

11/4763

114763

BY THE U.S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
**Report To The Director, International
Communication Agency**

**U.S. Government Exchange Programs Are
Not Being Coordinated In Japan And India**

As part of Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 and the Executive order implementing it, the U.S. International Communication Agency was charged with the responsibility to coordinate the international information, educational, cultural and exchange programs conducted by the U.S. Government. This report evaluates the agency's progress in Japan and India to fulfill the Presidential mandate.



GAO concluded that the agency missions in the two countries were not coordinating exchange programs of all U.S. Government agencies and that coordination activities in the two countries remained essentially unchanged from those operating prior to the issuance of the Presidential mandate. GAO believes it essential that the U.S. International Communication Agency define the limits of the Executive order.

GAO recommends that the Director of the U.S. International Communication Agency draw up and implement a plan to achieve coordination in U.S. Government exchange programs. At a minimum, the plan should prescribe which Government programs are to be included and specific actions to be undertaken within the missions abroad as well as within the involved Washington agencies.



ID-81-41
MARCH 30, 1981

016186

Request for copies of GAO reports should be sent to:

**U.S. General Accounting Office
Document Handling and Information
Services Facility
P.O. Box 6015
Gaithersburg, Md. 20760**

Telephone (202) 275-6241

The first five copies of individual reports are free of charge. Additional copies of bound audit reports are \$3.25 each. Additional copies of unbound report (i.e., letter reports) and most other publications are \$1.00 each. There will be a 25% discount on all orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address. Sales orders must be prepaid on a cash, check, or money order basis. Check should be made out to the "Superintendent of Documents".



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

INTERNATIONAL DIVISION

The Honorable John W. Shirley
Acting Director, International
Communication Agency

Dear Mr. Shirley:

This report discusses the Agency's efforts at U.S. Missions in Japan and India to coordinate international exchange programs of the Federal Government.

As part of Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 and Executive Order 12048 of March 27, 1978, the International Communication Agency was charged with the responsibility to coordinate the international information, educational, cultural, and exchange programs conducted by the U.S. Government. This review was made to evaluate the Agency's progress in the two countries to fulfill the Presidential mandate.

This report contains a recommendation to you on page 24. As you know, section 236 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires the head of a Federal agency to submit a written statement on actions taken on our recommendations to the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs and the House Committee on Government Operations not later than 60 days after the date of the report and to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations with the agency's first request for appropriations made more than 60 days after the date of the report.

We are sending copies of this report to the above-named committees; the House Committee on Foreign Affairs; the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and the Director, Office of Management and Budget.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Frank C. Conahan".

Frank C. Conahan
Director

D I G E S T

In the past four decades the U.S. Government has supported international exchange programs between the United States and other nations as an important foreign policy undertaking. These exchanges have involved the movement of persons between countries for the purpose of sharing knowledge, skills, ideas, and culture. There are at least 25 Government departments and agencies operating international exchange or training programs, including the U.S. International Communication Agency, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Education, and others. (See pp. 1 and 2.)

U.S. Government efforts over the past 30 years to effectively coordinate exchange programs have met with limited success and were short-lived. In a further attempt to coordinate Government exchange activities, Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977, which established the International Communication Agency, charged the Agency with ensuring interagency coordination of international information, educational, cultural, and exchange programs of the U.S. Government. The mandate was formalized in a 1978 Executive order instructing the Agency Director to exercise primary responsibility for Government-wide policy guidance in this area. (See p. 2.)

In 1978 GAO reported on the continual problems encountered by the Government to coordinate international exchange activities, pointing out that repeated attempts to establish an interagency mechanism for this purpose were unsuccessful. A conclusion reached in the report was that one of the most important places to coordinate Government exchanges is within the overseas missions. As a result, GAO recommended that the Director of the International Communication Agency issue instructions

to the field, designed to reemphasize and clarify coordination requirements. These instructions were never issued. (See p. 3.)

GOVERNMENT-WIDE EXCHANGES ARE NOT
BEING COORDINATED IN JAPAN AND INDIA

U.S. Government exchange programs in Japan and India are large and varied involving several Federal departments and agencies, as well as private organizations and institutions. GAO evaluated the efforts of the International Communication Agency missions in Japan and India to coordinate all Government sponsored international exchange programs. As used in the report, coordination means the development of close interagency relationships aimed at avoiding duplication and overlap in Government exchanges and bringing about overall coherence in exchange activities. In line with this, GAO found that the Agency missions in the two countries were not coordinating exchange programs of all U.S. Government agencies and that coordination activities in the two countries remained essentially unchanged from those operating prior to the issuance of the Presidential mandate. (See chs. 2 and 3.)

Generally, the two missions follow an informal, ad hoc approach in monitoring and sharing information on selected Government exchange programs. Although U.S. International Communication Agency officials at the missions are involved with programs falling under the Agency's responsibility and those which are closely related to its exchange activities, for the most part they had very little information on or knowledge of many of the other Government exchange programs operating at the missions. GAO believes in order to develop interagency relationships that serve the interests of all concerned and meet the full intent of the Presidential order, it is essential that Agency officials define the limits of the

order and establish and implement a plan to coordinate exchange programs of all agencies both in Japan and India as well as in Washington. (See pp. 23 and 24.)

RECOMMENDATION

GAO recommends that the Director of the International Communication Agency draw up and implement a plan designed to achieve coordination in U.S. Government exchange programs as called for in the President's directive. At a minimum, such a plan should prescribe which Government programs are to be included and specific actions to be undertaken within the missions abroad as well as within the involved Washington agencies. This would bring about more effective coordination of Government exchange activities. (See p. 24.)

AGENCY COMMENTS

GAO did not get official USICA comments on this report. Senior USICA officials in the geographic bureaus representing Japan and India and its U.S. Government Exchange Policy and Coordination Unit responsible for coordinating U.S. Government exchange programs commented on matters in the report. These officials believed the GAO recommendation has merit. (See p. 24.)

