% of ISTC's program funds will be provided to the international agricultural research institutes through the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research. In addition, nearly 40% of the rest of the ISTC's program will be devoted to agriculture."

2. ". . .AID aims to be the best in the business--in technical assistance and in financial support aimed at basic human needs . . .It has a strong tradition of leadership in innovative approaches to development, many of which are now supported by large investments from the banks."

3. "This (ISTC is the only new operating program created by the Administration in the foreign assistance field. It reflects the belief that there should be a discrete institution with a sole focus on mobilizing and applying U.S. technical and scientific talent to the problems of developing countries. In doing so, ISTC will work closely with LDC scientists and institutions and make a sustained effort to expand scientific and technological research capacity in

developing countries. These programs will be built around specific problem areas, selected on the basis of the experience of AID and other donor agencies, the views of developing countries themselves, and the global challenges facing developed and developing countries together. . . ."

4. The proposed AID and ISTC DA budget estimates would more than double between FY81 and FY85.

5. "IDCA and its components can effectively handle increasing foreign assistance levels with decreasing staff levels. We anticipate not only creating IDCA and ISTC from the present complement of foreign assistance staff, but also achieving a phased reduction in IDCA overall personnel of at least 5% (for AID 10%) below current levels by 1985.

". . .we have adopted these working guidelines concerning United States bilateral assistance, which is the most personnel-intensive part of our program.

"(1) It should complement, supplement, and capitalize upon the programs of other donors, particularly the much larger ones of the multilateral banks.

"(2) It should over time be more concentrated in a relatively few high-priority substantive areas.

"(3) In other important substantive areas, and in countries with relatively small programs, it should increasingly rely on modes of operation that do not require direct U.S. Government field management.

"(4) It should take advantage of the growing capacity of developing countries to manage their development activities, thereby reducing our own staff involvement in programs we support.

"(5) It should concentrate in substantive areas where the United States has a comparative advantage, and where United States leadership is important to the overall development effort throughout the world."

6. "Shifts will inevitably occur in our staffing projections. IDCA is a new institution, and foreign assistance priorities change over time. All components of IDCA need adequate recruiting flexibility to meet changing requirements. AID particularly needs predictability in staffing levels over time so that--after years of RIFs and personnel reorganizations--it can concentrate its energies on managing personnel and foreign assistance resources efficiently..."

7. "The key to AID personnel planning for the future is a set of interrelated shifts in the mode of AID field efforts in three categories of countries:

"(1) Countries where most of our AID program can be carried out by PVOs and other intermediaries, with appropriate oversight by AID. This approach will be followed in a growing number of countries where we will have a relatively small program of bilateral development assistance.

"(2) Countries in which project-oriented programs are gradually consolidated around a limited number of key problems or sectors. This pattern will apply to countries where the United States wishes to commit a higher level of resources and/or in which AID field staff are necessary to ensure program effectiveness.

"(3) Countries where larger AID programs provide broad financial support to a limited number of sectors, with substantial obligations made periodically, to be disbursed over periods of up to five years. These countries must be able to absorb a large amount of assistance effectively. . . .

"These categories reflect broad policy directions, not rigid sets of rules. AID must retain sufficient flexibility and presence in host countries to permit considerable experimentation and risk-taking when the potential payoffs are large. It must capitalize on the potential of multi-donor projects and sponsor pilot projects when substantial follow-up efforts by host country entities or others might be undertaken. And it must work to help countries develop their capacities to manage both their own and external resources for development purposes.

"IDCA will increasingly be testing the appropriateness of proposed AID projects by asking whether they can be done by other donors and--if they cannot--to what extent they capitalize on the work of those donors. We intend to look increasingly to other donors--bilateral aid programs, the multilateral banks and UN agencies, the variety of voluntary organizations, contract firms, and private financial institutions--to reduce pressures on AID personnel. AID will increasingly specialize--and be the best in the business--in technical assistance and financial support aimed at basic human needs programs, and in creating social infrastructures that make democracy work."

8. "ISTC plans that its staff will include 100 full-time direct-hire employees by the end of Fiscal Year 1980. In the three following years, this number should rise to a total of about 135 and then is expected to level off, as will the complement of Institute Fellows and assignments under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act (scientists from the United States and developing country institutions working for temporary periods with the Institute)."

The implications of these new principles on skill composition and numbers are not clear at this time. AID/W is now considering what policy, procedural, and other changes are required. Missions will prepare their FY82 CDSS's and will review their FY80 and 81 programs in the context of the new themes. Thus, it is difficult to reach firm conclusions and make appropriate recommendations on agricultural staffing. Certainly, fewer professional

agriculturalists would be needed in AID/W and/or some of the Missions if AID (a) increases certain types of sector assistance, resource transfers, and capital projects, with reduced funding available for technical assistance, (b) depends more on host governments, other donors, and intermediaries for economic and sector analysis and project design, (c) delegates more authority to the field for project approvals, and (d) gives more responsibility to Project Development and Program Officers.

This study has reached a different conclusion. Increasing aid levels, with continued emphasis on agricultural/rural development programs benefitting the poor and containing large elements of technical assistance, will require highly qualified DH professional agriculturalists. New and expanding country programs will need more staff, at least in the short-term, than will be released from terminating programs. Although certain programs, responsibilities, and limited AID staff will be transferred to ISTC, AID cannot expect significant technical help from ISTC. Changes in staff responsibilities within AID/W and Missions may be possible, but any potential reduction in the number of agriculturalists will be at the margin. Albeit without benefit of a manpower analysis, this report assumes a continued requirement for at least the approximately 260-280 professional agricultural positions currently authorized. It is hoped that these levels can be maintained, especially the higher figure, in order to permit establishment of a career development program (discussed in another part of the report).

This study has not attempted to analyze programs, staffing requirements, organizational arrangements, etc. on a bureau or country basis. In many ways AID's Regional bureaus (and Missions) operate with considerable independence of central control which permits necessary flexibility for adapting organizations and staff to different circumstances. While decisions on such matters may be based mainly on subjective considerations, it has not been possible in the past to develop more scientific approaches to organization and manpower analysis. No useful purpose would be served by recommending conformance in AID/W and field organizations and standard staffing patterns. Nevertheless, it would be useful for AID to have a practical, practicable, systematic approach which relates the nature of A/RD programs to the A/RD and non-A/RD staff required to run such programs. Although this may involve considerations not susceptible to credible analysis, it is worth another look.

With the above as background, this report will state a number of general requirements for organization, responsibilities, and staffing.

A. Organization

There is a need for a high level of professional agricultural competence in AID. DSB currently has about 26 Agriculturalists, 5 Rural Development specialists, and 9 Nutritionists. These highly qualified staffs develop and manage centrally funded projects. They also provide or arrange for services to the regional bureaus and missions. Establishment of ISTC and transfer of certain functions from DSB will reduce but not eliminate the importance DSB has in agency programs. It is assumed that DSB will continue to have a group of professionals with highly specialized skills the agency does not need and cannot afford to place in every bureau. They will provide advisory services, professional leadership and innovation within AID in certain areas, and liaison with ISTC and other organizations on matters of general concern to AID. DSB's role and the professional competence and visibility of its staff are important to the image AID projects in the U.S. academic and international agricultural community. It is therefore essential that DSB's stature be enhanced by continuing attention to the skills and quality of its staff.

Agriculturalists should be placed within bureaus and Missions so that they can actively participate in, provide leadership for, and have responsibility for all aspects of strategy, policy, program, and project development, implementation, and evaluation. Their technical advice should be readily available to and considered by decision makers (e.g., the Administrator, his Deputy, Assistant Administrators and Mission Directors) and to others in the organization. They should be the principal links with host governments, other donors, U.S. universities and others on agricultural matters of mutual interest. Existing organizational arrangements and functional statements are adequate for these purposes. The problems lie in practice rather than in the written word. In some (many?) instances the "system" does not seem to look to the agriculturalists for technical advice in the policy and decision making process, and/or the opposite, they do not offer it.

Implicit in the report's comments on organization is the expectation that there will continue to be a decentralization of technical staff in AID/W among the four regional bureaus and DSB. From time to time over the years it has been proposed that all technical staff be located in a single bureau, i.e. DSB, or that DSB staff be drastically reduced and reassigned to the regional bureaus. This study has not considered either of these proposals. The first, centralization, would have the disadvantage of division of responsibility for programs between the regional bureaus and a central staff, with few, if any, obvious advantages. It would involve a major restructuring of the agency, which does not seem to be a likely possibility at this time. Dispersion of DSB staff cannot be undertaken without a significant reduction in

centrally-funded activities. If a program decision is made with this effect, AID can then examine the staffing implications.

