



R U R A L  
D E V E L O P M E N T  
I N S T I T U T E

**RDI MONOGRAPHS ON FOREIGN AID AND DEVELOPMENT #10**

# **DOES FOREIGN AID BENEFIT THE POOR?**

## **A Report Card for Fiscal Year 1993**

**Roy L. Prosterman and Timothy Hanstad**

**May 1992**



**DOES FOREIGN AID BENEFIT THE POOR?**  
**A Report Card for**  
**Fiscal Year 1993**

**Grading of the Proposed  
U.S. Foreign Economic Assistance  
Program, as Embodied in the  
Agency for International Development's  
Congressional Presentation**

**Roy L. Prosterman and Timothy Hanstad**

**RDI Monographs on Foreign Aid and Development #10**  
**May 1992**

***The Rural Development Institute is an independent, non-profit operating foundation working on international development issues including the issues of poverty, hunger and development in the less-developed countries. The focus is particularly on the problems of the rural sector, where, in most countries, the bulk of the population lives. A persisting concern of the authors, who are at the University of Washington School of Law in Seattle and who also act as President and Executive Director of the Institute, has been the quality and effectiveness of foreign aid in addressing these issues. The present monograph represents the thirteenth in a series of endeavors to assess the probable effectiveness of the bilateral U.S. aid program in addressing the needs of the poor majority as mandated by Congress in the Foreign Assistance Act. This report-card assessment draws in part on fieldwork by one or both of the authors in a number of the aid-receiving countries, including India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Egypt, the Philippines, Indonesia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, the Dominican Republic, and Portugal. This is the tenth in a series of published monographs on Foreign Aid and Development issued by the Rural Development Institute.***

***The "grading" process evolved out of author Prosterman's work with a number of Senators and Representatives on foreign-aid legislation, especially his work in drafting the Magnuson-Humphrey-Packwood amendment, adopted in 1975 and now section 102(b)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act. This established a series of criteria for the allocation of U.S. aid, and led to requests by legislators on both sides of the aisle that he undertake a regular, wholly-independent evaluation of how well AID was meeting the entire congressional mandate. This periodic evaluation process has now overlapped four administrations, those of Presidents Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush.***

***Correspondence may be addressed to the authors at the Rural Development Institute, 1100 N.E. Campus Parkway, Seattle, Washington 98105, or faxed to (206) 632-2648.***

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	1
I INTRODUCTION .....	3
II METHOD .....	6
III THE REPORT CARD .....	9
IV RECOMMENDATIONS .....	23
ANNEX .....	A-1

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Legislation mandates that the first goal of the U.S. foreign aid program is alleviating poverty. Does foreign aid actually benefit the poor? This report attempts to answer that question. It is a report-card evaluation of U.S. foreign economic aid programs as proposed by the Administration for Fiscal Year 1993. It is our thirteenth such grading measuring the effectiveness of these economic aid programs in reaching the poor and promoting equitable growth in recipient countries. Benefiting the poor in these developing countries serves important U.S. humanitarian, economic, and security purposes.

The results of the report card, while improved from last year, are mixed. We conclude that the Agency for International Development (AID) plans to spend only 43 cents on the dollar of the evaluated foreign economic aid on undertakings that are likely to benefit the poor, and that in some less-developed countries, little or nothing of each aid dollar is spent for such effective undertakings. However, we also conclude that AID has a demonstrated capacity to do much better; that in some countries AID is spending over 85 cents on the dollar on projects likely to significantly benefit the poor; and that a small number of specific congressional and administrative initiatives could significantly improve AID's performance.

The central paradox is that although less than half of the proposed U.S. economic aid appears likely to be spent in ways that effectively help the poor, as the governing legislation requires, AID demonstrates the capability to design and implement projects that significantly benefit the poor. This is reflected in the vast differences in program quality from country to country. If this capability to design and implement quality projects were more fully realized with current levels of foreign economic aid, these resources could help several hundred million people in the Third World become productive, healthy and largely self-sufficient over the next decade. Such targeted interventions would set the stage for continuing economic growth which is both broadly participatory and sustainable.

Wrenching change by Congress is *not*, in our judgment, necessary in order to better focus AID's programs on the poor. A threshold requirement is the realization that foreign aid, when properly targeted on the poor, is critically important, and serves U.S. as well as recipient countries' interests. This report concludes with a series of recommendations aimed at improving U.S. foreign economic aid so it is more properly targeted on the poor, in compliance with the Foreign Assistance Act. Those recommendations are:

- Increase the amount of Development Assistance resources relative to Economic Support Fund resources.

- **Direct more of the foreign aid spent on education to basic education; more of the foreign aid spent on health care to child survival and other low-cost primary health care interventions; and more of the foreign aid spent on private sector activities to small- and micro-enterprise credit programs.**
- **Focus on fewer activities, concentrating on a limited number of interventions that are most likely to benefit the poor.**
- **Focus foreign aid on fewer countries.**
- **Cancel the Capital Projects Fund.**
- **Retain, but revise, the "functional accounts".**
- **Focus policy-based, non-project assistance on sectoral policy changes that carry benefits for the poor rather than macroeconomic policy reform.**
- **Increase AID's operating expenses budget and field staff.**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The first goal of the United States foreign economic assistance program, as stated in the Foreign Assistance Act, is "the alleviation of the worst physical manifestations of poverty among the world's poor majority."<sup>1</sup> Does the United States foreign aid program really benefit the poor? This report, which focuses on the Administration's proposed foreign aid program for fiscal year 1993, attempts to answer that question. It presents a grade-based project-by-project report card for most U.S. economic aid programs which are proposed by the Administration in the Agency for International Development's Fiscal Year (FY) 1993 Congressional Presentation. This is our thirteenth such report card measuring how well these economic aid programs comply with the congressional standards for foreign aid, with their strong emphasis on basic human needs and equitable growth for the poor majority in less-developed countries.<sup>2</sup>

The issue of foreign-aid's effectiveness in benefiting the poor looms large in a year in which a great debate is being joined over the usefulness, and even the necessity of a foreign aid program. We do not wish our findings, however, to add weight to suggestions that foreign economic aid should be drastically cut or eliminated. That would be throwing out the baby with the bath water. Foreign aid is critically important. The U.S. Agency for Interna-

---

<sup>1</sup> Foreign Assistance Act, sec. 101(a). The Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) also calls for concentrating Development Assistance "in countries which will make the most effective use of such assistance to help satisfy basic human needs of poor people through equitable growth" (sec. 102(b)(4)). The standards also call for assessing the commitment and progress of recipient countries by utilizing criteria that include, but are not limited to, six named: "increase in agricultural productivity per unit of land through small-farm, labor-intensive agriculture," "reduction of infant mortality," "control of population growth," "promotion of greater equality of income distribution," "reduction of rates of unemployment and underemployment," and "increase in literacy" (id., (A) through (F)). They go on to recognize, concomitantly, "the desirability of overcoming the worst aspects of absolute poverty by the end of this century by, among other measures, substantially lowering infant mortality and birth rates, and increasing life expectancy, food production, literacy, and employment" (sec. 102(c)).

The emphasis on targeting U.S. Development Assistance on the poor majority and achieving equitable growth is reiterated in the policy-guidance provisions of the FAA in sections 103(b)(1), 104(a), 104(c), 105(b)(1), 106(b)(2), 102(b)(13), and 128(a).

The foregoing standards apply directly to the Development Assistance portion of U.S. economic assistance. At the same time, the other major component of U.S. economic assistance, Economic Support Fund resources (ESF), are mandated to be provided "to the maximum extent feasible" pursuant to the same policies and for the same purposes as Development Assistance (sec. 531(a)).

AID has also acknowledged the anti-poverty goals as central. In AID Administrator Rosken's statement in the FY 1993 Congressional Presentation, Rosken states, "potential programs will be judged on the basis of how well they advance the long-term development of our partner countries and how well these programs improve the daily lives of poor people in these countries." In a June 1990 letter, AID's Assistant Administrator for Program and Policy Coordination told us that reduction of poverty was "the ultimate goal of AID's program."

<sup>2</sup> For last year's report, see Prosterman and Hanstad, *Foreign Aid: A Report Card For the Proposed FY 1992 Program*, Rural Development Institute Monograph #7, May 1991.

tional Development (AID), with all of its widely-publicized alleged (and actual) problems, clearly has the *capability* to design and implement projects that significantly benefit the poor. The goal, we believe, should be to improve the U.S. foreign aid program and AID so that more of our foreign aid dollars are spent in ways that effectively reach the poor.

Benefiting the poor in developing countries is important not only for humanitarian reasons, but serves U.S. economic and security purposes as well. The U.S. interest in the sustained expansion of the global economy is large and growing, and our fastest growing markets are in the developing world.<sup>3</sup> By the year 2000, four out of five consumers will reside in the developing world. But poor people are poor markets. If these markets are to expand, the incomes of the poor majority in the developing world must increase. Those incomes are unlikely to increase if people remain unhealthy, uneducated, and without jobs or income-producing assets. Foreign aid is intended to make an important contribution to turning this situation around.

Foreign aid focused on benefiting the poor can also contribute to global security. Poverty, hunger, disease, and ignorance respect no international boundaries in seeking victims. Improving the opportunities for the poor so they can participate in economic progress and in their own governance will reduce their willingness to engage in armed struggle internally and across borders. Widely distributed economic wellbeing is, moreover, vital to the survival of struggling democracies.

In general terms, the question as to whether foreign aid *does* benefit the poor can be answered: some foreign aid does benefit the poor and some does not. Judged in terms of effectiveness in benefiting the poor, the overall grade-point-average for evaluated FY 1993 projects is 2.23 on a 4-point scale.<sup>4</sup> While there is much room for improvement, this overall grade is the best mark since FY 1982.

Another measure we use to assess foreign aid's effectiveness is the proportion of every foreign aid dollar proposed to be used for projects likely to significantly benefit the poor in aid-receiving countries. We arrive at this measure by counting the resources going to projects that receive a 2.7 (B-) grade or better. For FY 1993 we calculate that 43¢ of every

---

<sup>3</sup> Exports to developing countries account for over 2.8 million U.S. jobs. The impact of not exporting to these countries would be equivalent to abolishing all the jobs now provided by General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, Sears, IBM, K-Mart, and Walmart (Agency for International Development, *Congressional Presentation Fiscal Year 1993*, p. 10).

<sup>4</sup> Includes all FY 1993 evaluated Development Assistance outlays, plus all FY 1993 evaluated Economic Support Fund outlays for countries also receiving Development Assistance. See Table 3.



dollar is to be spent on such projects likely to significantly benefit the poor. This is up from 36¢ last fiscal year and again is the highest mark since FY 1982.