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
DIGEST		i
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Past efforts to coordinate exchanges	1
	Objectives, scope, and methodology	4
2	USICA EFFORTS TO COORDINATE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES IN JAPAN	6
	Exchange activities involving USICA	6
	Exchange activities of other U.S. agencies	8
	USICA planning and coordinating efforts in exchange programs	9
3	USICA EFFORTS TO COORDINATE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES IN INDIA	15
	Exchange activities involving USICA	15
	Exchange activities of other U.S. agencies	19
	USICA actions to plan and coordinate exchange programs	20
4	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION	23
	Recommendation	24
APPENDIX		
I	Digest of previous GAO report "Coordination of International Exchange and Training Programs--Opportunities and Limitations" (ID-78-37, July 24, 1978)	25

ABBREVIATIONS

AIIS	American Institute of Indian Studies
CAO	Cultural Affairs Officer
CULCON	U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange
DCAO	Deputy Cultural Affairs Officer
GAO	General Accounting Office
JUSEC	Japan-United States Educational Commission
PAO	Public Affairs Officer
USEFI	United States Educational Foundation in India
USICA	United States International Communication Agency

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The fundamental premise of the International Communication Agency (USICA) is that it is in the U.S. interest to encourage the sharing of ideas and cultural activities among the people of the United States and the people of other nations. USICA endeavors to accomplish this task in part through its educational and cultural exchange programs and through financial support to private programs. In addition to USICA activities, other U.S. Government departments and agencies also sponsor exchange programs and while USICA has no authority to dictate the direction of these activities, it is charged with ensuring that all U.S. Government programs are coordinated.

Coordination, as used in the report, means the development of close cooperative relationships between the agencies involved in exchange activities, including the sharing of information, expertise and ideas. The overall purpose is to avoid duplication and overlap in Government programs in order to make more efficient use of scarce resources in this area. Coordination is also important to bring about overall coherence in Government exchange activities. A necessary part of the process is the collection and maintenance of data concerning the activities of all U.S. Government agencies conducting exchange programs. More specifically, coordination does not mean policy or fiscal control.

PAST EFFORTS TO COORDINATE EXCHANGES

For over 40 years the Government has supported international exchange programs between the United States and other nations as an important foreign policy undertaking. In addition, state and local governments, foundations and academic institutions in the United States and abroad have sponsored similar exchange activities. 1/ Exchanges have been of varying kinds and for significantly different purposes. For example, exchanges involve research, technical training, cultural presentations and athletic events. The objectives of these exchanges have been to explain U.S. foreign policy; enhance international cooperation; provide security assistance

1/Exchange in this context is properly defined as the movement of persons between countries for the purpose of sharing knowledge, skills, ideas, and culture. It thus embraces not only the reciprocal one-to-one placement of individuals between countries but also, and principally, all educational, cultural, and training activities devoted to those purposes.

training; and promote a better understanding of the cultural background of the peoples of the world.

In a 1978 report by the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs it was noted that there were at least 25 Government agencies operating international exchange or training programs. These have included such agencies as the USICA, the Agency for International Development, the Departments of Defense and Education, the Peace Corps, and the National Science Foundation. Some departments and agencies receive cooperation and counsel from appointed boards, and advisory and binational commissions. In addition, several commissions, subcommissions, and educational institutions have been created by legislation or international agreements to further mutual understanding at the highest level with certain foreign countries, including the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission, the Indo-U.S. Subcommittee on Education and Culture, and the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, commonly known as the East-West Center.

Although the U.S. Government-sponsored exchange program could be considered massive, it is estimated to represent only a small percentage of total exchange programs. For example, privately sponsored exchange and training programs are conducted by hundreds of institutions--including foundations, universities, religious organizations, labor unions, fraternal orders, and business corporations. Unfortunately information about such activities, except where they are assisted by government grants, is quite limited.

Since 1953 the U.S. Government has established and dis-established numerous executive level groups to improve data sharing and coordination in U.S. exchange activities. However, for the most part, these efforts have met with limited success and were short-lived. In a further attempt to develop effective interagency coordination, Presidential Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977, gave USICA responsibility for ensuring interagency coordination of international information, educational, cultural, and exchange programs conducted by the U.S. Government. This mandate was formalized in Executive Order 12048 (March 27, 1978) which instructed the USICA Director to exercise primary responsibility for Government-wide policy guidance for the coordination of these programs. The Order called upon the Director to take into account the statutory functions of the involved agencies. It imposed on the Director the responsibility to determine what actions should be taken to coordinate Government exchange activities.

In a 1978 report 1/ on international exchange and training programs, we outlined the checkered history of interagency coordination noting that:

"* * * repeated efforts to establish an interagency mechanism to coordinate such programs have produced a series of committees in Washington that generated a plentitude of reports and recommendations but little in the way of coordination. Such attempts at coordination finally crumbled under their own weight."

The report went on to say

"* * * the idea of creating a permanent, full-time interagency mechanism to coordinate U.S. Government exchange and training programs emerges as an over-elaborate solution to present and foreseeable problems."

A conclusion of the report was that one of the most important places to coordinate the exchange and training activities of U.S. agencies is within the overseas mission. In line with this, we recommended that the Director of USICA arrange with the State Department to issue instructions to the field designed to reemphasize and clarify interagency data sharing and coordination requirements.

In January 1979 USICA drafted but did not issue guidelines providing for the coordination abroad of all U.S. Government-funded exchange programs. The coordination envisioned by the guidelines was intended to (1) ensure information sharing among involved field agencies and their U.S. headquarters, (2) provide needed coherence in Government-sponsored exchanges, (3) increase program effectiveness, and (4) ensure that all programs also serve to increase mutual understanding and learning between the people of the United States and the people of other nations. Program direction was to come from USICA which was to serve as a central clearinghouse for information and for the maintenance of records concerning the overall activities of U.S. Government agencies conducting programs. Ultimately the guidelines were scrapped as being too cumbersome to administer at the overseas missions. Although USICA headquarters officials have undertaken a number of initiatives in Washington to improve coordination of Government exchanges, such as collecting data on exchanges and convening small, informal working groups of

1/"Coordination of International Exchange And Training Programs-- Opportunities and Limitations," ID-78-37 dated July 24, 1978.

officials from several U.S. agencies to discuss exchange coordination, no instructions have been sent to the U.S. missions defining coordination requirements overseas.

OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND METHODOLOGY

In our 1978 report on coordination of international exchange and training programs, we stated an important place to coordinate these programs is at the overseas missions. The objective of this review was to evaluate at the mission level efforts to coordinate all Federal Government-sponsored international exchange and training programs. To accomplish this objective we collected and reviewed information on the major exchange and training programs conducted by the United States with both Japan and India. These countries were specifically chosen because of their large exchange programs, involving several Federal departments and agencies, and numerous private organizations and institutions.

Since our 1978 report assessed coordination of exchange programs by U.S. Government agencies in Washington, this review focused on the coordination activities of such programs in Japan and India. The study was conducted by examining the records and interviewing USICA officials at headquarters and missions in Japan and India. Specifically, we reviewed (1) USICA country plans for the two countries, (2) Agency files dealing with exchange activities involving Japan and India, and (3) mission exchange files and message traffic between USICA Washington and the Japan and India posts. Overall one should not conclude that what was found in these two countries is characteristic of USICA coordination in all countries.