A brief comment on the Agriculture vs. Rural Development issue (or non-issue). RD is multi-sectoral (e.g. agriculture, health, education) and multi-disciplinary (e.g. technical, economic, social, political). Agriculture is at the center of RD, but it has nothing to do with many of the problems in RD. Often the RD expert appears to be more concerned with the process, systems, social environment, and organizations than with production. And the agricultural expert often appears to be concerned only with the technical aspects of production, to the exclusion of other elements of rural development. The two fields are interrelated and inter-dependent in AID's strategy. Neither group has all the answers to the development problems of the rural poor, and both are important to the success of many AID programs. While there may be merit (which AID/NE questions) to integrated staffs for Agriculture and Rural Development, they are not essential. More important are increased interaction, mutual respect and understanding between RD specialists and agriculturalists. Ways need to be found to make them work together where this is not now happening.

B. Staffing

The sizes of A/RD staffs and their skill mixes will continue to vary, largely as a function of program composition, complexity, and size. No bureau or mission can afford staff to cover the entire range of functional areas within the A/RD/N sector. This will not be possible even with greater concentration within country programs. However, each mission needs professional personnel capable of dealing with strategy, policy, program, and project design, implementation, and evaluation.^{1/}

As a minimum, every mission with an A/RD program should have a Development Officer with functions described in Annex 12.^{2/} Whether this person is an ADO or an RDO, or an ADO with an agricultural background will depend on the nature of the program. However, the person should have the professional background (MS or Ph.D degree) and experience, analytical and management skills, personality, and other attributes to permit him/her to carry out his AID in-house responsibilities and relate to host government officials, U.S. intermediaries, and others. The depth of experience and skills needed will depend on the size and scope of the program and the role AID plays with the host government and other

^{1/} This report deals primarily with professional agriculturalists. However, it should be noted that they cannot operate efficiently without clerical support, which in many cases has been inadequate.

^{2/} Annex 12 contains OPT's proposed job standards for agricultural positions. There is a view within AID that the standards (functions) for the ADO are too broad for the persons the agency can reasonably expect to fill such positions.

donors. Nevertheless, the requirements are steep, and AID's interests will not be well served by anything less than the best. The grade range of the qualified Development Officer should be R-4 to R-2.

Additional staff will include Project Managers/Advisors and Agricultural Economists (AE) at the R-5 to R-3 grades. The Project Manager (PM) should be strong on management and implementation and, if possible, should have technical competence in the project areas. He/she should have an MS degree and, it is hoped, the potential for advancement to an ADO or Assistant ADO position. A PM responsible for two or more projects may not be expert in all of the areas. However, a PM for an agricultural project should be an Agriculturalist. The view that project management does not require a technical background is not sound. While some generalists (i.e. non-Agriculturalists) may be strong managers and intelligent enough to understand many of the project technical details, they work at a disadvantage in relations with host governments and contractors.

The position of the AE is supportive of the ADO. The AE should be able to deal with strategy, policy and program matters and macro- and micro-analysis. In other words, with the economics of agricultural development. He/she should have at least an MS/MA degree in Agricultural Economics. A practical knowledge of agriculture is important. (Unfortunately, some AID AEs do not have educational backgrounds in agricultural economics, let alone agriculture.) The good AE should be able to fill an ADO position and, in time, possibly more senior agency assignments.

AID/W and field DH agricultural staff can be supplemented/complemented in a number of ways. Project/Capital Development and Assistant Program Officers play major roles in A/RD project development and implementation. As indicated earlier, the functions of the non-agriculturalists vary among bureaus and missions, depending on the nature of the projects, comparative skills, personalities, and work-load pressures. The backgrounds and experience of these employees and their use within AID are such that they can do some tasks more effectively than can the agriculturalists. These include financial analysis, some project documentations, and perhaps management of the project development and implementation processes. It is important that there be cooperation and collaboration by the Agricultural, Project/Capital Development, and Program staffs, with sharing of responsibility, usually in Project Committees, fully understood by all participants. At the same time the agency should attempt to develop in its agricultural personnel the ability to do, or at least a familiarity with, the full range of functions discussed above.

Another source of field assistance is foreign national professional employees. A number of missions in the past have used well trained, experienced foreign nationals for professional work either locally or in third countries. With shortages of qualified Americans, USDA ceiling limitations, and the high cost of assigning Americans overseas, consideration should be given to selective employment of more foreign national agriculturalists.

AID/W and Mission resources can be supplemented by RSSA and PASA staff on short and long term assignments. Various contractual arrangements are also available, i.e. appointed and detailed IPAs (See Section IV. H), Personal Service Contracts for field work, Purchase Orders (\$10,000 maximum), IQCs (up to 120 days), and institutional contracts. The proposal that Missions have advisory services contracts with particular universities offers an excellent source of short term professional help if continuity of personnel can be assured.

C. ISTC

This report does not deal at great length with ISTC staffing. There has been considerable planning relating to ISTC programs and staffing which has been discussed in hearings and inter-agency fora. If Congress approves ISTC funding, implementation of ISTC plans will take place over an extended period. ISTC capabilities and relations with AID, other USG agencies, LDC governments, and U.S. and foreign research and other institutions will evolve over time.

There are plans for ISTC to have an Agriculture Program staff with direct-hire Civil Service employees, reimbursed and appointed IPAs, and Fellows. ISTC staff would be selected on the basis of demonstrated professional competence. The Fellows would include LDC nationals as well as Americans. ISTC would also use short-term experts under consultancy and other contractual arrangements. ISTC proposes to have flexible employment authorities, especially for the Fellows. For example, it is proposed that full field security clearances not be required for most ISTC staff. Universities and research institutions would be the principal sources for ISTC staff, though a small number of AID/DS employees would probably transfer to ISTC.

Last spring the ISTC Planning Office prepared a thoughtful paper on ISTC-AID relationships. This paper was circulated within IDCA and AID and will be a basis for detailed IDCA/AID/ISTC discussions if Congress finally approves the establishment of ISTC.

IV. The AID Personnel Systems & Agricultural Staff

At the present time AID operates two personnel systems. Most professional agricultural employees (approximately 190) are under the Foreign Service (FS) system, which requires availability for assignments worldwide.

There are approximately 28 agriculturalists under the Civil Service (GS) system. The Obey Amendment reclassification exercise designated only about 10 highly specialized AID/W positions for retention under Civil Service, and the rest will be under the Foreign Service. Although present GS incumbents in FS positions may remain in those jobs indefinitely or convert to FS to fill overseas vacancies, neither option is satisfactory. Most of these employees are at the GS-14 or 15 grades, and the agency has not been willing to consider conversions to the comparable FS grades (R-3 and 2). Being frozen in their current jobs cuts off promotion and transfer possibilities. This Catch-22 situation has adversely affected GS employee morale in other occupations as well and should be addressed by AID very soon. However, in view of the relatively small number of GS positions and employees, this section will deal only with the Foreign Service.

A. Classification of Positions

Positions are classified on the basis of job responsibilities, grade of Mission Director, size of overall country program, agricultural program size and complexity, and A/RD staff numbers. ADO positions now range from R-2 to R-4, with most at the R-3 level. Deputy and Assistant ADO, Project Manager, and Agricultural Economist positions range from R-3 to R-5, with most at the R-4 level. (Before the tightening of job standards in the late 70s, AID positions were usually classified one grade higher than these levels.) AID/W jobs occupied by FS staff have been at the personal grades of the incumbents, but new FS grades will be assigned.^{1/}

B. Assignments/Placement

Assignments are made by the Assignment Board (AB) chaired by OPT, with representation by the EMS of each regional bureau. OPT is supposed to propose assignments for AB approval. In prac-

^{1/} Salaries are:

| | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| R-2 \$50,112 | } | plus overseas | GS-15 \$40,832-\$50,112 |
| R-3 \$37,067-\$44,483 | | | GS-14 \$34,713-\$45,126 |
| R-4 \$29,375-\$35,249 | } | allowances and | GS-13 \$29,375-\$38,186 |
| R-5 \$23,687-\$28,426 | | | GS-12 \$24,703-\$32,112 |
| R-6 \$19,451-\$23,339 |) differentials | | |
| R-7 \$16,288-\$19,546 | | | |
| R-8 \$13,925-\$16,709 | | | |

See Annex 11 for comparison of university and AID Foreign Service salary and compensation levels for 1978-1979.

tice, most assignments have been a matter of pre-arrangement by the regional bureaus, usually with the active but informal involvement of Mission Directors, the bureau EMS, Desk, and technical staffs, and often the assistant or Deputy Assistant Administrator. Employee job and post preferences are indicated on his/her Completion of Assignment Report, but they often bear little resemblance to the real world and usually are not honored. An employee may be assigned to a position at the same or one grade above or below his personal rank. However, there are exceptions.