There is growing belief in Washington D.C. and in development circles that the Agency for International Development (AID) is no longer capable of effectively administering the U.S. foreign aid program. We do not share that belief. The central paradox is that although less than half of the proposed U.S. economic aid appears likely to significantly benefit the poor, AID clearly has the *capability* to design and implement projects that significantly benefit the poor.

The capability of designing and carrying out projects that significantly benefit the poor is reflected in the vast differences in AID's program quality from country to country. At one end of the scale are programs to countries such as Peru and Bolivia, where that capability is largely realized. These country programs receive grades of 3.0 or higher, and at least 85 percent of the evaluated money that AID commits to those countries in FY 1993 will be spent on projects that genuinely help the poor. At the opposite end are programs in countries such as the Philippines, Tunisia, and Turkey, where the grade falls below 1.3 and the percentage of resources committed to projects likely to significantly benefit the poor declines to 15 percent or less.

What accounts for the differences between such country programs and the overall gap between AID's capability and its performance? We believe there are several reasons. Our field experience persuades us that a significant portion of the differences is due to what AID Country Mission Directors decide to push for. The recipient governments are generally open to a range of possibilities, especially where the aid is in outright grant form, as U.S. aid overwhelmingly is.

Another cause has been the decisions in Washington -- usually made at the State Department -- to use substantial amounts of scarce economic aid resource as a general "cash transfer" in exchange for macroeconomic policy change. This type of U.S. aid, in the amounts given in most recipient countries, is largely useless for grassroots development purposes. While the IMF and World Bank command the resources necessary to leverage these types of macroeconomic changes, AID does not. U.S. foreign aid resources go much further in benefiting the poor when more narrowly focused on specific interventions. When AID does provide policy-based assistance it should focus on sectoral policy changes targeted on the poor, and use resulting local currencies for specific projects relevant to the poor.

Pressures from some in Congress, certain domestic constituency groups, and from AID management in Washington to direct U.S. economic aid towards various activities not

intended to benefit the poor also contribute to the gap between AID capability and performance. A recent example is pressure to use foreign aid funds for direct U.S. export-promotion. The "Buy America" initiative aimed at AID field missions and the new Capital Projects Fund within AID are short-sighted attempts to use meager foreign aid resources<sup>5</sup> to make a dent in the U.S. trade deficit. Neither initiative is likely to benefit the poor, nor can they provide a long-term solution to America's trade problems. Providing real benefits to the poor in order to raise their living standards and incomes will do much more toward solving America's trade problems. As stated above, poor people make poor markets.

Other than the new Capital Projects Fund, the guidance coming from AID/Washington, as reflected in the Congressional Presentation, appears improved over last year. Last year we were concerned that the Administrator's new "initiatives" were askew from the anti-poverty standards of the Foreign Assistance Act.<sup>6</sup> Although those concerns have not been eliminated, the Administrator's Statement and the Program Overview in the FY 1993 Congressional Presentation place more emphasis on AID's commitment "to help overcome the most oppressive human conditions -- poverty, disease, and ignorance", on improving "the daily lives of poor people", and, generally, on anti-poverty measures. This message was also reflected in the overall improved quality of projects, especially new projects.

## **II. METHOD**

Since Fiscal Year 1977 the Rural Development Institute has evaluated the principal elements of the U.S. bilateral foreign-assistance program on a project-by-project basis. Each project is gauged in terms of its aptness to meet the congressionally mandated anti-poverty standards. The projects are graded in terms of aptness of conception from the project descriptions prepared by AID for Congress. These project descriptions are included either in AID's Congressional Presentation or in periodic "Congressional Notification" sheets. The projects are *not* assessed in terms of ultimate execution in the field, although, in our experience, our judgments of projects as conceived have almost always been nearly the same as our assessments of those projects on the occasions that we have later seen them executed in the field.

Each annual report card grades those projects the Administration proposes to be funded in the coming fiscal year. The Administration presents its proposal before Congress each year in the Agency for International Development (AID) Congressional Presentation. The

---

<sup>5</sup> Foreign aid constitutes approximately one-fifth of one percent of total U.S. GNP.

<sup>6</sup> See Roy L. Prosterman and Timothy Hanstad, *Foreign Aid: A Report Card for the Proposed FY 1992 Program*, Rural Development Institute Monograph #7, May 1991, pp. 15-18.

program was evaluated annually from Fiscal Years 1977 to 1983, then for Fiscal Years 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991, 1992, and now for Fiscal Year (FY) 1993.

The present monograph evaluates Development Assistance (DA) funds and Economic Support Fund (ESF) resources, as AID has proposed to obligate these resources for FY 1993 in its Congressional Presentation. Development Assistance funds are allocated to countries solely for development purposes, and are to follow the legislatively mandated anti-poverty guidelines (listed in footnote 1). Economic Support Fund resources, as distinct from Development Assistance resources, are foreign economic aid resources which are allocated to countries with "special economic, political or security conditions" involving U.S. national interests in amounts which "could not be justified solely under the development assistance portion of the foreign aid program."<sup>7</sup> Economic Support Fund resources, according to the Foreign Assistance Act, are to comply with the same Development Assistance anti-poverty guidelines "to the maximum extent feasible."<sup>8</sup> Economic Support Fund resources going to Egypt, the principal developing-country recipient of such funds, are separately assessed and not included here.<sup>9</sup> Resources going to Israel and to Eastern Europe have not been included because we regard them as developed countries, with relatively little poverty of the kind encountered in other aid recipients.

Our grading assessments, while focused on the Congressional Presentation (and prior "Congressional Notice" sheets and project descriptions from earlier fiscal years), are done against the background of extensive fieldwork carried out in 23 countries since the late 1960s and often involving project review on the ground. The grading assessments are also done against the background of our familiarity with the development literature and first-hand familiarity with much of the legislative history of the changes made in the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) in 1973 and subsequent years. Indeed, our grading process began because several members of Congress involved in those changes on both sides of the aisle asked author Prosterman if he would help them assess AID's compliance with the new legislative standards for foreign aid.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Foreign Assistance Act, sec. 531(a).

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* The mandate is a logical one: long-term "security" or "stability" -- which is what the Economic Support Fund is supposed to promote -- in virtually all country settings will require effective "development" that meets the basic needs of the poor majority. As Robert McNamara once said, "security is development."

<sup>9</sup> See Prosterman and Hanstad, *Egyptian Development and U.S. Aid: A 25-Year Perspective*, Rural Development Institute Monograph #9, March 1992.

<sup>10</sup> RDI fieldwork and research is done pro bono, with funding support given by foundations and individuals through the University of Washington, the Washington Law School Foundation, and the Rural Development Institute. RDI staff receive no salary, stipend or fee from any government or government agency.

In effect, the assessment is from a "Congress' eye" point of view. It attempts to reflect what judgments a senator, representative or staff person might make of the expenditures proposed in the Congressional Presentation vis-à-vis the legislative mandate, if they had the time and opportunity to gain extensive background on the program over a period of two decades and to review the Congressional Presentation item-by-item against that background. These assessments, made over a 17-year period, also afford a useful opportunity to view trends over time when a consistent set of evaluation criteria is applied.

The grades are on a traditional 4 point scale, with a "+" and "-" added to permit grading at (rounded) one-third point intervals. (A = 4.0; A- = 3.7; B+ = 3.3; B = 3.0; B- = 2.7; C+ = 2.3; C = 2.0; C- = 1.7; D+ = 1.3; D = 1.0; D- = 0.7; F+ = 0.3; and F = 0.) As with all standard grading, they are appropriately weighted, based on the dollar amount proposed to be obligated in the coming fiscal year for each project.

The significance assigned to each grade may be briefly expressed as follows:

"A" projects seem likely to fully implement the intent of Congress as expressed in the guiding legislation mentioned above, and to have a clear, significant impact on the poor majority.

"B" projects represent a reasonable effort at implementation, but have drawbacks likely to limit their impact.

"C" projects are only marginally relevant to implementing the legislative intent, although some benefit may be gained by the poor majority.

"D" projects are unsatisfactory as an effort to implement the legislative intent, being unlikely to produce any benefit for the poor majority.

"F" projects are not only unsatisfactory, but likely to be injurious, through encouraging a recipient country to pursue clearly ill-conceived development goals and to waste its resources on programs that are irrelevant to the lives of the poor majority, indeed that may even widen the gap between the poor and a small minority of the well-off within that society.

Judgments are made not only in terms of the specific nature and country setting of each project but also in terms of factors, such as cost-per-family-benefited, which determine

the prospective replicability of the project benefits for other similarly-situated members of the poor majority in that country.<sup>11</sup>

### **III. THE REPORT CARD**

The overall grade-point averages for all evaluated Development Assistance for each evaluation since Fiscal Year (FY) 1977 are shown in Table 1. Table 1 also shows the number of cents out of each Development Assistance dollar which we judge to be going towards a reasonable effort to help the poor in accordance with the legislative standards. A reasonable effort to help the poor is reflected in resources going to projects with a grade of 2.7 (B-) or above.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> A more concrete sense of the assessment process may be gained from our description of some 36 illustrative projects, their grades, and the reason for those grades, starting at page 38 in last year's grading report, Prosterman and Hanstad, *Foreign Aid: A Report Card For the Proposed FY 1992 Program*, Rural Development Institute Monograph #7, May 1991.

<sup>12</sup> For FY 1993 we have reviewed AID's description of, and graded, 463 proposed Development Assistance projects representing total funding requests of \$1.667 billion. We have reviewed and graded all Development Assistance projects (including African Development Fund and Special Assistance Initiative for the Philippines projects) requested to be funded, provided they carry a proposed obligation figure of \$1,000,000 or more, with minor exceptions noted below.

As in the past, we have excluded from our grading the proposed funds for American Schools and Hospitals Abroad, International Disaster Assistance, and the Housing Guaranty Reserve. In addition, we have excluded \$25 million of Development Assistance and \$25 million of Economic Support Funds going to Afghanistan Resistance because, as in the past, AID has not made project sheets available. Of the remaining Development Assistance funds we excluded from our FY 1993 grading proposed funds for the American Institute for Free Labor Development and for the Asian American Free Labor Institute, because of our previous work in association with the former (that work was done pro bono, with only expenses reimbursed).

AID is proposing \$530 million in Special Assistance Initiative funds for FY 1993, funds that do not fall under the Development Assistance nor the Economic Support Fund accounts. \$450 million of these Special Assistance Initiative funds are to be allocated to Eastern Europe. We excluded this \$450 million from our grading because we consider the Eastern European countries to be developed and a special case.