We discussed coordination of U.S. Government exchange programs with officials in Washington, Japan and India. Included in these talks were the Director and other officials of USICA's U.S. Government Exchanges Policy and Coordination Unit--the Washington group established to serve as a central clearinghouse for information and for the maintenance of records concerning the overall activities of U.S. Government agencies conducting exchange programs. We also talked with the Public Affairs Officers and Cultural Affairs Officers in Japan and India and other embassy officials representing Federal agencies normally involved in international exchange and training programs, such as the National Science Foundation, the Agency for International Development, the Department of Labor, and others. Additionally, we held discussions with representatives of several private organizations and the executive directors of the binational commissions which administer the Fulbright Program in both countries, to obtain their views on the need for better coordinated mission exchange programs.

Although we did not get official USICA comments, we discussed a draft of this report with senior USICA officials in the geographic bureaus responsible for Japan and India and its U.S. Government Exchanges Policy and Coordination Unit.

CHAPTER 2

USICA EFFORTS TO COORDINATE

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES IN JAPAN

U.S. Government-funded exchange programs are an important part of U.S. mission activities in Japan. The multiplicity of exchange activities include those funded wholly or in part by USICA, programs of other U.S. Government agencies, and those of private institutions. Overall USICA coordination of the various activities is handled on an informal, ad hoc basis. For the most part, coordination is not an integral part of the Agency's country plan process and is limited to several major programs which are the direct responsibility of the Agency or closely similar to its exchange activities. USICA does little to coordinate other U.S. Government programs.

EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES INVOLVING USICA

In Japan, USICA's major interest in the exchange program area centers on the activities of the Japan-United States Educational Commission (JUSEC)--commonly referred to as the Fulbright Commission--the International Visitor Program and the Japan-United States Friendship Commission. In addition, the mission has identified a number of major U.S. and Japanese organizations whose purpose is to promote various educational and cultural exchange programs between the two countries. These programs involve professors, journalists, students, and teachers.

Japan-United States Educational Commission

The JUSEC--a 10-member binational board of Americans and Japanese--administers the Fulbright program in Japan. In 1980 the Fulbright program operated at a \$2 million level and is now being funded on an equal basis by the Governments of the two countries. USICA represents the U.S. Government on the Commission and provides the U.S. share of the funding. Presently the Fulbright program operates under five major project areas--(1) American studies, (2) Japanese studies, (3) Pacific Basin studies, (4) studies in social change and social policy, and (5) studies in international education. For the 1980 program year ending June 1981, grants are expected to be awarded to 36 U.S. and 82 Japanese students, researchers, journalists, and lecturers. In addition to its grants program JUSEC, among other things, (1) provides an educational information service to counsel Japanese students on study and research opportunities in the United States, (2) offers facilitative support to research grantees funded under the Department of Education

(formerly the Office of Education) Fulbright program and those of certain private institutions, and (3) serves as the Japanese Office of the East-West Center.

During program year 1979, the JUSEC aided the East-West Center in selecting five graduate students and 14 Japanese participants for activities conducted by the Center. Established in 1960 to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the Asian and Pacific nations through cooperative study, training, and research, the East-West Center is divided into five problem-oriented institutes to bring together scholars, practitioners and policymakers to seek solutions to the problems that are common to the Asia-Pacific area. The Center receives most of its funding and facilitative assistance from USICA. During fiscal year 1981 this funding is approximately \$16 million. Additional funding comes from other Federal agencies, private organizations and several of the Asian and Pacific area governments.

International Visitor Program

The International Visitor Program, administered and funded by USICA, provides selected Japanese leaders in government, labor, mass media, education and other fields the opportunity to make short-term visits to the United States. The program differs somewhat from other exchange programs in the sense that it involves one-way (Japan to United States), non-academic type exchanges. Also, it is a U.S. Mission-wide program with nominations and selections coming from various elements within the U.S. Embassy and from USICA branch posts. Fiscal year 1981 funding is at the \$115,000 level, down from \$215,000 in fiscal year 1980. There were 53 participants in fiscal year 1980; about 40 visitors will participate in fiscal year 1981.

Japan-United States Friendship Commission

The Friendship Commission was established in 1975 to aid education and culture at the highest level and to support the close friendship and mutuality of interests between the United States and Japan. As an independent U.S. Government agency the Commission is accountable to the Congress and the President. It is composed of 18 Americans representing the fields of scholarship, mass media, business, the arts, and Government, including Members of Congress and executive branch officials. Operating income for the Commission is derived from a trust fund specifically established for this purpose. In 1979 the total grant expenditures amounted to \$2.2 million. Commission grant support goes to four project areas--Japanese studies, American studies, the arts, and cultural communication and public affairs. Grants are not made to individuals directly but instead are given to universities, academic associations or other appropriate organizations who make individual selections.

Other exchange activities

In addition to the larger exchange programs mentioned above, USICA in Japan maintains an active interest in a select group of Japanese exchange programs and certain private exchange activities which in some cases receive U.S. Government support. To facilitate this effort, the USICA mission has prepared for internal use two directories of institutions involved in U.S.-Japan exchanges. In general, they include information on the program's purpose, officers and directors, projects, and funding. One directory lists 13 important Japanese institutions in the area of exchanges, including among others the American Studies Foundation, The International House of Japan, the Japan Center for International Exchange and The Japan Foundation. The second directory identifies 12 U.S. organizations operating exchange activities in Japan. Among those listed are The American Council of Learned Societies, The Asia Foundation, The Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, and Social Science Research Council. Generally, these are private organizations but some receive U.S. Government funds.

Although these directories provide the USICA mission a ready-source of information on a number of organizations involved in exchanges between the two countries, the directories were incomplete with some outdated information. Other than this information, USICA mission officials maintain no other comprehensive exchange list.

EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES OF OTHER U.S. AGENCIES

While the USICA mission officials actively involve themselves in U.S.-Japan exchange activities supported by the Agency or those receiving U.S. funds that closely parallel USICA exchange activities, little or no resources are expended to collect and maintain information on other U.S. Government agencies' exchanges in Japan.

For our review USICA headquarters compiled information on international exchanges sponsored and supported by the U.S. Government in India and Japan for fiscal years 1977 and 1978. The Japan listing showed 19 U.S. departments or agencies involved in exchange activities such as agricultural training, intercultural education, security assistance training, international visitors, independent fellowships, and cooperative science exchanges. For most agencies the compilation showed the number of foreign national and U.S. participants. However, several programs had no participant data.

We showed this listing to the USICA officer in Japan involved in the exchange programs area to determine what he knew of these U.S. Government activities. We learned that except for the USICA and a few other similar type programs, he was unaware of the activities carried out under the programs listed and had no information on them. In addition, several other embassy officials could provide very little specific data on exchanges in their areas with which we could assess the accuracy and completeness of the USICA listing.