AID has recently decided to use the TPCA and an Agriculturalist in OPT to assist in the assignment process. Also, steps are being taken to make prospective vacancies known to employees so that they can be more realistic in expressing their post preferences. These moves should help improve the quality of and add a human touch to the assignment process, which otherwise has seemed very impersonal. However, in the short term, AID will have a limited number of well qualified employees, with competing demands for their services.

C. Recruitment

Outside or new-hire recruitment has been the responsibility of OPT, but regional bureaus and Missions also are actively involved with initial identification, screening and interviewing. AID has looked outside to fill a job only as a last resort since offices and Missions have not wanted to go through the recruitment process which has taken up to 10 months. Also AID has been reluctant to hire outside, especially at the R-2/3 levels, because of the adverse effect on career promotions. The excessive processing time has been taken in screening, interviewing, reference checks, security and medical clearances, management decisions, etc.

AID salaries at all grades have been generally competitive with most USDA, university, and other career opportunities, especially at the R-3/4/5 levels.^{1/} However, potential candidates have been deterred by (a) problems in dealing with the AID personnel system, (b) uncertainties and processing delays which disrupt personal plans, (c) reduced attraction of hardship overseas living, especially for individuals with working wives and/or small children, (d) AID's low professional image, and (e) concern about career development and advancement potential within AID. Further, academic work, including research, publishing, and consultancies, is often more attractive to individuals with teaching opportunities even at lower salaries. Only the most dedicated, hardest and/or hungriest have outwaited the recruitment/processing ordeal, and 66 Agriculturalists in addition to IDIs have been hired by AID since

^{1/}See Annex 11 for comparison of university and AID Foreign Service salary and compensation levels in 1978-79.

1976. ¹/₁ (See Annex 9.)

AID is now taking steps to improve the recruitment process. These include requiring more discipline in the selection process, e.g. approval by all bureaus of candidate suitability for agency jobs, and designation of specific position openings before processing begins. These measures will help, but more needs to be done to (a) upgrade the quality and efficiency of the recruitment process from identification through appointment, (b) project a better professional image (i.e. the role and status of the agriculturalist) and (c) explain the career opportunities in AID. The latter two objectives require more than mere salesmanship. The agency has to show by its program and personnel practices that it offers a challenge and is a good place to work for professionals interested in a general career in international agricultural development. Active help and support of Title XII institutions are also important.

Recruitment of highly qualified specialists suffers some of the same problems and solutions discussed above. While there should be a small core of specialists in AID (most in DS) with professional standing and qualifications higher than those required for ADO, Project Manager and most Advisor positions, this area probably does not offer long-term careers in AID. Likely sources for these specialists are universities, research institutions, and USDA. AID needs persons still active in their professions. Such individuals will probably not wish to (and should not) spend too long as bureaucrats in situations where individual research opportunities are limited and professional career advancement is frozen. Therefore, AID should recruit this staff for 2-4 year appointments with the understanding that they will return to their parent institutions or move on to positions with more professional attraction. There should be greater use of IPAs and RSSAs if candidates are reluctant to break their ties with current employers for limited, non-career appointments in AID.

D. Women

AID now has about seven women in BS-10 positions or with agriculture degrees and another 5 women IDIs with agriculture backgrounds. Women Agriculturalists have not applied for AID jobs in significant numbers, and AID has not made any special recruitment effort. Since the profession of agriculture is still regarded as a man's world, it is doubtful that there are many potential women candidates. Nevertheless, AID's recruitment activities should enlist BIFAD and JCAD help in identifying qualified women Agriculturalists for both permanent employment and short-term assignments.

¹/₁ New employees are given Limited Appointments, but usually receive career status (tenure) after about three years.

E. International Development Intern (IDI) Program

The IDI program is now the principal recruitment source for professional staff. AID looks for persons at the MA/MS (and PhD) level, preferably with some work experience overseas. A few IDIs in short-skill areas have been recruited with BA/BS degrees, again preferably with relevant experience. They enter a two-year training program at the R-8 level with BA/BS degrees or the R-7 level with MA/MS or PhD degrees, the exact salary dependent on work experience. (Most A/RD IDIs have MS degrees, with only a few at either the BS or PhD level.) They receive a broad orientation (8 weeks) in development theory, AID history, strategy, policies, documentation, and team work. They spend 1-6 months in AID/W in various work situations and, in addition, may receive formal language training before transfer to the field. The remainder of the two-year program is on-the-job training in various Mission offices, usually on rotation. At the end of two years, IDI graduates move into established Mission positions. Promotions are based on panel review, but if performance is good and the IDI shows promise, he/she can expect a promotion to R-7 or R-6 at the end of one year and to R-6 or R-5 at the end of the two years.

Overall, the IDI program has been successful in attracting and providing initial training for young professionals. However, as with all programs of this type, the quality of IDIs has been mixed, their on-the-job training programs often have been inadequate, and promotions and retention tended to be automatic. AID has strengthened the program in the past two years by being more selective in recruitment, hiring less qualified persons at the R-8 rather than the R-7 level, and being more rigorous about promotion and retention.

In spite of OPT's best efforts, there have been deficiencies in on-the-job training. The complaints are usually at the field level and may involve A/RD IDIs more than others. An IDI may be placed under the tutelage of an officer whose professional qualifications and/or performance are limited and attitude is negative and/or who lacks an ability to train. Often a Mission which is short of staff expects an IDI immediately to fill a vacant position, yet gives him/her only limited supervision. The good IDI will adapt to the situation and perform well. Some will seek changes in assignments, but others do not, and as a consequence they may not be well qualified to fill established positions at the end of their training.

The numbers, selection, training, and promotion of A/RD IDIs require continuing attention. Bureau management, the TPCA, and the ADO assigned to OPT all should more actively assist OPT/TD in the program. The program should strive for excellence in training and performance, and mediocrity should not be accepted. This

report suggests several areas for further study:

- (i) The numbers of A/RD IDIs recruited in the past 2-3 years have been adequate to meet estimated bureau requirements in the context of mission ceilings. However, if some of the recommendations in this study relating to career development, training, details, and assignments to non-A/RD positions are accepted, it may be desirable to expand recruitment of A/RD IDIs.
- (ii) Agricultural IDIs should not be recruited below the MS level.
- (iii) If a Mission cannot offer a satisfactory training experience, the IDI should be moved to another Mission that will.
- (iv) Longer on-the-job training in AID, up to two years, should be considered in more cases.

F. Career Development and Training

AID's record on career development is generally poor. The absence of any meaningful systematic program in this area has resulted in reduced competence and lower quality of service available for AID programs, as well as demoralization in the ranks of the Agriculturalists.

No career counseling has been provided by OPT, and supervisors have been less than frank in their advice and guidance to their technical staff. The assignment process has been haphazard and erratic: many placements have been made primarily because of expediency and as a consequence square pegs have been forced into round holes. Persons mis-assigned have been faulted for inadequate performance. Agriculturalists have been criticized for inadequacies in their technical and managerial competence, yet professional upgrading has not been given much attention.^{1/} The recent transfer of an ADO to OPT and the involvement of TPCA members in the recruitment and assignment process are steps in the right direction. However, it is essential that they both gain the support of management by demonstrating their objectivity and selectivity and hold the confidence of AID's Agriculturalists.

^{1/} At the present time one Agriculturalist is in long-term academic training and two are in short-term university training. One agriculturalist received long-term training in 1978-1979. There was little response within AID to OPT's offer of short-term tutorial training for Agriculturalists at Title XII universities. Of the 319 attendees since 1975 in the three-month Development Studies Program, primarily for R-3/4 personnel, only about 17 have been Agriculturalists.

Much more needs to be done. All employees should be counseled on appropriate job openings, self-improvement, required training, and realistic expectations for advancement. Younger Agriculturalists with promise, e.g. from the ranks of ex-IDIs and other employees with about six years or less of service, should be identified for career development and advancement. With appropriate job assignments, training and recognition, they can provide the excellence, innovation, and development leadership AID hopes to achieve. Though many will peak as Project Managers or Agricultural Economists, the better ones will become senior ADOs, RDOs, and senior Project Development and Program Officers. The best should be able to move into executive and other senior positions outside of the A/RD field. A number of actions are proposed for AID consideration and implementation:

1. Training: Training of agriculturalists in AID includes the Development Studies Program (DSP), a few long-term, mainly senior training assignments, ad hoc short-term tutorial or other training at universities, several short courses in contracting, project design and evaluation, etc., and language instruction. Training has been limited by non-availability of ceilings for long-term courses, reduced Operating Expenses funds, and shortages of good people who can be spared for even short periods.^{1/} A more significant constraint has been a negative attitude toward training which is in contrast to that found in AID for a few skill groups and in agencies such as State and DOD. Neither AID management nor agriculturalists have regarded training as very important for program quality or career development. While this view may be a consequence of unsatisfactory or inconsequential experience, the times now argue for a change. This report suggests several types of training, not as ends in themselves or to deal with placement problems, but rather to serve agency needs:

(a) DSP: The DSP is an intensive three-month course in development theory and practice conducted by OPT. The program includes lectures by DSP faculty, other AID officials, and outside experts, extensive readings, discussion groups, team case studies, etc. It is now AID's only formal mid-career course and is open to professional staff from most skill categories.