The other \$80 million of Special Assistance Initiative funds is for the Philippine Multilateral Assistance Initiative. We grade these funds (designated as AI funds in the Annex) and treat them as Development Assistance since 75% are required to be spent for such purposes.

AID is proposing \$100 million in Economic Support Fund resources and \$350 million in a separate economic assistance account called Humanitarian Assistance to the former Soviet Union. These resources for the former Soviet Union could not be graded because no project sheets were available. The AID programs for the former Soviet Union were being conceptualized as the FY 1993 Congressional Presentation went to press.

The 463 projects we have graded in FY 1993 account for a total of \$1.667 billion out of \$2.104 billion requested (apart from the just indicated exceptions) for projects under Development Assistance and the Philippine MAI. Thus, the present monograph reflects our evaluation of projects accounting for about 79% of the requested funds in these categories for FY 1993. For Development Assistance plus Economic Support Funds, the combined percentage graded is 84%, or \$2.580 billion out of the \$3.070 billion requested, apart from the indicated exceptions.

For FY 1993, 85 Development Assistance projects of over \$1 million with a total funding of \$357 million and 11 Economic Support Fund projects with a total funding of \$53 million were not graded because no project sheet was available.

**TABLE 1: DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE**

	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Cents per dollar going to "A" or "B" projects</u>
FY 77:	2.43	51¢
FY 78:	2.46	52¢
FY 79:	2.57	55¢
FY 80:	2.54	53¢
FY 81:	2.58	56¢
FY 82:	2.64	64¢
FY 83:	2.45	51¢
FY 85:	2.20	38¢
FY 87:	2.40	52¢
FY 89:	2.30	45¢
FY 91:	2.23	45¢
FY 92:	2.35	48¢
FY 93:	2.40	50¢

(No assessment was made for FY 1984, FY 1986, FY 1988, or FY 1990.)

The FY 93 Development Assistance program, considered alone, received the highest overall marks since FY 1987. However, the FY 1993 marks are lower than eight of the previous twelve gradings. There is much room for improvement. But it should be noted that half of each Development Assistance dollar *is* going to projects that are substantially relevant to the needs of the poor, demonstrating that AID does have the capacity to design projects that comply with the legislative standards.

Before FY 1981 Economic Support Fund resources could not be given to countries that received Development Assistance. Now, nearly half of Economic Support Fund resources graded in this assessment *do* go to countries that also receive Development Assistance.<sup>13</sup> Table 2 shows the overall marks for these Economic Support Fund resources.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> See footnote 1 and related text.

<sup>14</sup> For FY 1993 we have reviewed 42 such proposed Economic Support Fund projects (going to countries that also receive Development Assistance), representing funding requests of \$465 million. In addition we reviewed 19 Economic Support Fund projects going to countries that receive only Economic Support Funds (no Development Assistance) representing funding requests of \$488 million.

**TABLE 2: Economic Support Fund**

	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Cents per dollar going to "A" or "B" projects</u>
FY 82:	1.80	19¢
FY 83:	1.64	10¢
FY 85:	1.39	7¢
FY 87:	1.57	11¢
FY 89:	1.59 <sup>15</sup>	8¢ <sup>15</sup>
FY 91:	1.49	12¢
FY 92:	1.38	4¢
FY 93:	1.63	20¢

Table 2 shows that both in terms of overall grade and in cents-per-dollar going to "A" or "B" projects, the use of these Economic Support Fund resources is significantly improved from last year. The overall grade is the third highest since our grading of this aspect of the program began in FY 1982, and the cents-per-dollar going to "A" or "B" projects is the highest.

The combined result for Development Assistance (shown in Table 1) and Economic Support Funds (shown in Table 2) is as shown in Table 3.

<sup>15</sup> For years after FY 87 we also graded Economic Support Funds going to countries that do not receive Development Assistance (except Israel and Egypt for reasons stated on page 7). The corresponding numbers when these projects are included are:

	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Cents per dollar going to "A" or "B" projects</u>
FY 89	1.54	7¢
FY 91	1.54	10¢
FY 92	1.48	5¢
FY 93	1.66	14¢

**TABLE 3: COMBINED ASSESSMENT**

	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Cents per dollar going to "A" or "B" projects</u>
FY 82:	2.56	60¢
FY 83:	2.19	38¢
FY 85:	1.82	24¢
FY 87:	1.95	29¢
FY 89:	2.00 <sup>10</sup>	28¢ <sup>10</sup>
FY 91:	1.95	32¢
FY 92:	2.09	36¢
FY 93:	2.23	43¢

The combined marks for FY 1993 are the highest since FY 1982.

Table 4, on the following page, shows the distribution by grade for all evaluated Development Assistance resources. There were no substantial changes in the FY 1993 distribution from that in FY 1992.

The distribution of results by region are indicated in Table 5. The overall grade for Africa increased from a 2.0 last year to a 2.4 for FY 1993. Because of the juggling in AID bureaus and in countries between bureaus, comparisons for Asia and the Near East regions are not as easy to make. However, the combined grade for Asia and the Near East regions fell sharply from last year, from a 2.4 to a 1.9. The grade for Latin America remains at 2.5, its highest level since FY 1983, and the grade for Centrally Funded projects remains at its highest level ever, a 2.7.

---

<sup>10</sup> When graded Economic Support Funds going to countries that do not receive Development Assistance are included the corresponding results are:

	<u>Grade</u>	<u>Cents per dollar going to "A" or "B" projects</u>
FY 89	1.94	26¢
FY 91	1.91	29¢
FY 92	2.02	31¢
FY 93	2.14	37¢



**TABLE 4: DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS FOR DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE  
BY GRADE, FY 1993 (WITH COMPARISON OF FY 1977-1992)**

Total \$ value &  
percentage of  
projects receiving  
a grade of:

		<u>FY 77</u>	<u>FY 78</u>	<u>FY 79</u>	<u>FY 80</u>	<u>FY 81</u>	<u>FY 82</u>	<u>FY 83</u>	<u>FY 85</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 89</u>	<u>FY 91</u>	<u>FY 92</u>	<u>FY 93</u>
(millions)														
A	\$:	201.5	291.3	343.0	254.2	268.8	309.9	191.1	192.8	188.7	174.1	180.2	219.9	196.3
	%:	24	29	30	21	20	20	19	14	16	14	13	13	12
B	\$:	230.5	235.8	294.8	396.0	470.6	662.2	328.6	316.6	420.9	382.6	431.7	586.4	631.8
	%:	27	23	25	33	36	44	32	24	36	31	31	35	38
C	\$:	208.4	264.4	300.8	369.1	383.9	348.9	300.4	419.9	415.7	399.2	387.5	500.3	492.0
	%:	24	26	26	30	29	23	30	31	35	32	28	30	30
D	\$:	167.4	168.5	193.0	178.3	165.9	188.7	163.7	362.6	103.4	257.1	314.5	339.2	333.2
	%:	20	17	17	15	13	12	16	27	9	20	23	20	20
F	\$:	47.9	47.4	23.9	18.3	24.8	10.0	30.8	45.5	50.6	49.4	68.5	35.8	13.2
	%:	6	5	2	2	2	1	3	3	4	4	5	2	1

A plus B projects as a % of total \$ value

<u>FY 77</u>	<u>FY 78</u>	<u>FY 79</u>	<u>FY 80</u>	<u>FY 81</u>	<u>FY 82</u>	<u>FY 83</u>	<u>FY 85</u>	<u>FY 87</u>	<u>FY 89</u>	<u>FY 91</u>	<u>FY 92</u>	<u>FY 93</u>
51	52	55	53	56	64	51	38	52	45	45	48	50

Note: Percentage totals may not sum to unit because of rounding.

**TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS FOR DEVELOPMENT  
ASSISTANCE BY REGION, FY 1993 (WITH COMPARISON OF FY 1977-92)**

		<u>\$ Value of Projects Graded (millions)</u>	<u>Weighted Grade</u>
Africa	FY 93	537.0	2.4
	FY 92	635.0	2.0
	FY 91	427.9	2.0
	FY 89	381.1	2.0
	FY 87	277.5	2.3
	FY 85	280.7	2.4
	FY 83	264.6	2.4
	FY 82	471.5	2.8
	FY 81	350.2	2.5
	FY 80	235.7	2.5
	FY 79	224.8	2.8
	FY 78	130.0	2.9
	FY 77	150.0	2.6
Asia/ Near East	FY 93 <sup>17</sup>	307.9	1.9
	FY 92	298.2	2.4
	FY 91	385.7	1.9
	FY 89	282.9	2.3
	FY 87	312.8	2.3
	FY 85 <sup>18</sup>	457.9	2.2
	FY 83	372.7	2.2
	FY 82	551.4	2.5
	FY 81	521.9	2.7
	FY 80	545.8	2.6
	FY 79	486.9	2.4
	FY 78	422.1	2.3
	FY 77	410.9	2.4
Asia	FY 93	270.0	1.8
	FY 92	185.8	2.1

(continued)

<sup>17</sup> The Asia and Near East programs were together in the same bureau from FY 1987 until FY 1992. In FY 1992 the Near East program was combined with the Europe program in a Europe/Near East Bureau. For FY 1993 the Near East program has been split off as a separate bureau. Their separate grades are shown below, but the Asia and Near East grades are combined here to facilitate comparison.

<sup>18</sup> The Asia and Near East regions were also separate before FY 87. For closer comparability with the more recent figures, we combined the figures for the Asia and Near East regions for all years before FY 87.