USICA PLANNING AND COORDINATING EFFORTS IN EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Overall USICA activities in Japan are guided by an Agency Country Plan. However, the Plan is silent on the issue of coordinating international exchanges. While USICA monitors the larger, more important exchanges that are closely related to the Agency's overall mission, practical limitations on its coordination ability are cited as reasons USICA officials do not try to coordinate all U.S. Government exchange activities in country.

USICA planning and international exchanges

For the most part, the major focus of USICA's work through the year is presented in the Agency's Country Plan. This internal Plan is prepared annually and translates the Agency's global mission into definitive issues appropriate to the political, psychological, economic, and cultural conditions in a country. It also outlines a program of action to address these communication issues.

The 1981 Country Plan for Japan is broken down into three sections. The first part consists of a narrative discussion of the bilateral communication relationship between the two countries and a listing which prioritizes the major issues to be addressed in the plan, including such things as international politics and security affairs, trade problems, and arms control and disarmament. Section two individually identifies the issues and the ways USICA plans to deal with them--including the use of American speakers, visitor grants, and video tape recordings. The third section on academic programs provides a short explanation of what the JUSEC, the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission and USICA are doing in the American studies area. The third section also gives information on the number of Fulbright grants and costs.

A review of the USICA plan for Japan shows there is no extensive discussion of U.S. Government exchanges of other agencies or of possible actions or procedures to coordinate

exchanges between the two countries. The academic section is narrowly focused and the grants listed are limited to those provided under the Fulbright program. The USICA officer responsible for preparing the Country Plan told us that in terms of exchange programs primary emphasis is placed on the International Visitor Program where nominations and selections are directly tied to issues identified in the Country Plan.

USICA does not include exchange activities of other U.S. Government agencies in the plan because their needs are very different from the Agency's. While USICA considers Fulbright grants to be important, they are not integrated into the plan as are the International Visitor grants because the Fulbright program is designed to operate separately under the direction of an independent binational commission. Another USICA official stated that the Agency has no assurance grantees of other programs will volunteer their services in connection with a particular aspect of the Country Plan. Nevertheless, when the opportunity exists, the post draws on grantees of other exchange programs to supplement or complement the USICA plan for Japan. Possibly, as suggested by Agency officials in Washington, the Plan might be a good place to address the problem of coordinating U.S. Government exchange programs.

USICA coordination activities in Japan

International exchange programs play a key role in the development of an effective dialogue between the United States and Japan. Support for these exchanges comes from governmental, business and private sources and it is the responsibility of USICA to ensure coordination of those activities sponsored by the U.S. Government. For the most part, USICA coordination in Japan is an informal, ad hoc-type arrangement. It incorporates various approaches from maintaining continual contact with major exchange activities to information gathering on other programs.

International exchange programs in Japan are under the direct responsibility of USICA's Cultural Affairs Officer (CAO) who receives guidance and direction from the Public Affairs Officer (PAO), the highest ranking USICA official at the mission. The CAO splits his time among three Agency program areas-- cultural exchanges, program development, and USICA branch post libraries. Although the CAO has overall responsibility for exchanges and becomes directly involved in these efforts, he is assisted by a Deputy Cultural Affairs Officer (DCAO) who handles the daily operations of the various exchange activities, including collecting data and monitoring and acting as liaison with other similar programs between the United States and Japan.

The DCAO's approach to coordinating exchange programs at the mission is to work closely with the larger, more significant programs such as the Fulbright, the Friendship Commission, and the International Visitor Program; and to acquire a general working knowledge--plus retain information in the files--on other similar exchange programs. According to the DCAO, over-all efforts are geared to eliminating duplication and overlap among the different programs and as a result exchange activities in Japan tend to complement one another. Additionally, he stated it is not necessary or useful to coordinate or compile information on exchange programs of other U.S. Government agencies because they are more of a specialized nature. Traditionally, USICA exchange activities relate to academic and cultural issues. Since USICA headquarters has not issued new instructions to the field clarifying coordination requirements, the present system used by the USICA mission has remained essentially unchanged for the past several years.

With respect to the individual exchange programs, there are varying degrees of USICA involvement. In one of the most important exchange activities in Japan--the Fulbright Program--Agency mission officials are closely involved in all aspects of the program, with USICA representatives on the JUSEC. Direct Commission involvement not only provides Agency officials with information on USICA funded Fulbright grantees but also knowledge of exchanges sponsored by other agencies and institutions which are supported by the Commission, including Department of Education Fulbrighters, East-West Center grantees, and some university exchange programs.

In Japan, the PAO is the senior U.S. official on JUSEC; however, he is frequently represented by the CAO who acts as the lead U.S. official in carrying out Commission functions of the PAO. The DCAO is an alternate on the Commission when the PAO is absent. He also handles the routine contact with JUSEC through his dealings with the Commission's Executive Director. His involvement includes meetings and discussions on Commission activities, reviewing and clearing cable traffic, and commenting on JUSEC annual reports and program proposals. Overall USICA interactions with the Commission seem to provide mission officials a good opportunity to monitor and share information on the JUSEC program.

In addition to the Fulbright Program, much of the CAO's and his deputy's time is taken up with the activities of the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission--the largest U.S. Government-funded exchange program in Japan. Although the Friendship Commission is an independent agency of the U.S. Government, the Commission mandate to enhance reciprocal understanding and support friendship and mutuality of interests between the two countries is closely aligned with USICA's goals and the Commission supports grants in project areas similar to the Agency's exchange

programs. While the Commission is unaccountable to USICA, the Agency Director is a member of the Commission.

USICA officials in Japan monitor Friendship Commission activities and exchange information through discussions with the Commission's Assistant Executive Director and by reviewing Friendship Commission cables. Additionally, the DCAO is on the Commission's informal advisory committee on American studies in Japan. Problems of overlap between Commission projects and those of other exchange programs are generally resolved through discussion. While there is no formal process for USICA mission officials to review Friendship Commission projects before they are approved by the Commission Board, the USICA Director participates in discussions of such projects at Commission meetings. Subsequently, the Agency officials in Japan are briefed on the results of such meetings.

Another important exchange effort involving the USICA mission in Japan is the International Visitor Program. This USICA-funded program, administered by the CAO, is a one-way, short-term program which sends Japanese leaders to visit their counterparts in the United States. Nominations for the program come from all elements of the Embassy and USICA's branch posts in Japan. Selections are made by an embassy committee consisting of senior embassy officials, including the CAO, and is chaired by the Deputy Chief of Mission. As the situation warrants, reports are submitted to USICA headquarters at the completion of a visitor's stay in the United States. Also, visitors' names are included in the USICA mission computer data bank for possible later followup. Since the program is somewhat unique, extensive coordination of the visitors with the traditional long-term academic programs incountry is not required. However, USICA must be aware of whether a grantee previously visited the United States on a grant awarded by any U.S. agency.