At various times OPT has had difficulty filling spaces in the DSP. Often students have been drafted and sometimes marginal employees have been sent to the DSP because space was available. Assuming that the agency is satisfied with the DSP content, the program should be given higher priority for mid-level professional technical personnel since it offers an opportunity

^{1/} In January, 1978, OPT prepared a report titled "Prospective on Issues of Training and Retraining of AID Personnel" which highlighted the need for upgrading technical employees. No action was taken to implement the recommendations.

for such staff to gain a better understanding of development theory and practice and of work in a multi-disciplinary setting. The program should be required for persons at the R-5 as well as higher levels, e.g. new employees beginning after their first two-year assignment and ex-IDIs beginning after four years in AID.

(b) Academic and other Formal Training: Both short- and long-term academic and other training of interest to the agency should be increased. For example, training in Agricultural Economics, Rural Development, Financial Analysis, and Management for the ADOs, Assistant ADOs and Project Managers with potential for advancement would be useful to AID. Such study should be undertaken in cooperation with Title XII and other institutions (e.g. IADS) and tailored to the backgrounds of the employees and the needs of the agency.^{1/}

2. Seminars, Professional Meetings, and Travel: Seminars and workshops on current developments in agriculture and other development topics and management should be organized in AID/W and at selected field posts with outside experts and required attendance by AID agriculturalists and other staff. More (selected) agriculturalists should attend professional meetings in the U.S. and abroad to represent AID and to "learn" from others. Finally, there should be more inter-Mission travel to view successful development projects and visits to Title XII universities involved in AID projects. The seminars, meeting and travel mentioned here should be approved only if they serve AID interests and should not be regarded as "junkets" merely for the personal benefit of the attendees.

3. Details or Assignments to other Agencies and Institutions:

With projects now implemented (and, in some instances, designed) by intermediaries, AID agriculturalists do not participate in important aspects of the development process as they did in the past. To fill this gap in experience, AID should detail a few agriculturalists each year on a selective basis to U.S. universities (possibly semester exchanges, with faculty joining AID) and contract teams, USDA/W and PASA teams, and organizations such as the International Food Policy Research Institute. These assignments, which can be arranged as IPAs or details for varying periods, possibly with cost-sharing by the receiving organization, will provide learning, teaching, and research experiences benefitting AID, the exchange institutions, and the employees.

^{1/} It is assumed that AID will continue to provide intensive language training when required. However, an expansion of French language instruction is probably in order.

4. Assignments to Non-Agricultural Positions: In recent years Agriculturalists have been unable to compete successfully for promotions, higher career opportunities, or otherwise with Program and Project/Capital and General/Rural /Rural Development Officers. It is claimed that too often decisions involving agriculture are made by persons who know little or nothing about the sector. A few BS-10 employees have successfully transferred to other specialities, but usually out of frustration or because they perceive a greener pasture outside the A/RD sector.

The proposition "If you can't beat them, then join them" is worth testing. Some of the younger Agriculturalists, in particular those from the IDI program, should be considered for assignment to or training for "generalist" positions. A full or partial tour outside or even a permanent transfer from the A/RD discipline would benefit both the employee and the receiving office and, it is hoped, result in program enrichment.

G. Promotions and Expectations: As indicated above, Agriculturalists have received few promotions during the past three years. (See Annex 10.) Also, the number actually promoted as a percentage (12%) of total BS-10 employees "Recommended" was smaller than the percentages for almost every other skill category. There are probably several reasons--overall limitation on number of promotions in AID, congestion from a larger number of higher ranking BS-10 employees already in the system, relatively low PERs, and higher priority accorded other skill categories. Regardless of the reasons, paucity of promotions has been the single element most adversely affecting BS-10 employee morale. The 1979 Panels should provide some relief since BS-10 retirements have left vacancies at the R-2 and R-3 grades.

In advance of seeing the results of the 1979 Panels, it is not possible to reach a conclusion whether the FS promotion system is unfairly weighted to the disadvantage of BS-10 employees. FSR-4/5/6 employees are reviewed and compete with other Program Management employees, e.g. General Development, Health, Population, Education, etc. At the R-3 level they are reviewed and compete with Program Direction, Management, and Support employees. Numbers of promotions are decided on the basis of overall staffing levels at each grade and, at the R-3/4/5 levels, within the three clusters. Actual promotions result from high rank ordering regardless of numbers of positions in each BS.

There is basis to question the validity of all aspects of the FS promotion system: the PER, management review and input, promotion panel review, and rank ordering. How objective and reliable is the PER? Does it represent management's views about the employee? Can the Promotion Panel be completely objective? Is everyone "Recommended" really promotable? Is there a valid performance quality distinction between employees, for example, at ranks 15-18 with those at 19-21? The former may be promoted,

the latter not, even though all have been "Recommended" by the Panel.

My preliminary view is that promotions should be based on room at each grade within a particular BS, if the promotion system does not bring forward the quality, skills, and numbers needed at the FSR-2/3 levels, AID should consider outside recruitment for either permanent or time limited appointments (including IPAs). It is urged that the Promotion system be evaluated after the 1979 panels in the context of AID's needs for professional personnel.

Promotions aside, there is an absence of reality in FS staff expectations. In part because of the fast and excessive promotions of the 60s and early 70s, everyone, regardless of job assignments and quality of performance, has aspired to the R-1/2/3 levels and some to Executive appointments. Many reached these grades and immediately or subsequently became placement problems. For a period in the 70s promotions ceased or came more slowly, much to the disappointment of staff. A few good BS-10 employees left AID for better jobs. Others who stayed are restive and may decide to resign.

The real world in AID now leaves less room for ambition and expectations, but the door should not be closed. Employees need more counseling on what they can hope to achieve in an AID career. In a universe of approximately 260-280 BS-10 jobs there probably will be few, if any, at the R-1 level and probably only 30-35 at R-2 and 75-85 at R-3. Thus R-3 will be the terminal or retirement grade for most BS-10 employees and R-4 for some. At current salary levels, R-3 (\$37,067-\$44,483) and R-4 (\$29,375-\$35,249) are respectable grades and certainly compare favorably with the USDA career service and faculty salaries at most U.S. universities. However, what seems to be lacking at the moment is the possibility that some of those at the R-2/3 level will be considered for senior assignments if they have the management or other skills required for such jobs.

H. Intergovernmental Personnel Appointments (IPA)

Appointed IPAs can be used to fill established positions (i.e. within ceilings) in Missions and AID/W for periods up to 2-4 years. IPA Reimbursable Details are not charged to ceilings and are useful for supplementing and upgrading AID's technical competence. However, they cannot take the place or carry out the

^{1/} At USDA GS-15 jobs (\$40,832-\$50,112) are rare, a GS-14 grade (\$34,713-\$45,126) is top for most professional employees, and many (probably average performers) remain at the GS-13 level (\$29,375-\$38,186).

functions of DH employees. Neither type of IPA is now employed extensively by AID in the A/RD area, probably for a number of reasons. (Section II.B.2.j. has information on current IPAs.)

AID bureaus have not demonstrated a strong interest in IPAs by their identification of positions and tasks suitable for academically oriented talent and by active recruitment of qualified persons with backgrounds in international programs. There has been a preference for career employees for established positions, sometimes without regard for qualifications and suitability. Further, reduced Operating Expenses funds and inflexibility on compensation for reimbursable details have been limiting factors. On the other side, potential candidates have been deterred by the compensation limits for reimbursable details to the high cost Washington area, AID's tarnished professional image, and questions whether the jobs offer useful experience and personal satisfaction. Candidates with and without tenure are also reluctant to absent themselves from universities for obvious reasons relating to their career advancement. In this regard, the universities have probably not done enough to reassure staff and encourage IPA assignments in the interests of both the universities and individual careers, and provide the necessary administrative flexibility.

TPCA, bureau management, OPT, and BIFAD should review whether there are opportunities and mechanisms for increased use of IPAs. Elements for study are identification of established positions and suitable reimbursable details (including replacements for AID employees in training), flexibility in compensation arrangements, use of reimbursable details for Missions (USDA has one on a PASA in LAC), conflict of interest, comparability of AID practices with those of other agencies such as USDA, and need for new legislative authority. At an appropriate time AID should consult JCAD to explore whether, from the university side, increased use of IPAs is feasible and, if it is, how cooperation can be encouraged to effect the increase.