(continued)

**TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS FOR DEVELOPMENT  
ASSISTANCE BY REGION, FY 1993 (WITH COMPARISON OF FY 1977-92)**

		<u>\$ Value of Projects Graded</u>	<u>Weighted Grade</u>
<b>Near East</b>	<b>FY 93</b>	<b>37.9</b>	<b>2.6</b>
<b>Europe/ Near East</b>	<b>FY 92</b>	<b>112.4</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Latin America</b>	<b>FY 93</b>	<b>338.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 92</b>	<b>294.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 91</b>	<b>227.1</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 89</b>	<b>279.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>
	<b>FY 87</b>	<b>328.9</b>	<b>2.3</b>
	<b>FY 85</b>	<b>351.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>
	<b>FY 83</b>	<b>175.4</b>	<b>2.9</b>
	<b>FY 82</b>	<b>164.7</b>	<b>3.1</b>
	<b>FY 81</b>	<b>229.8</b>	<b>2.9</b>
	<b>FY 80</b>	<b>179.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>FY 79</b>	<b>205.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>
	<b>FY 78</b>	<b>226.6</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 77</b>	<b>175.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<b>Centrally Funded</b>	<b>FY 93</b>	<b>483.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>FY 92</b>	<b>449.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>FY 91</b>	<b>342.1</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>FY 89</b>	<b>319.0</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>FY 87</b>	<b>258.4</b>	<b>2.7</b>
	<b>FY 85</b>	<b>247.2</b>	<b>2.6</b>
	<b>FY 83</b>	<b>201.9</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 82</b>	<b>332.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>
	<b>FY 81</b>	<b>215.2</b>	<b>2.2</b>
	<b>FY 80</b>	<b>235.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>
	<b>FY 79</b>	<b>238.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 78</b>	<b>175.6</b>	<b>2.5</b>
	<b>FY 77</b>	<b>119.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>

(continued)

(continued)

**TABLE 5: DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS FOR DEVELOPMENT  
ASSISTANCE BY REGION, FY 1993 (WITH COMPARISON OF FY 1977-92)**

	<b>Weighted Grade</b>
<b>Over-all:</b>	
FY 93	2.40
FY 92	2.35
FY 91	2.23
FY 89	2.30
FY 87	2.40
FY 85	2.20
FY 83	2.45
FY 82	2.64
FY 81	2.58
FY 80	2.54
FY 79	2.57
FY 78	2.46
FY 77	2.43

Table 6, on the following page, shows a distribution by grade and region for both Development Assistance and all evaluated Economic Support Funds. The world comparisons underline that Economic Support Funds are of much lower overall quality than Development Assistance in relation to the poverty-fighting goals of the Foreign Assistance Act. This is true despite a significant increase in the FY 1993 grade for Economic Support Fund resources from FY 1992.

The results by country shown in Table 7 and Table 8 continue to offer one of the most fundamental indictments of the inadequacy of AID's efforts to comply with the statutory standards. Year after year this report card has found an enormous gap between the poverty-fighting compliance level of the best country programs and that of the worst country programs. For Development Assistance considered alone,<sup>19</sup> the quality of country programs in FY 1993 ranges from Peru (3.48) to the Philippines (1.43). (When Economic Support Funds are included, the Philippines drops to 1.26, and the overall range widens.)

From our extensive experience in the field looking at AID programs and projects, we do not believe this enormous gap in compliance with the legislative poverty-alleviation standards is due to differences in what recipient countries request. The recipient governments are generally open to a range of possibilities. Rather, it can be traced to the AID Country Mission Directors and to AID management in Washington. State Department pressures for general "cash transfer" also play a role.

---

<sup>19</sup> For countries with three or more graded projects.

**TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF RESULTS BY "GRADE" AND REGION, FOR  
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AND ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND  
ACCOUNTS, FY 1993<sup>20</sup>**

(dollars per grade in '000s)

	A	B	C	D	E
<b><u>Africa</u></b>					
tot ESF	0	0	15,000	0	0
DA	<u>37,939</u>	<u>209,220</u>	<u>182,579</u>	<u>103,550</u>	<u>3,700</u>
Total	37,939	209,220	197,579	103,550	3,700
<b><u>Latin America</u></b>					
tot ESF	0	82,900	289,400	250,625	0
DA	<u>50,882</u>	<u>141,305</u>	<u>86,762</u>	<u>56,512</u>	<u>3,000</u>
Total	50,882	224,205	376,162	307,137	3,000
<b><u>Asia</u></b>					
tot ESF	0	0	20,000	25,000	25,000
DA	<u>22,005</u>	<u>47,437</u>	<u>80,627</u>	<u>44,422</u>	<u>2,548</u>
Total	22,005	47,437	100,627	69,422	27,548
<b><u>Near East</u></b>					
tot ESF	25,000	20,000	24,500	13,000	5,000
DA	<u>0</u>	<u>27,883</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>3,000</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Total	25,000	47,883	29,500	16,000	7,000
<b><u>Europe</u></b>					
tot ESF	0	0	40,000	77,000	1,000
DA	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	0	0	40,000	77,000	1,000
<b><u>Cent. Funded</u></b>					
(no ESF)					
DA	<u>85,523</u>	<u>206,003</u>	<u>137,008</u>	<u>52,750</u>	<u>2,000</u>
Total	85,523	206,003	137,008	52,750	2,000
<b><u>World<sup>21</sup></u></b>					
tot ESF	25,000	102,900	388,900	365,625	31,000
	(3%)	(11%)	(43%)	(40%)	(3%)
DA	196,349	631,848	491,976	333,234	13,248
	<u>(12%)</u>	<u>(38%)</u>	<u>(30%)</u>	<u>(20%)</u>	<u>(1%)</u>
Total	221,349	734,748	880,876	698,859	44,248
	(9%)	(28%)	(34%)	(27%)	(2%)

<sup>20</sup> Includes all Economic Support Funds, both for countries also receiving Development Assistance and for those that receive only Economic Support Funds.

<sup>21</sup> For FY 1992 the respective percentages for ESF, DA and combined, by grade, were: A = 2 / 13 / 9; B = 3 / 35 / 22; C = 39 / 30 / 33; D = 54 / 20 / 33 and E = 3 / 2 / 2.

**TABLE 7: THE RANKING OF PROGRAMS  
COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY FOR FY 1993**

**(1) Based on Development Assistance Only (with 3 or more graded projects)**

<u>Country</u>	
Peru	3.48
Guatemala	3.30
Morocco	3.12
Lesotho	3.00
Bolivia	2.99
Nigeria	2.91
Uganda	2.86
Ghana	2.81
Haiti	2.80
Mozambique	2.76
Nicaragua	2.76
Madagascar	2.73
Indonesia	2.72
El Salvador	2.71
Nepal	2.67
Gambia	2.65
Cameroon	2.63
Malawi	2.57
Mali	2.44
Chad	2.43
Honduras	2.42
Jamaica	2.36
Senegal	2.32
Zimbabwe	2.28
Niger	2.24
S. Africa	2.22
Dominican Republic	2.17
Yemen	2.13
Ecuador	2.13
Kenya	2.09
Guinea	2.06
Panama	2.06
Costa Rica	2.01
Swaziland	1.84
Tanzania	1.78
Sri Lanka	1.72
India	1.67
Bangladesh	1.64
Burundi	1.63
Philippines	1.43

(continued)

(continued)

**TABLE 7: THE RANKING OF PROGRAMS  
COUNTRY-BY-COUNTRY FOR FY 1993**

**(2) Ranking of Country Programs When Development Assistance and  
Economic Support Fund are Both Included**

(for clarity, grades for countries receiving Economic Support Funds in addition to Development Assistance are italicized, and grades for countries receiving only Economic Support Funds and no Development Assistance are in boldface)

West Bank/Gaza	3.70	Costa Rica	2.18
Peru	3.48	Haiti	2.18
Lesotho	3.00	Jordan	2.17
Bolivia	2.99	Yemen	2.13
Nigeria	2.91	Ecuador	2.13
Guatemala	2.90	Kenya	2.09
Uganda	2.86	Guinea	2.06
Morocco	2.86	Panama	2.06
Ghana	2.81	Jamaica	1.98
Mozambique	2.76	Dominican Rep.	1.97
Madagascar	2.73	Swaziland	1.84
Indonesia	2.72	Tanzania	1.78
Nepal	2.67	Honduras	1.74
Gambia	2.65	Nicaragua	1.74
Cameroon	2.63	Sri Lanka	1.72
Malawi	2.57	Portugal	1.70
Mali	2.44	India	1.67
Chad	2.43	Bangladesh	1.64
Senegal	2.32	Burundi	1.63
Zimbabwe	2.28	Philippines	1.26
Niger	2.24	Tunisia	1.15
El Salvador	2.23	Turkey	1.00
S. Africa	2.22		

It is generally the AID Mission Director who -- within a range of options acceptable to both the recipient country and AID management in Washington -- lobbies diligently and usually successfully for those projects he or she wishes to fund. AID/Washington's failure to provide directions to the country missions which are consistent with the legislative standards has contributed to the continuing erratic performance from one country to the next. AID/Washington, when they invoke standards and establish initiatives, should be following the mandate of the Foreign Assistance Act, not a set of standards largely in conflict with the congressional mandate.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> For example, AID has initiated a Capital Projects Fund for FY 93 which is in conflict with the congressional standards of the Foreign Assistance Act. The AID Congressional Presentation, in describing the new Capital Projects Fund and AID's history of funding capital projects, recounts that the Agency was primarily involved in funding capital projects in the 1950s and 1960s. The Presentation goes on to state, "In the 1970s, however, Congress mandated a switch in emphasis to directly addressing basic human needs," but "recently, a number of considerations have caused a renewed interest in capital projects as a key element of our assistance program." (AID Congressional Presentation, Fiscal Year 1993, p. 77). AID and U.S. engineering companies may have a renewed interest in capital projects, but the congressional mandate to address basic human needs remains the statutory mandate. It has not been repealed, and still has the force of law. See Recommendation number 5 on page 24.

**TABLE 8: CHANGES IN COUNTRY RANKINGS, FY 1992 TO FY 1993<sup>23</sup>****Development Assistance**

<b>Biggest Improvements</b>	<b><u>FY 92</u></b>	<b><u>FY 93</u></b>	<b><u>Gain</u></b>
Mozambique	1.72	2.76	+1.04
Malawi	1.84	2.57	+0.73
South Africa	1.61	2.22	+0.61
Uganda	2.26	2.86	+0.60
Panama	1.46	2.06	+0.60
<b>Biggest Declines</b>			<b><u>Decline</u></b>
India	2.34	1.67	-0.67
Dominican Republic	2.83	2.17	-0.66

**Countries Receiving Both Development Assistance and Economic Support Funds**

<b>Biggest Improvements</b>	<b><u>FY 92</u></b>	<b><u>FY 93</u></b>	<b><u>Gain</u></b>
Guatemala	1.90	2.90	+1.00
El Salvador	1.80	2.23	+0.43
<b>Biggest Declines</b>			<b><u>Decline</u></b>
Philippines	1.67	1.26	-0.41
Dominican Rep.	2.35	1.97	-0.38

Table 9, on the following page, shows basic economic assistance program trends in the Administration's request from year to year, including the ratio of Development Assistance to Economic Support Fund resources. Although the total amount of economic assistance requested has remained at roughly the same level for the past several years, the *mix* of the requested funds has somewhat improved. The amount of Development Assistance relative to Economic Support Fund resources has risen slowly over the past several years. Since Development Assistance, overall, has consistently had a much better record of effectively reaching the poor than Economic Support Fund resources, such shifts in favor of Development Assistance are favorable and should continue to occur.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>23</sup> At least 3 graded projects each year.