Although the majority of the CAO's and his deputy's time is devoted to the three major programs outlined above, USICA officials try to keep current on other exchange activities between the United States and Japan which closely parallel these programs. To do this the DCAO has been collecting data on a number of institutions involved in U.S.-Japan exchanges and has put together two directories of such information--one for Japanese organizations sponsoring exchanges and another for U.S. organizations located in Japan. As previously mentioned, these directories need to be more complete and current.

The USICA mission has compiled some data on private exchange organizations. However, the DCAO maintains no comprehensive listing or description of private exchange organizations operating in Japan. Information that is available on

private programs is limited in many cases to those receiving some U.S. Government funding. Also, as previously discussed, no effort is made to coordinate exchange activities sponsored by the other U.S. Government agencies. USICA officials at the mission believe there are limitations on their ability to do this effectively.

Limitations on USICA's ability
to coordinate U.S. Government-wide
exchanges

Although USICA has been charged with the responsibility to coordinate all U.S. Government exchange programs, as a practical matter Agency officials at the mission believe there are certain limits or restrictions on what they can do to coordinate such Government programs. Specifically, the officials stated that,

- personnel of U.S. agencies involved in exchange activities are not always represented at the mission,
- complete information is not always available at the mission on the exchange efforts of U.S. Government agencies, and
- the USICA mission lacks adequate resources to accomplish across-the-board coordination of U.S.-sponsored exchanges.

We discussed coordination of all U.S. Government exchanges with USICA officials in Japan. The PAO stated that agency officials at the mission should not be involved in other U.S. agency exchange programs relating to such things as science, agriculture and defense because they are more specialized than those relating to USICA's mission. USICA officials said that with existing resources it would be impossible to coordinate all U.S. exchanges at the mission.

Embassy officials handling other U.S. agency exchange programs told us there is sufficient coordination between USICA and the programs they are responsible for, and that additional USICA involvement was unnecessary. We found also that some of these officials did not have complete information on their exchange programs. For example, one embassy official acknowledged that he did not have complete information due to limited staff resources. Two other officials explained that some exchange programs are handled directly between U.S.-based and in-country institutions and consequently the mission occasionally may not get information on these.

The role of the U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange

Discussions on the future role of the U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange (CULCON) could have important implications for coordination of exchange activities between the two countries. Established in 1961 through bilateral agreement between the two Heads-of-State, CULCON is an organization of public and private leaders from the United States and Japan dedicated to improving cultural and educational relations between the two countries. It meets every 2 years, alternating between Japan and the United States. Since 1968 it has been composed of a permanent Joint Committee made up of two panels--American and Japanese. The American panel is composed of 12 members representing such constituencies as government, foundations, academic institutions, business and media. Appointments to the American panel are made by the USICA Director. Although both Governments share the costs of joint meetings, many of the activities carried out under CULCON's general aegis are funded privately. Principal ongoing projects of the organization are planned and carried out by subcommittees of experts.

Since its initial formulation in 1961, CULCON has gone through an evolutionary process. Through 1969 the organization primarily reviewed and advised both Governments on areas relating to exchanges. In the period from 1969 to 1980 CULCON's role shifted from advisory to a projects oriented one and involvement in exchange projects became the dominant feature of the organization. At the same time, during this period new exchange organizations came into existence overshadowing the project activist role of CULCON. Consequently, according to USICA the Friendship Commission now totally overlaps CULCON in form and function--members of CULCON's American panel serve concurrently as Commission members and areas of Commission activity include all areas of CULCON subcommittee activity.

Due to the changing environment in exchanges, USICA mission officials are now involved in discussions with Japanese representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on proposed changes in CULCON. These officials stated they believe the organization should be restructured more along the lines of a government-to-government body with input from the private sector, and that it should return to its original advisory role. According to USICA, one of the goals of the restructuring process is for CULCON to formally coordinate some of the more traditional academic and cultural exchanges between Japan and the United States. It would not include coordination of Government-wide exchange programs.

CHAPTER 3

USICA EFFORTS TO COORDINATE

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGES IN INDIA

The U.S. Mission in India is involved in a large and varied U.S. international exchange program funded by USICA, other government agencies, and private institutions. In most cases, USICA coordination of these activities at the Mission is handled informally, on an ad hoc basis and takes into account the major exchange programs under the Agency's responsibility or those which are outside USICA's control but which are involved in similar-type exchange activities. Also, USICA does not coordinate, maintain information on, or become aware of other U.S. Government-sponsored exchange programs.

EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES INVOLVING USICA

In India, USICA officials in the exchanges area are considerably involved in the major exchange programs between the two countries, including the activities of the United States Education Foundation in India; the Indo/U.S. Subcommittee on Education and Culture; the American Institute of Indian Studies; and the International Visitor Program. In addition, information is on file for several private and Indian governmental institutions involved in furthering educational and cultural opportunities between India and the United States. A further description of these organizations follow.

United States Educational Foundation in India

The United States Educational Foundation in India (USEFI), a binational commission of distinguished Indians and Americans, administers the Fulbright program in India. The Commission is chaired by the CAO in India and funding comes almost exclusively from the U.S. Government. During the 1980 program year, ¹/_{full, short-term, and travel-only grants for Americans included 16 lecturers, 4 research scholars and 1 student. Indian grants went to 3 visiting lecturers, 30 researchers, and 8 students. USEFI also sponsored several short-term seminars. The Commission also provides a student counseling service which advised more than 40,000 persons during the year.}

¹/A USEFI program year covers exchanges for the Indian and U.S. academic years from July through June and September through August, respectively.

USEFI also administers U.S. Department of Education exchanges, East-West Center programs and the Hubert H. Humphrey Exchanges in India. During the program year ended August 1980, the Department of Education sent four students and three post-doctoral researchers to India. For the East-West Center, USEFI selected four students for graduate degree study and more than 40 Indians for participation in Center seminars, institutes, short courses and joint research projects involving senior academics and persons from various professional fields. In the first year of the Humphrey program, academic year 1979-80, two Indians were given fellowships.

The estimated program budget for USEFI for the program year ending August 1982 is approximately \$832,000. Of the total program budget nearly \$723,000 is budgeted for grants during the academic year.

American Institute of Indian Studies

The American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS), a consortium of 37 American colleges and universities interested in the study of Indian culture and civilization, provides fellowship grants to American scholars to conduct research in India. During its 1978-79 academic year over 100 research fellowships for faculty and post-graduate students were provided by AIIS for the following purposes:

- Indian language training program.
- Travel grants to India for persons who have a scholarly purpose for visiting India.
- Seminars and conferences.
- Facilities in both New Delhi and regional offices for research and assistance to grantees.
- Administering the Indo-American Fellowship program of the Indo-U.S. Subcommission on Education and Culture in India.