I. Joint Appointments

Earlier this year the BIFAD Board proposed that, in order to assure the availability of highly qualified agriculturalists, AID consider joint AID-university appointments of academic staff. Presumably AID would agree to reimburse a university for a portion of the appointee's time, and he/she would be available to assist AID staff in Washington and the field on both short- and long-term assignments. Appointees presumably would not count against AID ceilings.

USDA practice has been cited as a precedent. USDA makes joint appointments in connection with its statutory authority (Smith-Lever Act of 1914) to carry out cooperative agricultural

extension work in colleges under Section 341 et seq. of Title 7, U.S. Code. These appointments have been authorized by the Civil Service Commission on the theory that state employees in land grant colleges were performing Federal as well as state functions. Although these joint appointees do not count against USDA personnel ceilings, the appointees receive health insurance, life insurance, and other Federal benefits. It is understood that USDA uses joint appointment personnel on overseas PASAs, again without charge to ceilings.

The BIFAD proposal was not studied in detail by AID or pursued by the Board. However, on the surface, the USDA precedent does not appear to be applicable (Title XII notwithstanding), since there is no parallel in AID to the inter-relationship between USDA, the universities, and state extension services. Precedent aside, the principal question is whether a joint appointment mechanism offers any advantages over IPAs, expert/consultant authorities, university contracts and cooperative agreements/grants, PSCs, IQCs, Purchase Orders, PASAs, and RSSAs. The expanded use of existing mechanisms should be pursued before AID seeks necessary legislative authority for joint appointments unless there are clear needs and advantages for the latter.

AID DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
(\$ million)

| | FY78 Actual | FY79 Est. Actual | FY80 Est. OYB | FY81 Proposed |
|------------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------|
| A/RD/N Sec. 103) | | | | |
| Total | 554 | 612 | 620 | 799 |
| Grants | 275 | 321 | 339 | 415 |
| Loans | 279 | 291 | 281 | 384 |
| Pop. Plan | | | | |
| Total | 155 | 185 | 195 | 239 |
| Grants | 149 | 172 | 187 | 219 |
| Loans | 6 | 13 | 8 | 19 |
| Health | | | | |
| Total | 101 | 127 | 125 | 161 |
| Grants | 45 | 68 | 83 | 105 |
| Loans | 56 | 59 | 42 | 56 |
| E/HR | | | | |
| Total | 88 | 97 | 112 | 121 |
| Grants | 70 | 83 | 96 | 97 |
| Loans | 18 | 14 | 16 | 24 |
| Sel. Dev. Act | | | | |
| Total | 102 | 122 | 130 | 215 |
| Grants | 74 | 94 | 115 | 164 |
| Loans | 28 | 28 | 15 | 51 |
| Subtotal | 1000 | 1143 | 1181 | 1535 |
| Grants | 614 | 739 | 820 | 1001 |
| Loans | 386 | 404 | 361 | 534 |
| Sahel Total | 50 | 75 | 100 | 121 |
| A/RD/N (All Grants) | 48 | 57 | 82 | 107 |
| Total | 1050 | 1218 | 1281 | 1565 |

AID DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE
(% figures)

| | FY78 Actual | FY79 Est.Actual | FY80 Est.OYB | FY81 Proposed |
|--|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Sec.103&Sahel A/RD/N % of Dev. Assist. | 57% | 55% | 55% | 55% |
| Sec.103&Sahel A/RD % of Dev.Assist. | NA | 54% | 54% | 53% |
| Sec.103/Sahel/ ESF A/RD as % of Total | NA | 25% | NA | NA |
| Sec.104(c)&Sahel Health as % of DA | 10% | 11% | 10% | 10% |
| Sec.104(c)/Sahel/ ESF Health as % of Total | NA | 10% | NA | NA |
| Sec.104(b)&Sahel Pop.Plan.as % of Dev.Assist. | 15% | 15% | 15% | 14% |
| Sec.104(b)/Sahel/ ESF Pop.Plan. as % of Total | NA | 6% | NA | NA |
| Sec.105&Sahel E/HR % of Dev. Assist. | 8% | 8% | 9% | 8% |
| Sec.105/Sahel/ESF E/HR as % of Total | NA | 4% | NA | NA |
| Sec.106&Sahel Sel.Dev.Act as % of Dev.Assist. | 10% | 10% | 10% | 13% |
| Sec.106/Sahel/ESF Sel.Dev.Act as % of Total | NA | 54% | NA | NA |

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT & NUTRITION
 Sec. 103, Sahel, ESF
 (\$ million)

| | FY79 Est Actuals | FY80 Est OYB | FY81 Proposed |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <u>Sec. 103</u> | | | |
| Ag Inputs | 95.3 | 106.2 | 139.1 |
| Rur.Elec. | 82.6 | 31.1 | 42.8 |
| Credit | 10.0 | 41.4 | 70.6 |
| Land Dev. | 8.9 | 2.0 | 7.9 |
| Land.Set. | 4.3 | 19.7 | 25.8 |
| Land Mgt & Cons. | 9.1 | 24.7 | 68.0 |
| Non.Conv. | | | |
| Rur.Energy | 4.0 | 2.2 | 17.1 |
| Rur.Rds | 21.3 | 19.8 | 11.3 |
| Storage | 2.8 | 5.5 | .2 |
| Wat.Dev. | 41.4 | 51.8 | 68.8 |
| Subtotal | 279.7 | 304.4 | 451.6 |
| <u>Sahel</u> | | | |
| Ag Inputs | ---- | ---- | .5 |
| Credit | ---- | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Land Dev. | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 |
| Land Mgt & Const | 7.4 | 12.3 | 12.3 |
| Non.Con.Rur. | | | |
| Energy | ----- | .5 | 1.4 |
| Rur.Rds | 2.5 | 8.1 | 6.9 |
| Storage | .2 | ---- | ----- |
| Wat.Dev. | 2.0 | 5.7 | 27.0 |
| Subtotal | 13.1 | 29.2 | 51.2 |
| <u>ESF</u> | | | |
| Subtotal | 104.0 | NA | NA |
| <u>Subtotal</u> | 396.8 | 333.6 | 502.8 |
| <u>Sec. 103</u> | | | |
| Res.-U.S. | 43.0 | 27.5 | 36.2 |
| Res.-LDC | 55.5 | 56.1 | 73.2 |
| Extension | 39.8 | 64.3 | 34.5 |
| Int.Ctrs. | 26.5 | .7 | .8 |
| Local Inst. | 24.0 | 28.9 | 31.2 |
| Land Ref. | .4 | .4 | .4 |
| Marketing | 7.8 | 22.5 | 19.0 |
| Plan&Pol-Ag | 41.6 | 44.2 | 47.1 |
| PVOs | 2.8 | 9.0 | 17.7 |
| Rur.Ents. | 36.5 | 23.5 | 27.5 |
| Educ&Trng | 38.8 | 18.7 | 18.1 |
| U.S.Inst.Cap | <u>3.2</u> | <u>5.5</u> | <u>5.5</u> |
| Subtotal | 319.0 | 301.3 | 311.2 |

| | FY79 Est.Actuals | FY80 Est.OYB | FY81 Proposed |
|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| <u>Sahel</u> | | | |
| Res.U.S. | ----- | ----- | .3 |
| Res.-LDC | 5.4 | 11.0 | 8.0 |
| Extension | 22.1 | 21.4 | 22.3 |
| LocalInst | 2.9 | 2.4 | 4.9 |
| Marketing | ----- | 2.0 | 1.4 |
| Plan&Pol.Ag | 9.6 | 10.5 | 11.8 |
| PVOs | ----- | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| Rur.Ents. | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.0 |
| Educ.&Trng | <u>2.3</u> | <u>2.3</u> | <u>1.9</u> |
| Subtotal | 43.5 | 52.4 | 53.2 |
| <u>ESF</u> | | | |
| Subtotal | 41.3 | NA | NA |
| <u>Subtotal</u> | 404.7 | 353.7 | 364.4 |
| Total | 801.5 | 687.3 | 867.2 |

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

FY1979
(\$ million)

| | |
|--|----------------|
| A/RD | 145.3 |
| Health | 178.7 |
| Population | 6.5 |
| E/HR | 39.6 |
| Miscellaneous (including IP, cash transfers, industry, infra- structure) | <u>1,567.5</u> |
| Total | 1,937.6 |

D. Staffing Implications

This policy has significant staffing implications. Its successful implementation requires an increased level of mission personnel professionally trained in most, perhaps all, of the five functional categories (discussed below), to enable them to develop sound projects and manage high calibre technical assistance. This need arises from the on-going depletion of professional agricultural and related social science expertise in the Agency; the complexity of agricultural development programs and issues; the critical importance of technological change for agricultural development; and the rapid increase of technically competent personnel in the developing countries who view with impatience the surface treatment of their problems often provided by developed countries. It is crucial that all staff, regardless of specialization, have a strong commitment to acquiring a deep understanding of the culture in which they are working, including a sensitivity to the concerns of the rural poor. A.I.D. should also make special efforts to see that a greater number of women are brought into agricultural professional positions, both in LDC institutions through A.I.D. supported participant training and in A.I.D. direct-hire and contract positions.