<sup>24</sup> See Recommendation number 1 on page 23.



**TABLE 9**  
**ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM TRENDS**  
**FY 1979-93**

(dollars in 000,000's)	1979	1980	1981	1982	1982	1983	1984	1985	1987	1989	1991	1992	1993
	Request	Request	Request	Original Request	Revised <sup>25</sup> Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request
1. Development Assistance <sup>26</sup>	1,214	1,439	1,528	1,971	1,507	1,392	1,445	1,683	1,627	1,650	1,969	2,237	2,121
2. ESF	1,904	1,995	2,081	2,432	2,582	2,886	2,949	3,438	4,094	3,281	3,344 <sup>27</sup>	3,223 <sup>27</sup>	3,112 <sup>27</sup>
3. ESF (ex-Egypt & Israel)	369	460	546	897	1,047	1,351	1,414	1,838	2,079	1,266	1,329	1,213	1,097 <sup>28</sup>
3A. Simultaneous <sup>29</sup> ESF	--	--	117	270	270	758	706	1,411	1,595	1,076	960	776	633
3B. ESF-Only <sup>30</sup>	--	460	429	627	777	603	708	428	483	191	369	437	464
4. Special Assistance Initiatives For Eastern Europe & New Independent States <sup>31</sup>	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	300	400	800
(1):(3)	3.3:1	3.1:1	2.8:1	2.2:1	1.4:1	1:1	1:1	0.9:1	0.8:1	1.3:1	1.5:1	1.8:1	1.9:1
(1):(3A)	--	--	13.1:1	7.3:1	5.6:1	1.9:1	2:1	1.2:1	1:1	1.5:1	2.1:1	2.9:1	3.4:1

<sup>25</sup> The revised request for FY 1982 was graded.

<sup>26</sup> Includes Development Programs, Development Fund for Africa, and \$200 million for FY 1991, \$160 million for FY 1992 and \$80 million for FY 1993 from Special Assistance Initiatives (AI) (only the Philippine MAI portion). All funding requested from these categories is included here whether or not information for grading was available.

<sup>27</sup> Does not include a small amount of Deob./Reob.

<sup>28</sup> For FY 1993, Egypt \$815 million, Israel \$1.2 billion, in ESF.

<sup>29</sup> ESF going to countries which simultaneously receive DA.

<sup>30</sup> ESF going to countries or regional programs which do not receive DA. For 1993 this includes \$250 million for the Andean Narcotics Initiative and \$50 million for the SE Asia Contingency Program.

<sup>31</sup> Philippine portion has been included under DA.

**TABLE 10: NUMBER OF COUNTRIES AND PROJECTS  
RECEIVING DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE FUNDS**

	<b>Number of Countries with Development Assistance Programs<sup>32</sup></b>	<b>Number of Development Assistance Projects of \$1 Million or More</b>
<b>FY 1977</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>FY 1978</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>222</b>
<b>FY 1979</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>283</b>
<b>FY 1980</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>304</b>
<b>FY 1981</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>348</b>
<b>FY 1982</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>361</b>
<b>FY 1983</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>336</b>
<b>FY 1985</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>356</b>
<b>FY 1987</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>415</b>
<b>FY 1989</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>396</b>
<b>FY 1991</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>451</b>
<b>FY 1992</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>593</b>
<b>FY 1993</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>586<sup>33</sup></b>

Table 10 reflects that Development Assistance will be spread among the largest number of countries (70) since our grading process began. The available resources also continue to be divided among an excessively large number of projects. The U.S. foreign aid program could improve its effectiveness by concentrating resources on fewer countries and fewer activities.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Does not include regional programs.

<sup>33</sup> For FY 1993, this includes 463 graded undertakings, and 91 undertakings of \$1 million or more for which no grade was assigned because no project sheet was available and 32 projects, most in Eastern Europe, that were not graded for reasons described supra, at page 7.

<sup>34</sup> See Recommendations numbers 3 and 4 on pages 23-24.

#### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Our most basic recommendation is that Congress and the Administration should work together to better focus foreign aid on helping to meet the the needs of the poor. The more specific recommendations that follow all are aimed at achieving this most basic objective, which is the existing mandate of the Foreign Assistance Act.**

- 1. *Increase the amount of Development Assistance resources relative to Economic Support Fund resources.*** Development Assistance funds are typically much more targeted on the poor than Economic Support Fund resources, which are given for political or strategic reasons (though spent on economic development projects).
- 2. *Direct more of the foreign aid spent on education to basic education; more of the foreign aid spent on health care to child survival and other low-cost primary health care interventions; and more of the foreign aid spent on private sector activities to small- and micro-enterprise credit programs.*** AID should direct resources in poor countries to activities which will provide the most benefits to the most people, and which will set the stage for broad-based, equitable growth. This means spending education dollars for primary education programs, not on providing degrees for a few students in U.S. universities (at costs of up to \$100,000 per student). This means spending health dollars on inexpensive child survival and other primary health care interventions, and not on more expensive forms of curative care. And this means assisting the private sector by assisting the tens of thousands of innovative, employment-generating small- and micro-enterprises, instead of concentrating the resources on larger firms.
- 3. *Focus on fewer activities, concentrating on a limited number of interventions that are most likely to benefit the poor.*** The development needs in most recipient countries are numerous, and AID, a relatively small agency, cannot do everything well. AID should concentrate its resources on fewer interventions, and choose interventions most likely to benefit the poor. In particular there are three areas where there is legislative precedent upon which both AID and Congress could build. These are: land reform, micro-enterprise credit, and child survival.
- 4. *Focus foreign aid on a more limited number of countries.*** The U.S. should draw the line between those countries where there is to be a set of mutually reinforcing efforts

large enough to matter,<sup>35</sup> and those where our country is simply showing the flag with a small and symbolic aid program.

5. ***Cancel the Capital Projects Fund.*** AID, under pressure from some in Congress, is directing more resources to capital projects in an attempt to promote U.S. trade competitiveness. Although AID promises to apply "exceedingly strict economic development screens" in selecting capital projects, a return to funding capital projects is likely to result in a replay of the failed aid of the 1950s and 1960s. In those years the United States focused foreign aid on superhighways, steel mills, airports, harbor complexes, and railroads -- generating few jobs and having little linkage to the basic needs and sources of livelihood of the poor. The United States should not return to such a trickle-down approach. The contribution towards reducing the U.S. trade deficit would be minimal and short-term.

In describing the Capital Projects Fund, the AID Congressional Presentation states that the agency moved away from capital projects in the 1970s when "Congress mandated a switch in emphasis to directly addressing basic human needs." That legislative mandate *is still in effect*, and must take precedence over any AID initiative.

6. ***Congress should retain, but revise, the "functional accounts".*** Congress should keep AID focused on fewer and more effective interventions, but AID does need some flexibility in allocating resources in order to respond to a changing world. A compromise should be possible on the issue of functional accounts by assigning 75% (or a similar percentage) of Development Assistance funds to specific functional accounts while allowing the remainder to be used for *any* purpose that is proper under the guiding legislation for Development Assistance funds.<sup>36</sup>
7. ***When foreign aid resources are traded for policy reform the aim should be on sectoral policy changes that carry special benefits for the poor rather than macroeconomic policy changes of the kind already pursued by the IMF and World Bank.*** We have been strongly critical of using aid resources in exchange for broad macroeconomic policy-

---

<sup>35</sup> It is tragic that the planned FY 1993 U.S. Development Assistance program for India -- a country that contains perhaps 40% of the world's least-well-off people, and that is now attempting significant market reforms -- is only \$24 million.

<sup>36</sup> In both its FY 1992 and FY 1993 Congressional Presentation, AID has prematurely ceased to identify the functional account (Agriculture, Population, Health, Education, or Selected Development Activities) out of which a project is to be funded. Such identification remains essential, if Congress is to be informed as to AID's compliance with existing law.

based assistance, especially where there is no complementary focused and projectized benefit for the poor through the use of resulting local currency. Such macroeconomic changes in monetary, fiscal, trade, commodity, and consumer policy do not produce development. Although such policy changes can remove barriers to development, the IMF and World Bank have been the institutions which have traditionally leveraged their significant resources for such policy reform. AID is not the IMF and the attempt to make AID perform IMF-like functions can rapidly eat up scarce foreign aid resources.

AID has proven more effective in using policy-based assistance when it has focused on more narrow, sectoral policy reforms of a kind likely to bring benefits to the poor. This assistance can be even more effective when the cash transfers traded for policy reform generate local currencies which are projectized for complementary activities relevant to the poor.<sup>37</sup>

8. *Increase AID's operating expenses budget and field staff.* The operating expenses account for AID is clearly insufficient to maintain the necessary number of people in the field. A special strength of the U.S. aid program has been its strong field presence and the technical expertise of its field staff. Yet with new AID missions opening up around the world, existing missions are under intense budgetary pressure to cut U.S. field staff. The cuts disproportionately reduce the discretionary time available for AID mission staff to design and oversee administration-intensive projects (usually the best projects) since there is a core of mission administrative and paperwork that must be done. Since FY 1979, the number of U.S. direct-hire field staff has declined by almost one-quarter, while the number of Development Assistance projects requiring oversight has doubled.

Congress should increase AID's operating expense budget so AID field staff can be increased to adequately respond to present needs and new opportunities. AID should increase the amount of local currency directed towards operating expenses for overseas missions.

---

<sup>37</sup> For examples of such assistance, see discussion of AID's Primary Education Program in Ghana in Prosterman and Hanstad, *Foreign Aid: A Report Card For the Proposed FY 1992 Program*, RDI Monograph #7, May 1991, pp. 42-43 and discussion of AID's Agricultural Production Credit Project in Prosterman and Hanstad, *Egyptian Development and U.S. Aid: A 25-Year Perspective*, RDI Monograph #9, March 1992, pp. 17-18.

In sum, we find that even if the overall level of foreign economic assistance cannot be significantly increased, important advances can be made in helping the poor and achieving broad-based sustainable growth in recipient countries. Improvements in the foreign aid program's ability to target the poor could positively affect the lives of hundreds of millions. Such results would be in the best economic, strategic, and humanitarian interests of the United States. These improvements in the foreign aid program can be accomplished through a highly realistic and realizable set of legislative and administrative adjustments. With such refinements, the impact and effectiveness of the U.S. foreign economic assistance program in meeting the present goals of the Foreign Assistance Act can be greatly amplified.