AIIS member universities and colleges pay annual dues. However, the majority of funding for AIIS operation and programs is received from U.S. Government agencies in the form of grants. One of the largest contributors to AIIS is the Smithsonian Institution. Other grants are received from the National Science Foundation, USICA, and the Department of Education. In addition to Federal support, the Ford Foundation

provides an annual grant to AIIS. For its program year ending June 1980, AIIS operated at an approximately \$1.4 million level.

Indo-U.S. Subcommittee on
Education and Culture

In October 1974 the Governments of the United States and India agreed to form the Indo-U.S. Joint Commission on Economic, Commercial, Scientific, Technological, Educational, and Cultural Cooperation. Under the umbrella of this Commission, several Subcommittees were formed, one of which was the Indo-U.S. Subcommittee on Education and Culture. The Subcommittee reviews and recommends programs, plans and priorities for cooperative efforts to facilitate the interchange of people, materials, and ideas in the broad fields of education, scholarship, and such areas of cultural endeavor as performing arts, fine arts, libraries and museums, sports and mass communications. An American Secretariat, established within the Asia Society, 1/ was set up to fulfill the U.S. Government's obligations under the terms of the agreement which established the Subcommittee. The Society operates on a grant from USICA, which in fiscal year 1980 amounted to \$275,000.

One of the major program efforts of the Subcommittee is the Indo-American Fellowship Program. Since its inception in 1976 the number of grants have steadily increased. During the 1979-80 program year, 21 Americans conducted post-doctoral research in India. In return 19 grants were awarded to Indian post-doctoral, pre-doctoral and visitors for research and study in the United States. Future expansion of the Fellowship Program will depend on financial considerations as well as the availability of other exchange programs.

Although USICA officials agree that the Fellowship Program is similar to the Fulbright and others, they believe that it does not duplicate the efforts of other federally sponsored programs. Further, USICA officials in India stated that the program could be administered by the Fulbright Commission; however, at the present time the program falls under the responsibility of the AIIS, and operates on Federal grants from USICA, the Smithsonian Institution and the National Science Foundation.

1/The objective of the Asia Society is to deepen American understanding of Asia and Asians. It is headquartered in New York and provides assistance to 16 Asian countries.

In addition to the Fellowship Program the Subcommittee sponsors several committees, workshops, and seminars in areas which will promote a better understanding between the two cultures. These programs include, but are not limited to, a visitorship program, an exchange of art objects, an exchange of museum personnel and promoting exhibits in each country. Overall, U.S. Government funding provided to the Subcommittee is shown in the following table.

Indo-U.S. Subcommittee
on Education and Culture
Source of Funding
1979 - 80

<u>Source of funds</u>	<u>Purpose</u>				<u>Total</u>
	<u>Administration</u>	<u>Program</u>	<u>Fellowship Program</u>	<u>Film exhibit</u>	
USICA	\$ 154,773	\$120,227	\$260,650	--	\$535,650
Smithsonian Institution	9,760	139,740	160,014	60,000	369,514
National Science Foundation	--	--	193,014	--	193,014
Total	\$ <u>164,533</u>	<u>\$259,967</u>	<u>\$613,678</u>	<u>\$60,000</u>	<u>\$1,098,178</u>

International Visitor Program

The International Visitor Program is the only exchange program in India which USICA totally controls and funds. The CAO is responsible for administering the program which is designed to identify emerging leaders and to expose them to the United States. The program involves many elements of the embassy. In India the selection committee for the program is chaired by the PAO. Others on the board include the Deputy Public Affairs Officer, CAO and embassy representatives. During fiscal year 1980 the program provided 24 Indians the opportunity to visit America.

Private funded exchange programs

At the USICA mission, information on private exchange programs operating in India was very limited. However, one of the larger private foundations--the Ford Foundation--operates in India. The Ford Foundation is a private organization whose objective is the advancement of human welfare at both national and international levels. The Foundation does not operate a formal exchange of persons program in India. However, it does provide funds to Indian institutions which in

turn send Indians to the United States. Also, the Foundation supports the AIIS to send Americans to India for the purpose of conducting research in Indian studies.

The Foundation's current grants in education, social sciences, culture, and public affairs are mainly in the areas of languages, the social sciences, the documentation and preservation of the origins of Indian classical and folk culture, and human rights. Several of the programs in this category provide grants to institutions which provide funds to Indians for research and study within India or abroad. Total active grants of the Foundation for education, social sciences, culture and public affairs were approximately \$10 million as of October 1979. Most of this support goes to programs carried out within India and does not involve exchange of people.

Other than informal meetings and a limited exchange of information, USICA officials who deal with exchanges have no direct involvement with the Ford Foundation or any other private organizations sponsoring exchanges in India.

EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES OF OTHER U.S. AGENCIES

USICA officials at the U.S. mission do not actively gather or coordinate information on international exchanges sponsored by other U.S. Government agencies. These officials also had limited knowledge of exchange activities conducted by these agencies. We showed several USICA and embassy officials the listing of exchanges prepared by USICA headquarters. The India listing identified 18 U.S. departments or agencies involved in Government exchange activities such as the Departments of Defense and Agriculture, the Agency for International Development, the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies. As we found in Japan, USICA officials in India had little or no information on the exchanges conducted by the above departments and agencies. Similarly, other mission officials involved with these programs could provide very little specific data on exchange activities of these agencies with which to assess the USICA listing.

Although limited information is known about these other Government agencies' exchange programs, both USICA officials and embassy officials in India stated that exchanges conducted by the above agencies were for different purposes. Some officials believe that a more formal mechanism for coordinating all Government exchanges would be of little value. Officials generally agreed that additional coordination of all these exchange

programs would serve no useful purpose. For example, the Defense Attache stated that military exchanges between the two countries are highly technical and politically sensitive. Also, he believes adequate coordination exists between the Departments of Defense and State.

USICA ACTIONS TO PLAN AND COORDINATE EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

In a large measure, USICA activities in India are guided by the Agency Country Plan which defines the communication issues for the country. Although the plan identifies exchange programs as an important issue area, it does not set out steps to coordinate such activities. In general, USICA monitors the large exchange programs receiving agency funding, however, no effort is made to coordinate exchange activities of all Government agencies.

Country plan

USICA annually prepares a country plan which identifies the communication needs in-country and a program of action to address these issues. The plan follows the Ambassador's goals and objectives for the mission. For fiscal year 1981, USICA identified 11 major issues in its plan for India. Although the plan lists American studies and educational exchanges as a major communication issue, there is no discussion of the coordination aspects of the various programs between the two countries.