The bulk of A.I.D.'s technical assistance will continue to be provided under contract and consulting arrangements, much of it by U.S. universities under Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act ("Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger"), which authorizes A.I.D. to institute programs to

encourage increased and longer term involvement of U.S. land-grant and other universities in efforts to apply science to solving food and nutrition problems of developing countries. These efforts, under the law, must focus on the needs and participation of small farmers and their effective access to improved technology. A central concern of A.I.D. will be that the planning, research, education, extension, agricultural engineering, analytical, and other expertise and training supported under Title XII be consistent with this focus. Title XII provides authority for a seven member Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) to assist in the administration of these programs and help maintain the appropriate focus. BIFAD should also be able to help A.I.D. meet its direct-hire technical and professional agricultural staffing needs. Title XII institutions could provide long and short term training for A.I.D. staff, as well as provide professional training for new staff. University staff members could be seconded to A.I.D. for time-limited appointments (e.g., through the Intergovernmental Personnel Act). Identifying and recruiting appropriately qualified personnel is probably the most difficult challenge BIFAD and A.I.D. face in implementing A.I.D. agriculture policy.

DS and REGIONAL BUREAU A/RD/N POSITIONS and FY79 PROGRAM

| | <u>Dev. Officers</u> | <u>Ag. or other Economists</u> | <u>Advisors Specialists Project Mgrs</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>FY79 Programs (\$ million)</u> | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| | | | | | <u>A/RD</u> | <u>Nutrition</u> |
| DS/AGR | 3 | 5 | 18 | 26 | 67.9 | 5.5 |
| DS/RD | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | | |
| DS/N | 1 | -- | 8 | 9 | | |
| ASIA/ARD | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | | |
| ASIA/Nutrition | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | 286.6 | .3 |
| ASIA/Field ^{1/} | 14+14 | 7+1 | 11+8+1 | 56 | | |
| AFR/ARD | 3 | 2 | 4 | 9 | | |
| AFR/Reg | 1 | -- | -- | 1 | 154.4 | 1.0 |
| AFR/Field ^{2/} | 34+4 | 13 | 41+1 | 93 | | |
| NE/AD | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | | |
| NE/RD | 4 | -- | 3 | 7 | 161.3 | negl.. |
| NE/Field ^{3/} | 9+3 | 4 | 9 | 25 | | |
| LAC/RD | 3 | 5 | 2 | 10 | | |
| LAC/Nutrition | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | 127.6 | 2.4 |
| LAC/Field | 24+1 | 13 | 8+5+3 | 54 | | |
| PDC | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3.5 | 2.6 |

^{1/} Includes up to 23 RD and 1 Nutrition

^{2/} Includes up to 5 RD

^{3/} Includes up to 3 RD

^{4/} Includes up to 6 RD and 3 Nutrition

104

10/26/79

AID DIRECT HIRE PERSONNEL
Foreign Service and GS

| | <u>Overseas</u> | | <u>AID/W</u> | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>Positions</u> | <u>Employees</u> | <u>Positions</u> | <u>Employees</u> |
| <u>Program Direction</u> | | | | |
| Subtotal | 359 | 307 | 544 | 469 |
| <u>Program Implementation</u> | | | | |
| Agriculture | 203 | 161 | 76 | 59 |
| Health & Sanitation | 51 | 38 | 54 | 42 |
| Population | 25 | 20 | 33 | 26 |
| Education | 37 | 31 | 65 | 59 |
| Food-for-Peace | 25 | 20 | 6 | 6 |
| Engineering | 97 | 76 | 37 | 31 |
| General Development | 187 | 150 | 78 | 62 |
| Capital Development | 142 | 117 | 89 | 70 |
| IDIs | <u>116</u> | <u>112</u> | <u>1</u> | <u>--</u> |
| Subtotal | 883 | 725 | 439 | 355 |
| <u>Program Support</u> | | | | |
| Subtotal | 549 | 473 | 1665 | 1405 |
| TOTAL | 1791 | 1505 | 2648 | 2229 |
| Total Positions | 4439 | | | |
| Total Employees | 3734 | | | |

AID AGRICULTURAL POSITIONS AND EMPLOYEES
(Excludes BIFAD staff)

| | <u>Positions</u> | <u>Employees</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>Overseas</u> | | |
| R-2 | 19 | 8 |
| R-3 | 53 | 38 |
| R-4 | 110 | 70 |
| R-5 | 16 | 39 |
| R-6 | <u>--</u> | <u>4</u> |
| | 198 | 159 |
| | | |
| <u>AID/W</u> | | |
| R-1 | 1 | 1 |
| R-2 | 6 | 5 |
| R-3 | 15 | 13 |
| R-4 | 12 | 11 |
| R-5 | <u>2</u> | <u>2</u> |
| | 36 | 32 |
| | | |
| GS-16+ | 3 | 3 |
| GS-15 | 12 | 9 |
| GS-14 | 19 | 12 |
| GS-13 | <u>6</u> | <u>2</u> |
| | 40 ^{1/} | 26 |
| | | |
| Subtotal | 76 | 58 |
| | | |
| TOTAL | 274 | 217 |

1/ Includes about 16 positions designated Foreign Service

Computer
9-30-79

AID NEW HIRE

Foreign Service Agriculturalists
1976-1979

Development Officers

| | |
|-----|-----------|
| R-3 | 1 |
| R-4 | 12 |
| R-5 | 2 |
| | <u>15</u> |

Economists

| | |
|-----|-----------|
| R-3 | 3 |
| R-4 | 13 |
| R-5 | 6 |
| | <u>22</u> |

Project Managers and Advisors

| | |
|-----|-----------|
| R-4 | 14 |
| R-5 | 10 |
| R-6 | 4 |
| | <u>28</u> |

IDIs (R-8/7)

| | | <u>Proposed</u> <u>Winter</u> <u>1980</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------|---|
| Agriculture-General | 34 | 4 |
| Agricultural Economists | 18 | 2 |
| Forestry | 3 | |
| | <u>55</u> | <u>6</u> ^{1/} |

* * * * *

Mid Level

IDI

| | | |
|------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1976 | 4 | |
| 1977 | 11 | |
| 1978 | 28 | |
| 1979 | 22 ^{2/} | |
| | <u>65</u> ^{2/} | <u>55</u> ^{3/} |

^{1/} Includes 2 women

^{2/} Includes 3 women

^{3/} Includes 9 women, 8 of whom are still in AID.

PROMOTIONS OF AID
FOREIGN SERVICE AGRICULTURALISTS (BS-10)

| <u>Panels</u> | <u>R-3 to R-2</u> | | <u>R-4 to R-3</u> | | <u>R-5 to R-4</u> | | <u>Total</u> | <u>BS-10</u> |
|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Total</u> | <u>BS-10</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>BS-10</u> | <u>Total</u> | <u>BS-10</u> | | |
| 1976 | 17 | -- | 44 | -- | 88 | 5 | 149 | 5 |
| 1977 | -- | -- | 13 | 1 | 42 | 4 | 55 | 5 |
| 1978 | <u>12</u> | <u>--</u> | <u>50</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>50</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>112</u> | <u>4</u> |
| TOTAL | 29 | -- | 107 | 3 | 180 | 11 | 316 | 14 |

SALARIES AND COMPENSATIONCategory I Public Institutions
1978-79 - 12 month year
(1.33 Standard Academic Year)AID Foreign Service
1978-79

| | <u>Salary</u> | <u>Compensation</u> | | <u>Salary</u> | <u>Compensation^{1/}</u> |
|------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Professor | \$31,390 - 45,760 | \$35,520 - 53,870 | R-2 | \$44,430 - 47,500 | \$55,981 - 59,850 |
| | | | R-3 | 34,842 - 41,572 | 43,900 - 52,390 |
| Associate | \$25,540 - 31,390 | 28,870 - 37,910 | R-4 | 27,453 - 32,943 | 34,950 - 41,508 |
| Assistant | \$21,020 - 24,480 | 23,680 - 29,400 | R-5 | 22,137 - 26,585 | 27,893 - 33,497 |
| Instructor | 16,230 - 20,490 | 18,360 - 24,610 | R-6 | 18,178 - 21,815 | 22,904 - 27,487 |
| | | | R-7 | 15,222 - 18,264 | 19,180 - 23,003 |

^{1/} Compensation package (salary, retirement, health and life insurance, and miscellaneous benefits) has been calculated at 126% of salary, of which about 20% is the estimated total, real cost of Federal retirement programs. Source: Office of Personnel Management.