# **FY 1993 PROJECT GRADES ANNEX**

# ANNEX

## AFRICA -- FY 93

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Angola	654-0004	Infrastructure Rehab.	[DA]	8,000	2.7
	654-0005	Soc. Sector Rehab. & Support	[DA]	7,000	2.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			15,000	2.70
Benin	680-0206	Childs Learning Found. (NPA)	[DA]	7,500	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			7,500	3.00
Botswana	633-0253	Botswana Private Enterp. Dev.	[DA]	3,950	1.3
	633-0254	Basic Educ. Consolidation	[DA]	2,150	3.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			6,100	2.00
Burkina Faso	686-0270	Ag. Research & Training Sup.	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	686-0275	Family Health & Financing	[DA]	1,550	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			2,550	2.73
Burundi	695-0124	Enterprise Support & Trng.	[DA]	2,400	1.7
	695-0125	Enterprise Promotion (NPA)	[DA]	9,000	1.3
	936-5972	AIDS Tech. Support	[DA]	2,000	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			13,400	1.63
Cameroon	631-0052	Cereals Res. & Ext.	[DA]	2,000	2.3
	631-0059	Agric. Policy & Planning	[DA]	1,800	1.7
	631-0066	Agric. Education II	[DA]	1,900	1.0
	631-0081	Natural Resources Mgmt.	[DA]	1,000	3.0
	631-0084	National Family Health	[DA]	2,550	2.7
	631-0086	Reform in Ag. Mkt. II (NPA)	[DA]	5,000	2.7
	631-0090	Maternal Child Health II	[DA]	4,200	3.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			18,450	2.63
Cape Verde	655-0014	Export Dev. Services	[DA]	1,000	1.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			1,000	1.70

28



## ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Chad	677-HRDA	Human Res. Dev. Assistance	[DA]	1,200	1.3
	677-0062	Ag. Marketing & Tech. Transfer	[DA]	1,000	3.0
	677-0064	Child Survival	[DA]	2,650	3.3
	677-0067	Strengthening Road Maint. II	[DA]	2,100	1.7
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				6,950	2.43
Côte d'Ivoire	681-0004	Municipal Dev. II	[DA]	1,000	2.0
	681-0005	Family Planning & Health	[DA]	4,240	3.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				5,240	2.81
Gambia	635-0235	Natural Res. Mgmt. (NPA)	[DA]	2,000	3.0
	635-0236	Natural Res. Mgmt.	[DA]	3,000	3.0
	635-0237	Financial & Priv. Ent. Dev.	[DA]	2,650	2.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				7,650	2.65
Ghana	641-HRDA	Human Res. Dev. Assist.	[DA]	1,000	1.3
	641-0118	Family Planning & Health/AIDS	[DA]	3,000	3.0
	641-0119	Basic Education (NPA)	[DA]	5,639	4.0
	641-0121	Family Planning & Health (NPA)	[DA]	5,000	3.0
	641-0122	Nat. Res. Conserv./Historic Pres.	[DA]	1,200	1.7
	641-0125	Non-traditional Export & Mkt. (NPA)	[DA]	5,436	2.0
	641-0126	Non-traditional Export & Mkt. (PA)	[DA]	1,200	2.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				22,475	2.81
Guinea	675-HRDA	Human Resource Dev. Assist.	[DA]	1,500	1.3
	675-0215	Rural Enterprise Dev.	[DA]	1,000	2.7
	675-0216	Rural Roads	[DA]	6,300	2.3
	675-0218	Econ. Pol. Reform Program (NPA)	[DA]	3,000	1.3
	675-0221	Ag. Marketing Investment	[DA]	4,000	2.3
	675-0222	Basic Education (NPA)	[DA]	4,400	2.3
	675-0227	Social Mktg. of Contraceptives	[DA]	2,300	1.7
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				22,500	2.06
Guinea-Bissau	657-0022	Legal Sector Assist. Prog. (NPA)	[DA]	2,500	3.3
	657-0023	Legislative Development	[DA]	1,000	1.7
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				3,500	2.84

29

## ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Kenya	615-0229	Agriculture Research	[DA]	2,800	3.3
	615-0232	Family Plan. Serv. & Support	[DA]	5,200	1.7
	615-0238	Priv. Enterp. Dev.	[DA]	1,572	2.0
	615-0247	Conserv. of Biodiv. Res. Areas	[DA]	1,328	2.7
	615-0249	Kenya Export Dev. Support	[DA]	2,500	1.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			13,400	2.09
Lesotho	632-0225	Primary Education Program	[DA]	1,500	3.0
	632-0228	Community Natural Res. Mgmt.	[DA]	1,500	3.0
	632-0230	Primary Education Program (NPA)	[DA]	4,200	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			7,200	3.00
Madagascar	687-0107	Population Sector Support	[DA]	4,000	2.0
	687-0110	Sus. Approaches Via Env. Mgmt.	[DA]	8,000	3.3
	687-0116	Pop. Pol. Reform (PA)	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	687-0117	Pop. Pol. Reform (NPA)	[DA]	3,000	2.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			16,000	2.73
Malawi	612-0232	Svcs. for Health, Ag. & Rural Enterp.	[DA]	1,900	3.7
	612-0235	Ag. Sector Assist. Program	[DA]	3,600	3.0
	612-0236	Small Enterprise Transformation	[DA]	1,690	2.7
	612-0238	Family Health & AIDS	[DA]	3,000	1.7
	612-0239	Ag. Sector Assist. Program (NPA)	[DA]	5,000	3.0
	612-0241	Malawi Family Health Svcs.	[DA]	4,000	1.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			19,250	2.57
Mali	688-HRDA	Human Resource Dev. Assist.	[DA]	1,000	1.3
	688-0244	Animal Prod. for Export	[DA]	3,000	3.7
	688-0245	Policy Reform for Econ. Dev. (PA)	[DA]	3,000	1.0
	688-0246	Policy Reform for Econ. Dev. (NPA)	[DA]	6,000	1.0
	688-0247	PVO Co-Financing	[DA]	2,800	3.7
	688-0248	Community Health & Pop. Svcs.	[DA]	5,000	3.0
	688-0250	Strengthening Ag. Res.	[DA]	3,000	3.0
	688-0258	Basic Ed. Expansion	[DA]	3,000	3.3
	688-0263	Agribusiness & Mktng. Support	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			27,800	2.44

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Mozambique	656-0217	PVO Support Program	[DA]	7,192	3.3
	656-0225	Health Sec. Assist. Prog. (NPA)	[DA]	9,900	2.3
	656-0226	Health Sec. Assist. Prog. (PA)	[DA]	3,000	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			20,092	2.76
Namibia	673-0003	Basic Ed. Reform Sec. Assist.	[DA]	4,000	1.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			4,000	1.00
Niger	683-0254	Health Sector Support (PA)	[DA]	1,300	2.0
	683-0257	Ag. Sector Dev. Grant II	[DA]	5,000	1.7
	683-0258	Family Health & Demography	[DA]	4,050	1.7
	683-0260	Rural Org. Dev.	[DA]	1,700	3.7
	683-0272	CARE Maradi/Microenterp. Dev.	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	683-0274	Ag. Mkting. & Export Promotion	[DA]	3,500	2.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			16,550	2.24
Nigeria	620-0001	Nigeria Family Health Services	[DA]	4,300	1.0
	620-0004	Combat. Childhd. Comm. Diseases	[DA]	6,900	4.0
	620-0006	Mging. Health Care at Local Level	[DA]	1,300	3.3
	936-5972	AIDS Technical Support	[DA]	2,000	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			14,500	2.91
Redso/EA	623-0004	CAFS Fam. Plan. Trng. Supp. II	[DA]	1,090	2.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			1,090	2.00
Rwanda	696-0134	Reproductive Health	[DA]	4,000	2.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			4,000	2.30
Senegal	685-HRDA	Human Resource Dev. Assist.	[DA]	1,500	1.3
	685-0285	Strength. Ag. Research	[DA]	2,000	2.3
	685-0286	Child Survival/Fam. Plan.	[DA]	2,900	2.3
	685-0297	Ag. Sector Grant (NPA)	[DA]	8,000	2.0
	685-0305	Community-based Nat. Res. Mgmt.	[DA]	3,000	3.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			17,400	2.32

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
South Africa	674-0301	Community Outreach & Leader Dev.	[DA]	11,000	3.0
	674-0302	Ed. Supp. Training	[DA]	5,000	3.3
	674-0303	Black Priv. Enterp. Dev.	[DA]	8,000	1.7
	674-0305	Human Rights Supp.	[DA]	6,000	2.3
	674-0309	Tertiary Education	[DA]	9,500	1.0
	674-0315	Tertiary Educ. Linkages	[DA]	10,000	2.0
	674-0316	Training for Employment	[DA]	3,000	3.0
	674-0510	Program Dev. & Support	[DA]	2,500	2.3
	936-5972	AIDS Tech. Support	[DA]	1,500	3.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				56,500	2.22
Swaziland	645-0229	Commercial Ag. Prod. & Mkting.	[DA]	1,168	2.0
	645-0230	Educ. Pol., Mgmt. & Tech.	[DA]	1,500	1.7
	645-0231	Training & Inst. Dev.	[DA]	1,800	1.0
	645-0235	Small Business Dev.	[DA]	1,332	1.7
	645-0236	Fam. Plan, Maternal & Child Health	[DA]	1,200	3.3
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				7,000	1.84
Tanzania	621-HRDA	Human Resource Dev. Assist.	[DA]	2,200	1.3
	621-0166	Ag. Transport Assist. Prog.	[DA]	6,500	1.0
	621-0173	Family Planning	[DA]	2,500	2.0
	621-0177	AIDS Support	[DA]	2,500	3.3
	936-5972	AIDS Tech. Support	[DA]	1,500	3.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				15,200	1.78
Togo	693-0234	Togo Child Survival (PA)	[DA]	4,000	3.0
	693-0235	Private Sector Support	[DA]	1,000	2.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				5,000	2.80
Uganda	617-0113	Nontraditional Export	[DA]	6,000	3.0
	617-0115	Expanded FHS/Child Spacing	[DA]	2,625	1.7
	617-0124	Action Prog. for the Envir. (PA)	[DA]	8,125	2.3
	617-0125	Ag. Mkting. & Inst. Strength.	[DA]	1,000	2.7
	617-0127	AIDS Control & Prevention	[DA]	4,000	3.3
	617-0128	Policy Analysis & Capacity Bldg.	[DA]	1,750	1.7
	617-0131	Education Reform Assistance (PA)	[DA]	3,000	3.3
	617-0132	Education Reform Assistance (NPA)	[DA]	6,000	3.3
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				32,500	2.86