The plan identifies major exchanges funded by ICA and provides details concerning international visitors and American participants. Further, the plan recommends that USICA Washington provide grants to the Subcommittee on Education and Culture, AIIS and USEFI. There is no mention of exchange activities of other Government agencies. The plan might be a good mechanism to emphasize the importance of exchange coordination.

USICA/India coordination process

Although USICA was directed by the President to ensure appropriate coordination among U.S. agencies for international, informational, educational, and cultural activities, including exchange programs, USICA headquarters has not provided guidance to its missions for coordinating exchange programs in-country. In the absence of such guidance to the field, USICA/India has narrowly defined its coordinating responsibility for Government exchange programs. It has developed unstructured, ad hoc, procedures to deal with the coordination issue surrounding exchange programs.

A major activity of the CAO in India is to administer USICA's International Visitor Program. He also monitors other U.S. Government programs which are funded by USICA, including the

--United States Educational Foundation in India which administers the Fulbright program, several Department of Education programs, and the East-West Center program in India;

--American Studies Research Center; and

--Indo-U.S. Subcommittee on Education and Culture.

Further, the CAO provides facilitative assistance when required to (1) the American Institute of Indian Studies, (2) the Educational Resources Center, and (3) the Berkeley Professional Programs.

Although there is no formal mechanism for the CAO to coordinate all exchange programs between the two countries, he maintains cognizance over many of these activities through his direct involvement in and collection of data on the major exchange programs operating in India. Specifically, the CAO is the Chairman of the Fulbright Commission, and serves as an ex-officio member of the Subcommittee. Also, he maintains records on all of the above exchange programs. Such records include minutes of important meetings, program descriptions, budgets, cables and correspondence with each institution and in some cases records on individual grantees.

Other U.S. Government-sponsored exchange and training programs carried on by the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, Labor and such agencies as National Institutes of Health, the Library of Congress, and the Agency for International Development continue to operate with very little contact between USICA and representatives of other Government departments and agencies at the embassy. However, all USICA and embassy officials we talked with during this review generally agreed that a formal mechanism for coordinating all Government sponsored exchanges would be of limited value, particularly since there are differences in programs and the control of the activities rests with the headquarters agencies. The USICA officials did agree, however, that at the present time, more could be done at the Mission. The Public Affairs Officer stated that he plans to bring together the different elements within the embassy for periodic informal discussions of exchanges. The PAO believes such informal meetings could lead to developing a plan which would prioritize these activities to ensure that U.S. funds go to the right areas. Also, the PAO believes more coordination of exchanges is needed in Washington.

Limitations on USICA's ability to coordinate all federally sponsored exchange programs

Apparently one of the President's objectives in Reorganization Plan No. 2 which established the USICA, was to bring about interagency coordination of the Government exchange programs. However, the mission sees this as a difficult task since USICA cannot control other agency programs and because it lacks the necessary resources and information. Furthermore, several key agencies which conduct educational and culture exchanges with India are not represented at the U.S. mission. Also, policy decisions and selection of grantees for several different exchanges are neither originated nor implemented in-country.

USICA officials in India stated that the lack of statutory authority to control Government exchange programs places certain restrictions on what they can do at the mission to coordinate these exchange activities across the board. These officials feel that for a formal coordinating process to exist at the mission, guidance would be needed from the Director of USICA and approved by the Secretary of State. Such guidance to the field could reemphasize and clarify interagency coordinating requirements at the mission level.

Another limiting factor in USICA coordination of all Government programs is the fact that several Federal agencies identified by USICA headquarters as conducting international exchange and training programs with India are not represented at the U.S. Embassy in India. Several of the embassy officials handling programs of other agencies stated that they were unaware of the exchanges identified by USICA, had only limited information on such exchanges and were not required by the Department of State to compile information for reporting or following up on such exchanges.

Furthermore, several officials stated that exchanges are often handled between Federal agencies in Washington and individual institutions in India without any or limited embassy involvement. In addition, USICA officials stated that in several cases planning and policy direction as well as nomination and selection of grantees occurs in Washington or elsewhere and that the field is notified of decisions after the fact.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Recent efforts to coordinate U.S. international exchange programs of the U.S. Government overseas by USICA have been limited. USICA missions in Japan and India have not established a systematic approach to coordinate Government-wide exchange activities. As noted previously, we think coordination should include a close cooperative relationship between all agencies involved in exchange activities, including information sharing activities, in order to more efficiently use the scarce resources in this area and to provide coherence in Government exchange activities.

Generally, the two missions follow an informal, ad hoc approach in monitoring and sharing information on selected Federal exchange programs. While USICA officials in the two countries are involved in the traditional academic and cultural exchange programs under the Agency's responsibility and those which are closely related to the USICA programs, in most cases the officials are unaware of other U.S. Government exchanges which the mission officials believe are more of a specialized nature. One possible explanation for this, we believe, is that USICA in Washington has not prescribed coordination requirements for the missions in Japan and India.

At least 25 Government agencies have exchange programs. For USICA to carry out its role as coordinator of Government exchanges it should be aware of the activities which are a part of these programs. However, USICA missions in the two countries had very little information on, or knowledge of, many of the Government programs operating at the missions. We believe that to develop interagency relationships that serve the interests of all concerned and fulfill the intent of the Executive order calling for coordination of these programs, it is essential that USICA establish and implement a coordination plan to deal with exchanges of all Government agencies both in Japan and India, as well as Agency headquarters in Washington.

While we believe there may be no need to draw up an elaborate and costly system to coordinate and compile data on all U.S. Government exchange programs, particularly where there might be small programs far removed in purpose from the main exchange programs, various options should be considered, including the idea of periodically holding informal meetings with various elements of the embassy to share information on exchange activities. Also, collecting and maintaining some information on in-country exchange activities could provide a central source of data on Government exchanges.

Overall, USICA missions in Japan and India are actively involved in and serve as a central repository of information on the major educational and cultural exchange programs between the United States and the two countries. However, little action has been taken to carry out the full intent of the Presidential mandate. It appears that existing coordination efforts by USICA in Japan and India remain essentially unchanged from those prior to the issuance of the Executive order. Given the importance attached to coordinating Government exchange programs, as evidenced by the numerous efforts over the years to accomplish this and by the recent Presidential order, we believe USICA should take the necessary actions to define the limits of the Executive order and subsequently to develop a plan for the systematic coordination of Government exchanges both at the missions and in Washington.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend the Director of USICA draw up and implement a plan designed to achieve coordination in U.S. Government exchange programs as called for in the President's directive. At a minimum, such a plan should prescribe which Government programs are to be included and specific actions to be undertaken within the missions abroad as well as within the involved Washington agencies to bring about more effective coordination of Government exchange activities.