ANNEX 12

OPT PROPOSED JOB STANDARDS

Draft

POSITION TITLES:

Agricultural Development Officer 0401.
Deputy Agricultural Development Officer 0401.
Assistant Agricultural Development Officer 0401.

The Agricultural Development Officer plans and administers the Missions or Region's agricultural development program.

The Deputy Agricultural Development Officer performs any or all of the functions of the program and acts in the absence of the Agricultural Development Officer.

The Assistant Agricultural Development Officer performs any of the assigned responsibilities of the program.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF WORK

Agricultural development is the strategy designed to strengthen the capability of developing countries in producing and getting more food to hungry and malnourished people. Means of accomplishing this include the acceleration of domestic food production and increasing income levels of the poor who are dependent on agriculture. Increased emphasis must be placed on problems of employment and income distribution, particularly on problems of the small farmer and landless laborer. New jobs must be made available in market towns and urban centers to expand production and create employment and capital; and access to health, education and family planning services must be

improved. Therefore, the thrust of A.I.D.'s agricultural development programs is to improve the quality of life of the poor by promoting and coordinating programs in all areas of agriculture and related fields.

The functions of the Agriculture Development Officer position will vary with Mission programmatic needs. This position standard is intended to be a guide only. Functions may range from one of staff advisor to senior Mission management to one of a senior line officer responsible for programming, planning and implementing all mission activities in the agriculture sector.

Agriculture development encompasses a broad range of agricultural and agriculture/related programs which include: agricultural research, education, extension systems, nutrition livestock, agronomy, forestry, fisheries, horticulture, land use, farm roads, marketing, credit, cooperatives, industries, and other investments, rural physical infrastructure, local administration, local institutions, women's role in agricultural development, and the interrelationship of agricultural development with other economic, social and political developments. These programs interact predominantly with those of rural development or community organizations. Missions may have both an agricultural office and a rural development office. In such a situation, programs directed at agriculture/productivity and production are

normally located in the agriculture office while programs directed at off-farm rural employment, agrarian reform, integrated or area development approaches, development of cooperatives and local organizations, and rural financial markets would normally be located in the rural development office. Some activities such as marketing, sector planning, credit and cooperatives could be assigned to either office depending on their particular focus and relationship to other programs and on cooperating country or Mission needs. Where it is impractical or unnecessary to have both an agricultural and a rural development office at the line level, the Mission should determine the position title for the single office based on the content and nature of the Mission's program. Reference should be made to the occupational standard for the Rural Development Officer, ASOC 0340 —

REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES

1. Participates with cooperating government officials in examining agricultural development policy with reference to the national economy; national objectives and regional variations; environmental constraints; levels of policy authority; maximizing resources efficiencies; coordination with private/public sector activities; inter-agency coordination; local autonomy; resource inputs, available technologies; cost/benefits; management; training and evaluation; status of research and agricultural technology; energy and power

and coordination of women into agricultural development activities.

2. Participates with the Mission or Regional Director and other senior staff in planning and designing A.I.D. programs and projects for the country or region and provides policy, management and technical advice on the role considered appropriate for the agricultural development program and each of its sector components.
3. Participates with responsible Mission or Regional staff in advising and negotiating with cooperating country officials on the planning, design and financial and administrative requirements of the country's agricultural development program taking into consideration Mission staffs and services provided at the particular Mission (e.g., Food for Peace, Voluntary Agencies).
4. Works closely with the Capital Resources Office and the Program Office in establishing the loan and grant funding levels for the sector components of agricultural development programs and projects.
5. Participates in the preparation, review and submission of required program and project documentation from the cooperating government, PASA, contractors and agricultural development and other Mission staffs.
6. Advises and confers with United Nations, other country and independent donors on their on-going and planned advisory, institutional and monetary contribution to the total country

or regional agricultural development program, and negotiates with them on the most appropriate showing of responsibility for assistance.

7. Maintains continuing contact with cooperating government officials, other donors, voluntary agencies, educational and private institutions, and cooperating country contractors to insure compliance with commitments, resolve problems, and determine if additional loan or grant funding should be extended.

8. Monitors U.S. participating agency and private contractor activities to insure that projects for which they are responsible are implemented in accordance with terms of the contract and recommends corrective action, if indicated.

9. Travels extensively to monitor and provide management and technical guidance to project staff; to advise and negotiate with local level officials ; and to evaluate the impact that the programs and project initiatives are having on agricultural development objectives. Advises the Mission Director on status of programs and potential problem areas.

10. Directs and supervises project managers and technical advisory scope assigned to agricultural development office and may serve as project manager for one or more agricultural development projects.

QUALIFICATIONS

The appropriate qualifications requirements are normally

a combination of experience in rural and agricultural environments of less developed countries and academic training, preferably at least at the Master's level in such areas as agriculture, agriculture economics and related fields of agricultural development. Experience, interest and ability to work in and relate to an agricultural environment is the most important qualification. ^{The incumbent may} ~~and can~~ also be considered qualified if supported by relevant past experience.

Draft

- 53 -

Annex 12
cont'd

POSITION TITLE:

Project Manager (Agriculture) 0401.

The Project Manager (Agriculture) is responsible for the management and surveillance of A.I.D. funded Agricultural development assistance projects.

NATURE AND SCOPE OF WORK:

The Project Manager (Agriculture) has the overall responsibility for the management, monitoring, coordinating and evaluating the progress, effectiveness and compliance of assigned agricultural projects in a wide variety of specialized fields. The Project Manager's role will vary depending on the Mission's program needs and the extent to which the cooperating government officials may become involved in project management. In accordance with the U.S. policy mandate for extending overseas development assistance to less developed countries, Missions are encouraged to place as much responsibility as practical on the cooperating government and its government and private sector institutions for programs and project planning, management and implementation. Preferably, the cooperating government should exercise full responsibility for this management of the project with inspections of its progress and operational effectiveness being conducted by the Project Manager. Depending upon the type of project and the level of technical and managerial expertise of the cooperating country, the Project

Manager may be required to assume full-time technical and managerial direction of the project. If less immediate monitoring is necessary, the Project Manager (Agriculture) makes on-site inspections to evaluate project status and advise with and provide guidance to local level project workers.

The Project Manager (Agriculture) participates in new project design, the redesign of on-going projects and contract renegotiation, but is not involved in the initial planning or design stages of Mission or Regional Program planning.

The Project Manager (Agriculture) reports to the Agriculture Development Officer for the Mission or Region or in smaller Missions may report to the Mission Director or designee.

REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES:

1. On new agricultural projects initiated and designed at the Mission level, participates with responsible A.I.D and cooperating country staff, PASA and contract representatives in project design and review to evaluate and advise on the scope of the project; role of U.S. institutional and other donor manpower and training components; level of expertise of cooperating country staffing; aggregate monetary and funding levels; preferable method of staffing (i.e. PASA, contract, etc.) and

program and fiscal documentation and reporting requirements.

2. Coordinates, directs and participates in the administration of assigned agricultural projects by overseeing and coordinating performance; quality, adequacy and condition of equipment; competence and performance of PASA and contractor personnel; project cost and progress; methods and acceptability of project reporting, timeliness in meeting commitments and scheduled completion dates and other related management objectives.
3. Based on evaluation of project status, level of acceptability and future need in meeting U.S. and cooperating country development objectives, recommends continued funding, withholding of funds or withdrawal of A.I.D. from further participation in the project.
4. Works closely with and advises central and local level counterparts and with other cooperating country institutions, contract personnel and other donors participating in the project to insure coordinated and executed managerial performance.
5. Recommends and secures specialized technical guidance for any project activity which requires additional supportive assistance in the numerous agricultural specialized fields and prepares all necessary justification and program documentation involved.

6. Monitors and audits financial disbursement procedures by cooperating government ministries and institutions responsible for the project and advises responsible Mission offices of need for corrective action or investigation.
7. Works with appropriate cooperating government entities to insure adherence to environmental and ecological considerations in project operations.
8. In order to identify potential priorities, needs and problems and to provide technical advice and assistance, keeps informed of agricultural concerns of the cooperating country as related to assigned projects. Keeps abreast of agricultural research being conducted in cooperating country as well as similar research in the U.S. and elsewhere.
9. Participates in the preparation and submission of all required program and project documentation and has continuing responsibility for obtaining, reviewing and transmitting all project loan and grant funded cooperating country, PASA and contractor reports and documentation required under A.I.D. reporting procedures.
10. Travels extensively to project sites to monitor and provide management and technical guidance to the project staff; to advise and negotiate with local level officials; and to assess the impact of agricultural projects on other projects.