32

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Zambia	611-0222	Ag. Sector Adjust. Program	[DA]	3,500	2.0
	611-0227	Private Sector Dev.	[DA]	2,000	1.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			5,500	1.89
Zimbabwe	613-0230	Family Planning	[DA]	1,445	2.3
	613-0232	Business Development	[DA]	1,000	2.0
	613-0233	Ag. Marketing Support Prog. (NPA)	[DA]	5,000	2.0
	613-0234	Ag. Mkt. Reform Support (PA)	[DA]	1,500	2.0
	613-0236	Housing Sec. Assist. Program	[DA]	5,000	2.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			13,945	2.28
S Afr Reg	690-0224	Regional Sorghum/Millet Research	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	690-0245	Enhanced Export Competitiveness	[DA]	5,000	0.7
	690-0247	Regional Rail Systems Support	[DA]	1,500	1.0
	690-0251	Natural Resource Mgmt.	[DA]	12,010	3.3
	690-0255	NACALA Corridor Rehabilitation	[DA]	15,000	0.7
	690-0262	Signal Improvmt.-Zambia Rail	[DA]	2,500	0.7
	690-0510	Project Dev. & Support	[DA]	2,000	2.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			39,010	1.66
Afr Reg	625-0973	Sahel Water Data & Mgmt. III	[DA]	1,700	0.7
	625-0975	Sahel Reg. Institutions	[DA]	1,500	2.0
	625-0978	Promoting Pop. Policy Dev.	[DA]	1,300	2.0
	693-0421	Afr. Child Survival Init.	[DA]	5,300	4.0
	698-0455	Afr. Grad. Fellowship Prog. III	[DA]	1,200	0.3
	698-0463	Human Resources Dev. for Africa	[DA]	3,500	1.3
	698-0464	Afr. Dev. Supp.	[DA]	4,200	2.3
	698-0466	Famine Early Warning Systems	[DA]	2,000	2.3
	698-0474	HIV/AIDS Prevention in Africa	[DA]	2,000	3.3
	698-0475	Afr. Trng. for Leader. & Skills	[DA]	2,500	0.3
	698-0477	Afr. Labor Dev. III	[DA]	3,000	2.3
	698-0478	Strength. Afr. Ag. Rsch. II	[DA]	13,000	3.0
	698-0485	Onchocerciasis Control IV	[DA]	3,500	4.0
	698-0486	Afr. Electoral Assist. Fund	[ESF]	5,000	1.7
	698-0510	Prog. Dev. Supp. II	[DA]	3,891	2.3
	698-0526	Priv. Vol. Org. Supp.	[DA]	1,700	3.0
	698-0536	African Capacity Bldg. Init.	[DA]	2,500	1.3
	698-0541	Dem. & Human Rts. Fund	[DA]	1,945	1.7
	698-0544	Afr. Priv. Enter. Dev. Fund II	[DA]	8,000	1.3
	698-0980	Sahel Pol. & Prog. Dev.	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	698-9901	Special Self-Help Dev. Act.	[DA]	5,000	2.7

23

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Afr Reg, cont'd		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		73,736	2.30
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		5,000	1.70
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		68,736	2.35
African Economic Policy	698-0511	African Econ. Policy Reform	[ESF]	10,000	1.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		10,000	1.70
<b>ASIA -- FY 93</b>					
Bangladesh	388-0060	Fertilizer Dist. Improv. II	[DA]	2,540	2.0
	388-0070	Rural Electrification III	[DA]	2,548	0.0
	388-0071	FP & Health Services	[DA]	28,000	1.7
	388-0074	Tech. Resources II	[DA]	2,411	2.0
	388-0076	Industrial Promotion	[DA]	1,500	2.3
	388-0078	Financial Sector Credit & TA	[DA]	3,000	1.3
	388-0081	Food for Work IV	[DA]	2,500	2.7
	388-0087	Priv. Sector Ag. Inputs	[DA]	5,768	1.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		48,267	1.64
Cambodia	442-0100	Cambodian Non-Communist	[DA]	2,600	1.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		2,600	1.70
India	386-0494	Accel. of Comm. Energy Research	[DA]	1,000	1.7
	386-0507	Center for Tech. Dev.	[DA]	1,000	1.0
	386-0513	Plant Genetic Resources	[DA]	2,000	3.0
	386-0515	Tech. Assist. & Supp.	[DA]	1,500	1.3
	386-0517	Energy Mgmt. Consult. & Trng.	[DA]	1,000	1.0
	386-0525	AIDS Prevention and Control	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	386-0526	Housing Finance System	[DA]	1,000	2.0
	386-0528	Restruct. of Enterprise & Trade	[DA]	3,500	1.0
	386-0529	Improved Deliv. of Serviced Land	[DA]	1,000	1.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		13,000	1.67

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Indonesia	497-0347	Small Scale Irrig. Mgmt.	[DA]	2,665	3.7
	497-0353	Rural Roads Maint. Systems	[DA]	2,913	3.0
	497-0354	Health Sector Financing	[DA]	2,087	3.3
	497-0355	Private Sector FP	[DA]	5,017	3.3
	497-0357	Ag. & Rural Sector Support	[DA]	1,300	2.3
	497-0358	Higher Education Dev. Support	[DA]	2,690	1.3
	497-0360	Financial Markets Dev.	[DA]	3,286	2.0
	497-0362	Natural Resources Mgmt.	[DA]	5,000	3.3
	497-0364	Strengthening Inst. Dev.	[DA]	4,312	4.0
	497-0365	Municipal Finance	[DA]	1,000	2.0
	497-0366	Trng. for Open Mkts.	[DA]	3,000	0.7
	497-0372	Econ. Law & Improved Proc.	[DA]	3,000	1.7
	497-0373	Privatiz. Svcs. in Urban Sector	[DA]	4,390	2.0
	497-0377	Microenterprise Promotion	[DA]	4,000	3.7
Country Total and Weighted GPA				44,660	2.72
Mongolia	438-0002	Training for Market-Based Economy	[DA]	3,600	1.7
	438-0003	Energy System Renovation	[ESF]	15,000	1.3
	Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)			18,600	1.38
	ESF Country Total & Weighted GPA			15,000	1.30
DA Country Total & Weighted GPA			3,600	1.70	
Nepal	367-0152	Development Training	[DA]	1,500	1.0
	367-0154	Institute of Forestry	[DA]	2,000	2.7
	367-0155	Rapti Development	[DA]	2,022	3.0
	367-0157	Child Surv. & Family Plng. Svcs.	[DA]	4,300	4.0
	367-0159	PVO Co-Financing II	[DA]	2,528	3.7
	367-0163	Democratization in Nepal	[DA]	1,500	1.7
	367-0166	Redressing Pub./Priv. Sector Balance	[DA]	3,000	1.0
	Country Total and Weighted GPA				16,850
Philippines	492-0395	Enterp. in Community Dev.	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	492-0396	Family Planning Assist.	[DA]	10,000	2.7
	492-0429	Rural Electrification	[DA]	6,000	1.0
	492-0432	Technical Resources	[VA]	1,900	1.7
	492-0445	Agribusiness Assistance	[ESF]	25,000	0.0
	492-0446	National Health Financ. Dev.	[DA]	4,200	2.7
	492-0447	Capital Mkts. Dev.	[AI]	10,000	0.7
	492-0449	Private Sector Invest./Trade	[DA]	2,500	1.7
	492-0456	Mindanao Area Dev.	[AI]	20,000	1.3
	492-0463	Local Govt. Infrastructure	[ESF]	19,000	2.0

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Philippines, cont'd	492-0464	Priv. Enterp. Policy Support II	[AI]	20,000	1.0
	492-0470	PVO Co-Financing IV	[DA]	2,900	3.7
	492-0473	AIDS Prevention & Control	[DA]	2,000	3.0
	492-0476	Priv. Infrastructure Dev.	[AI]	23,000	1.0
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		147,500	1.26
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		45,000	0.88
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		102,500	1.43
Sri Lanka	383-0086	Mahaweli Ag. & Rural Dev.	[DA]	1,000	1.0
	383-0090	Mahaweli Enterp. Dev.	[DA]	1,000	1.0
	383-0100	Priv. Sector Pol. Support	[DA]	5,302	1.3
	383-0108	Tech. Init. for Priv. Sector	[DA]	3,000	1.7
	383-0109	Natural Res. & Environ. Pol.	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	383-0111	Comm. of Ag. Sys. Horticulture	[DA]	3,198	2.7
	383-0113	Irrigation Sector Privatization	[DA]	2,000	1.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		16,500	1.72
Thailand	493-0345	Natural Resources Management	[DA]	1,000	2.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		1,000	2.70
ASEAN	399-0358	ASEAN Priv. Investment & Trade	[DA]	2,000	0.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		2,000	0.70
Asia Regional	499-0000	Prog. Dev. & Support	[DA]	8,500	1.7
	499-0002	Asia Democracy Program	[DA]	1,000	2.0
	499-0005	APEC Partnership for Ed.	[DA]	1,162	1.3
	499-0017	Sustainability in Asia	[DA]	2,500	2.0
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		13,162	1.74
South Pacific Regional	879-0011	Fisheries Treaty Program	[ESF]	10,000	1.0
	879-0017	PNG Child Survival Support	[DA]	1,300	3.7
	879-0018	Mkt. Access & Reg. Compet.	[DA]	1,000	1.0
	879-0020	Pacific Islands Marine Resources	[DA]	1,500	2.7
	879-0026	Commercial Ag. Dev.	[DA]	2,100	2.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		15,900	1.55
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		10,000	1.00
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		5,900	2.49



# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<b>EUROPE -- FY 93</b>					
Cyprus	233-0001	Bi-Communal Dev.	[ESF]	2,000	1.0
	233-0002	Scholarship Program	[ESF]	1,000	0.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			3,000	0.77
Portugal	150-0009	Cash Transfer	[ESF]	40,000	1.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			40,000	1.70
Turkey	277-XX93	Cash Transfer	[ESF]	75,000	1.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			75,000	1.00
<b>NEAR EAST -- FY 93</b>					
Jordan	278-K646	Export Dev. Sector Support	[ESF]	13,500	2.0
	278-0283	Financial Mkt. Improvement	[ESF]	3,000	1.0
	278-0287	Family Health Services	[ESF]	1,000	3.3
	278-0288	Environ. Svcs. Dev.	[ESF]	2,500	2.7
	278-0289	Horticultural Exp. Prom.	[ESF]	3,000	2.3
	278-0290	Jordan Enterp. Res. & Self Help	[ESF]	4,000	3.0
	278-0291	Jordan Environmental Dev.	[ESF]	3,000	2.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			30,000	2.17
Lebanon	268-0342	Lebanon Relief Assist.	[VA]	7,500	3.3
	268-1336	Education Support-AUB	[DA]	1,500	1.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>			9,000	2.97
	<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			5,000	3.30
	<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			4,000	2.55
Morocco	608-0136	Dryland Ag. Applied Rsch.	[DA]	1,276	3.3
	608-0198	Population and Child Survival	[DA]	11,693	3.0
	608-0204	New Enterprise Dev.	[ESF]	5,000	1.7
	608-0207	Health Care Financing	[DA]	6,256	3.3
	608-0218	Microenterprise Dev.	[ESF]	2,000	3.3