We discussed this recommendation with senior USICA officials in the geographic bureaus representing Japan and India and its U.S. Government Exchange Policy and Coordination Unit. These officials believe our recommendation has merit.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S
REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

COORDINATION OF INTERNATIONAL
EXCHANGE AND TRAINING PROGRAMS
--OPPORTUNITIES AND LIMITATIONS
ID-78-37, dated July 24, 1976

D I G E S T

The U.S. Government has sought over the past 30 years to supplement and reinforce classic intergovernmental diplomacy through programs designed, in the words of the Fulbright-Hays Act, "to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries" by supporting and encouraging international educational and cultural "exchange". The Government's participation in American exchange activities is small (perhaps 5 percent of the total) but of special significance.

On April 1, 1978, the International Communication Agency assumed the functions of the U.S. Information Agency and the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. Part of its mandate from the President is to "coordinate the international information, educational, cultural and exchange programs conducted by the U.S. Government" and to serve as "a governmental focal point for private U.S. international exchange programs."

In this activity of Government, as in others, GAO believes the national interest in efficiency and effectiveness can best be served by identifying the limitations on interagency coordination and data sharing as well as by clarifying the unrealized opportunities. In this report GAO seeks to do both.

THE LIMITATIONS

Data sharing and coordination mechanisms cannot properly be characterized in the abstract as either good or bad. The history of international exchange and training programs conducted by a score of Federal agencies suggests that some coordination efforts can be productive and important but others can be futile or even detrimental.

ID-78-37

Repeated efforts over the past 2 decades to expand interagency data sharing among Federal exchange and training programs, even under the occasional spur of Executive order, proved limited in scope, spotty in results, and short lived.

By the same token, repeated efforts to coordinate such programs succeeded in producing a series of interagency mechanisms in Washington that generated a plenitude of reports and recommendations but little in the way of coordination. Such attempts at coordination finally crumbled under their own weight.

One might conclude from this experience that the problem has been either mistakenly perceived or ineffectually addressed. Primarily it appears to have been the former: the notion of a permanent interagency mechanism supported by a full-time staff and an interagency data bank to coordinate U.S. Government exchange and training programs emerges from the experience to date as an overelaborate solution to current and foreseeable problems. A data system covering all significant Government programs, providing information about American as well as foreign exchangees, and requiring regular data inputs from all appropriate agencies cannot be established and maintained at a cost commensurate with the benefits.

GAO's survey of Government and private agencies confirmed that few if any potential users of such a data system would find more than marginal use for it in their own planning and programing. (See pp. 36 to 44.) The reason for this is inherent in the specialized nature of the programs. The intrusion of extraneous "interagency" criteria could undermine their integrity and credibility.

THE OPPORTUNITIES

This is not to say that U.S. exchange programs lack certain common purposes. There is an important political and cultural dimension to

any international exchange--a perfectly legitimate, usually incidental dividend to be expected and sought in any program through the provision of orientation briefings, family hospitality, cultural experiences, and historical visits. No program need or should neglect such opportunities, and it appears that the possibilities for interagency cooperation in that regard have yet to be fully exploited.

Nor does GAO's caveat about the limits of coordination suggest that interagency cooperation and coordination are unnecessary. It suggests that what is needed to perfect meaningful coordination appears to be more modest and more manageable than some of the efforts and proposals of recent years. What seems indicated are arrangements, buttressed by a predisposition on the part of the agencies, to identify real interagency problems as they emerge and to deal with them case by case.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Exchange Visitor Information System

GAO recommends that the Director, International Communication Agency, evaluate the possibility of expanding the coverage and utilization of the Exchange Visitor Information System developed by the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs. This system, which has yet to determine its own users and uses, now covers only those foreign exchangees (some 60,000 a year) who enter the United States under Government-designated (J-visa) programs. That limited coverage could be vastly increased by the relatively simple expedient of including other visa categories. Thus expanded, the exchange visitor system could serve three purposes:

- Produce lists of names and basic biographical data on the bulk of the country's exchange visitors and foreign students for use by U.S. country teams in followup work.

- Make possible a more comprehensive, versatile, and perhaps more expeditious national census of exchange activity than that which is now conducted.
- Provide statistical data, country by country, on most U.S. Government exchange and training programs for foreigners in such a way as to reveal undesirable gaps or overlaps and thereby to point up specific possibilities for improving interagency coordination.

Country team coordination

In view of the apparently uneven performance of U.S. embassies in coordinating U.S. exchange and training activities at the country level, the International Communication Agency should arrange with the Department of State to issue new instructions to the field. These should be designed to reemphasize and clarify interagency data-sharing and coordination requirements.

Interagency conference

Periodic Washington conferences among U.S. agencies engaged in exchange and training activities would permit them to share experiences, air problems, and consider possibilities for joint planning and programming. Such meetings should normally not exceed one a year. Their preparation should be assigned to an existing organization having appropriate staff, presumably either the International Communication Agency's Educational and Cultural Affairs directorate or the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Communication, Cultural and Educational Affairs. The Director of the Agency and the Chairman of the Commission should determine between them who should sponsor such conferences, with a view to holding the first one before the end of fiscal year 1979.

Publications

There is a need for a periodically updated, reasonably comprehensive directory of organizations, programs, and key contacts in the field of international exchange. For this purpose, the Agency should resume publication, with certain improvements, of the State Department's "Directory of Contacts for International Educational, Cultural and Scientific Exchange Programs."

There is also demand for a professional journal. The quarterly publication of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Communication, Cultural and Educational Affairs, now called "Exchange," could be suitably adapted to the Commission's and the Agency's expanded responsibilities.

Exchangee roster

Among representatives of the U.S. Information Agency; the Departments of State; Defense; and Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Agency for International Development, GAO found agreement that it would be useful and feasible to provide the International Communication Agency with periodic rosters of their exchangees. The Agency should obtain and use such rosters. If organized by country, they could be used advantageously in one phase of exchange activities which practitioners and observers widely agree has too often been inadequately managed, namely, post-sojourn followup.

Arrival list

For some 20 years, State's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs published a weekly "Arrival List of International Visitors." The list, which was confined to State-sponsored exchangees, provided a means by which recipients could establish contact with at least some arriving foreign visitors. The Agency should seek to clarify the past and potential

uses of such a list with a view to determining whether it should be continued and, if so, whether its coverage and distribution should be expanded.

Agency comments

The agencies principally concerned with GAO's recommendations--International Communication Agency, Agency for International Development, and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare--reviewed a draft of this report and expressed essential agreement with its conclusions and recommendations.

(467390)

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

**UNITED STATES
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548**

**OFFICIAL BUSINESS
PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE, \$300**

**POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE**



THIRD CLASS