QUALIFICATIONS

Academic degree, preferably a graduate degree or advanced study, in agriculture, rural development or agricultural economics, is required.

Demonstrated planning, coordinating and problem solving skills and working knowledge of A.I.D. programming process and documentation, contracting procedures and financial management principles are required.

Personality traits necessary for effective interpersonal relationships, including empathy, understanding, tact and sensitivity to the interplay among various sectors of a developing country and how such interactions influence project management and implementation.

POSITION TITLE: AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIST 0110.35*

*Annex 12
contd.
Draft*

The Agricultural Economist advises on and performs studies and analyses of the economics factors affecting the development of agriculture, agricultural products, land use, and agriculture credit structures and institutions.

Nature and Scope of Work

Positions in this series are involved with economic analyses of the effects on the agricultural sector of the costs and levels of production, consumption, markets and marketing systems, prices, labor supply, processing, distribution, transportation, credit structures and institutions, farm associations and cooperatives, land tenure and use policies, farm management practices, scientific and technological developments, traditional habits and attitudes of producers, government rural policies and laws, urbanization and industrialization, promotion of agriculture related industries and policies and development in other sectors of the economy and in the social and political spheres. The work includes forecasting trends, production and consumption levels, and the economic effects on agriculture of proposed policies, legislation, and programs. It also includes the development of a body of basic information and making judgments and recommendations which are essential to sound policy making and program planning. The position may be used for advising on the economic aspects of land reform programs or investigations of land tenure and land use.

The Agriculture Economist works within the Mission or Regional AID office as an advisor on economic factors which reflect on the agriculture development of the country or region. Depending on the size and organizational structure of the Mission or regional office, works with the Agriculture Development Officer, Rural Development Officer, Program Officer, and the Economic Advisor in providing advice and guidance to host country or regional area officials and institutions on the improvement of country or regional agricultural economic and planning capability and its effect on agriculture, its impact on related industries and credit institutions as well as on the standard of living and economic development of the country or area as a whole.

Representative Duties

1. Serves as the principal agriculture economic advisor to the host government or governments and participates actively with other Mission agriculture, rural development, engineering and program staffs in planning and designing the country's or region's agriculture development programs and projects to assure a balanced and integrated country or regional agriculture development plan.
2. Initiates and encourages host governments to undertake economic research directly related to agriculture production; commodity processing; storage, distribution and transportation of farm products; utilization and establishment of cooperatives and marketing, credit and financial institutions; and other

programs which can be employed to improve the agriculture economy of the country or area.

3. Participates with host government offices and other Mission program and agriculture staffs in developing a body of basic economic information to assist the country or region in making economic and policy judgments and recommendations for project design, programming and evaluation on individual programs as well as for the total agriculture sector program.
4. Makes recommendations for improving the level and quality of training to upgrade the potential economic base of the country's agriculture program.

Qualifications

1. College degree with major in Agriculture Economics.
2. A high degree of demonstrated analytical ability, particularly in problem identification, project design and evaluation.
3. Specialized study and field research in economic and social (rural) development is highly desirable.
4. Must be familiar with AID programming processes and documentation contracting procedures and financial management principals.
5. Professional experience and knowledge of agriculture production, consumption, distribution and marketing practices.
6. Professional knowledge of and experience in agriculture practices and theory in the fields of credit and financing is desirable.

Annex 12
cont'd

Draft

| | | |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|-------|
| <u>TITLE:</u> | RURAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER | 0340. |
| | DEPUTY RURAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER | 0340. |
| | ASSISTANT RURAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER | 0340. |

DEFINITION: The Rural Development Officer plans and administers the Mission's or Region's rural development program.

BEST AVAILABLE

NATURE AND SCOPE OF PROGRAM WORK

Rural development is the strategy designed to improve the economic, social, and cultural life and expectations of the rural poor in less developed countries. The rural poor either in densely populated or sparsely settled areas include small-scale farmers, tenants, sharecroppers, landless workers, nomads and their families. The thrust of A.I.D.'s rural development program is to increase the rural poor's access to income producing opportunities and to social services as well as to promote greater participation of local groups and rural communities in development decision making and resource allocation. Program designs will vary according to development conditions and circumstances within the country or region, the size and program emphasis of the Agency's involvement, the extent of the loan and grant commitments and those of other donors, and the degree to which the host government can analyze development problems and manage development projects.

Similarly, the functions of the rural development officer position will vary with Mission programmatic needs. This position description is intended to be a guide only. Functions may range from one of staff advisor to senior Mission management to one of a senior line officer

responsible for programming, planning and implementing all Mission activities in the rural sector. Obviously, within these two extremes there are numerous other possibilities. Missions must adapt the functional statement of rural development officer in a manner most suited to their needs.

Although rural development per se involves the sectors of education, and health, infrastructure, public and private institutional management, it usually interacts predominantly with agriculture and local rural government or community organizations. Missions may have both a rural development office and an agricultural office operating as line offices with responsibilities divided between them. In such a situation, programs directed at agriculture/productivity and production are normally located in the agricultural office while programs directed at off-farm rural employment, agrarian reform, integrated or area development approaches, development of cooperatives and local organizations, and rural financial markets would normally be located in the rural development office. Some activities, such as marketing, sector planning, ^{agribusiness} and institutional development could be assigned to either office depending on their particular focus and relationship to other programs and on host country or Mission needs. Where it is impractical or unnecessary to have both a rural development and an agricultural office at the line level, the Mission should determine the position title for the single office based on the content and nature of the Mission's program.

Annex 12
cont'd

BEST
AVAILABLE

If the Mission or Regional program is large enough to support a full Deputy Rural Development Officer (AOSC) position, the Deputy performs any or all of the functions of the program and acts in the absence of the Rural Development Officer. The Rural Development Officer, (AOSC), or the Assistant Rural Development Officer (AOSC), performs any of the assigned responsibilities of the program.

REPRESENTATIVE DUTIES

1. Participates with ^{cooperating} ~~host~~ government officials in examining rural development policy with reference to the national economy; national objectives and regional variations; environmental constraints; levels of policy authority; maximizing resources efficiencies; coordination with the private/public sector activities; inter-agency coordination; local autonomy; resource inputs; available technologies; cost/benefits; management; training and evaluation.
2. Participates with the Mission or Regional Director and other senior staff in planning and designing A.I.D. programs and projects for the country or region and provides policy, management and technical advice on the role considered appropriate for the rural development program and each of its sector components.
3. Participates with responsible Mission or Regional staff in advising and negotiating with ^{cooperating} ~~host~~ country officials on the planning, design, and financial and administrative requirements of the country's rural development program.

BEST
AVAILABLE

Annex 12
contd

4. Works closely with the Capital Resources Office and the Program Office in establishing the loan and grant funding levels for the sector components of rural development programs and projects.

5. Participates in the preparation, review and submission of required program and project documentation from the host government, PASA, contractors and rural development Mission staff.

6. Advises with United Nations, other country and independent donors on their on-going and planned advisory, institutional and monetary contribution to the total country or regional rural development program, and negotiates with them on the most appropriate sharing of responsibility for assistance.

7. Maintains continuing contact with ^{cooperating} ~~host~~ government officials, other donors, voluntary agencies, educational and private institutions, and ^{cooperating} ~~host~~ country contractors to insure compliance with commitments, resolve problems, and determine if additional loan or grant funding should be extended.

8. Travels extensively to monitor and provide management and technical guidance to project staff; to advise and negotiate with local level officials; and to evaluate the impact the programs and project initiatives are having on rural development objectives. Advises the Mission Director on status of programs and potential problem areas.

BEST
AVAILABLE

BEST
AVAILABLE

Annex 12
cont'd.

9. Monitors U.S. participating agency and private contractor activities to insure that projects for which they are responsible are implemented in accordance with terms of the contracts and recommends corrective action, if indicated.
10. Directs and supervises project managers and technical advisory staff assigned to rural development office and may serve as project manager for one or more rural development projects.

QUALIFICATIONS

The appropriate qualifications are normally a combination of experience in rural environments of IDC's and academic training, preferably at least at Master's level, in such areas as rural sociology, anthropology, political science, and economics including agricultural economics. Experience, interest and ability to work in and relate to a rural environment is the most important qualification and can substitute for the academic requirement. Thus, individuals without Masters level degrees or with degrees that are more technically oriented (e.g., agriculture, engineering) or more general (humanities, public or business administration) with emphasis on agriculture can also be considered qualified, if supported by past experiences.