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Morocco, cont'd		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		26,225	2.86
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		7,000	2.16
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		19,225	3.12
Oman	272-0105	Omani-American Joint Comm. II	[ESF]	5,000	0.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		5,000	0.30
Tunisia	664-0346	Private Sector Development	[ESF]	2,500	1.3
	664-0353	Development Studies	[ESF]	1,000	1.0
	664-0354	Agribusiness Promotion	[ESF]	4,000	1.0
	664-0355	Productive Skills Training	[ESF]	2,500	1.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		10,000	1.15
West Bank/Gaza	398-0159	West Bank/Gaza Dev.	[ESF]	25,000	3.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		25,000	3.70
Yemen	279-0080	Dev. Training II	[DA]	1,500	1.0
	279-0082	Accel. Coop. for Child Surv.	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	279-0090	Options for Family Care	[DA]	3,000	2.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		5,500	2.13
NE Reg	398-0158	Regional Cooperation	[ESF]	5,000	2.7
	398-0249	Program Dev. and Support	[VA]	5,658	2.7
	398-0371	Regional Agribusiness	[DA]	2,000	1.7
	398-0376	Regional Trade & Inv. Supp.	[DA]	2,000	0.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		14,658	2.24
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		5,500	2.70
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		9,158	1.96

## LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN -- FY 93

Belize	505-0042	Rural Access Bridge	[DA]	1,900	1.7
	505-0043	Nat. Res. Mgmt. & Protection	[DA]	2,500	2.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		4,400	2.27

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Bolivia	511-0000	Program Dev. and Support	[DA]	1,350	3.0
	551-0568	Reproductive Health	[DA]	1,095	2.3
	511-0577	Industrial Transition	[DA]	1,920	1.3
	511-0594	Community and Child Health	[DA]	1,850	4.0
	511-0596	Micro Enterprise Dev.	[DA]	1,001	3.0
	511-0607	Self-Financ. Prim. Health Care II	[DA]	1,500	3.3
	511-0608	AIDS Prevention	[DA]	1,000	3.0
	511-0617	Cochabamba Reg. Dev.	[DA]	5,148	2.7
	511-0618	CARE Community Dev.	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	511-0619	Interactive Radio Learning	[DA]	1,235	3.3
	511-0620	Child Survival Network II	[DA]	1,500	3.7
	511-0621	Special Dev. Activities	[DA]	2,000	3.7
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				20,599	2.99
Costa Rica	515-0212	Trng. for Priv. Sect. Dev.	[DA]	1,000	1.3
	515-0241	Policy & Training Support	[DA]	3,700	2.3
	515-0247	Financial Services	[DA]	1,300	3.0
	515-0254	CLASP II	[DA]	1,250	0.7
	515-0268	Trade & Investment III	[ESF]	10,000	2.3
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>				17,250	2.18
<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>				10,000	2.30
<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>				7,250	2.01
Dom Rep	517-0000	Program Dev. and Support	[DA]	1,049	2.0
	517-0243	University Agribus. Partnership	[DA]	1,500	1.3
	517-0247	PVO Co-Financing	[DA]	1,168	3.7
	517-0251	Private Primary Education	[DA]	2,000	0.0
	517-0259	Family Planning Ext. Svcs.	[DA]	5,844	3.0
	517-0262	Economic Policy & Practice	[DA]	2,000	1.3
	517-0263	Investment Trade Expansion	[ESF]	5,000	1.3
	517-0265	Democracy Initiative	[DA]	1,500	2.0
	517-0266	Sustaining Natural Res. Mgmt.	[DA]	1,500	3.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>				21,561	1.97
<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>				5,000	1.30
<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>				16,561	2.17

34

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Ecuador	518-0069	Sustainable Uses-Biol. Resources	[DA]	1,500	3.0
	518-0084	Population & Family Ping. II	[DA]	2,470	3.0
	518-0091	Ecuador Dev. Schol./CLASP II	[DA]	1,377	0.7
	518-0094	Trade & Investment Sector	[DA]	2,056	1.0
	518-0106	Small Enterp. Export Linkages	[DA]	1,528	2.7
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				8,931	2.13
El Salvador	519-0000	Program Dev. & Support	[DA]	2,050	2.7
	519-0287	Ind. Stabilizn./Recovery	[DA]	2,900	2.0
	519-0308	Health Systems Support	[VA]	11,565	3.3
	519-0318	Micro Enterprise Dev.	[DA]	2,000	3.3
	519-0320	Public Svcs. Improvemnt	[DA]	3,000	2.3
	519-0323	Free Zone Dev.	[ESF]	1,555	1.3
	519-0327	Agribusiness Dev.	[DA]	3,800	1.0
	519-0349	Tech. Supp., Pol. Analy. & Trng.	[DA]	2,055	2.0
	519-0357	Educ. Quality Enhancement	[VA]	6,500	3.3
	519-0361	Carib./Latin Am. School Program	[ESF]	1,390	0.7
	519-0362	Coffee Technology Enhancemt	[DA]	2,450	2.7
	519-3063	Family Health Services MCH	[DA]	3,808	3.0
	519-0367	Maternal Health/Child Surviv. Svcs.	[DA]	6,035	3.0
	519-0376	Judicial Sector Strengthening	[ESF]	1,500	1.7
	519-0378	Balance of Pymts. Supp.	[ESF]	80,000	1.3
	519-0387	Small Enterprise Support	[DA]	3,500	3.3
	519-0388	Municipal Level Democratic Dev.	[VA]	3,500	2.3
	519-0390	Trng. for Prod./Competitiveness II	[DA]	2,650	2.7
	519-0392	Small Farmer Export & Mkting.	[DA]	2,000	3.0
	519-0394	National Reconstruction Program	[ESF]	61,000	3.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA+ESF)</i>				203,258	2.23
<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>				155,945	2.09
<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>				47,313	2.71
Guatemala	520-0000	Program Dev. & Support	[DA]	1,040	3.0
	520-0286	Cooperative Strengthening	[DA]	1,600	3.3
	520-0339	Immunization/Child Survival	[DA]	3,000	4.0
	520-0353	Rural Electrification III	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	520-0357	Family Health & Pop. Services	[DA]	8,300	3.3
	520-0374	Basic Educ. Strengthening	[DA]	2,400	3.0
	520-0381	Small Farmer Coffee	[DA]	1,000	3.3
	520-0393	Guatemala Peace Schol. II	[ESF]	2,680	0.7
	520-0398	Democratic Initiatives	[ESF]	1,200	1.7

40

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Guatemala, cont'd	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>			22,220	2.90
	<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			3,880	1.01
	<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			18,340	3.30
Haiti	521-0000	Program Dev. & Support	[DA]	1,700	2.3
	521-0190	Incentives Improve Prim. Educ.	[DA]	4,000	3.0
	521-0206	Vol. Ags. for Child Survival	[DA]	5,100	3.7
	521-0219	Family Health and Population	[DA]	4,000	2.3
	521-0224	AIDS Control	[DA]	2,000	3.3
	521-0226	Economic Recovery Assistance	[ESF]	15,000	1.3
	521-0240	Supp. of Const'l Democracy	[DA]	4,500	2.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>			36,300	2.18
	<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			15,000	1.30
	<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			21,300	2.80
Honduras	522-0216	Health Sector II	[DA]	7,100	3.0
	522-0246	Forestry Dev.	[DA]	3,828	3.0
	522-0268	Irrigation Dev.	[DA]	1,910	2.0
	522-0273	Primary Education Efficiency	[DA]	1,032	4.0
	522-0292	Land Use Productivity Enhanc.	[DA]	2,300	2.3
	522-0296	Strengthen. Democrat. Institut.	[ESF]	1,650	1.7
	522-0312	Investment & Export Promotion	[DA]	3,600	2.0
	522-0325	Policy Analysis & Implement.	[VA]	4,500	1.0
	522-0334	Rural Trails & Access Roads III	[DA]	1,100	2.0
	522-0340	Municipal Dev.	[DA]	1,856	2.7
	522-0364	Honduras Peace Schol. II	[ESF]	2,000	0.7
	522-0365	Structural Adjust. Program	[ESF]	24,000	1.0
	522-0367	Privatization II	[DA]	1,500	0.7
	522-0369	Private Sector Pop. Program II	[DA]	2,500	2.7
	522-0381	Strengthening Acctability. Systems	[DA]	1,000	1.7
	522-0383	Small Farmer Org. Strength. II	[DA]	1,100	3.0
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>			60,976	1.74
	<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			29,650	1.02
	<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			31,326	2.42
Jamaica	532-0101	Hillside Agriculture	[DA]	1,397	2.0
	532-0129	UWI Mgmt. Education	[DA]	1,009	1.3
	532-0135	Export Dev. & Invest. Promotion	[DA]	1,525	2.0
	532-0155	Primary Educ. Assistance II	[DA]	1,320	3.7
	532-0163	Pop. & Family Plng. Serv. II	[DA]	1,250	3.3
	532-0164	Pol. Ref. Supp. of Priv. Invest.	[ESF]	15,000	1.7
	532-0165	Ag. Export Services	[DA]	1,810	2.0

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Jamaica, cont'd	532-0173	D E M O	[DA]	1,537	2.7
	532-0175	Sustainable Justice Reform	[DA]	1,050	1.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		25,898	1.98
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		15,000	1.70
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		10,898	2.36
Nicaragua	524-0000	Program Development & Support	[ESF]	2,000	1.7
	524-0301	Econ. Growth & Dev.	[ESF]	4,000	2.7
	524-0312	Family Planning Expansion	[DA]	2,000	2.7
	524-0313	PVO Co-Financing	[DA]	4,000	3.7
	524-0315	Private Ag. Services	[DA]	4,000	2.3
	524-0317	Private Sector Support	[DA]	5,500	1.0
	524-0318	Dev. Training & Support	[VA]	5,000	1.3
	524-0327	Decentralized Health Servs.	[DA]	6,000	4.0
	524-0329	Basic Education	[DA]	8,500	3.7
	524-0330	Public Sector Financial Mgmt.	[ESF]	2,000	1.3
	524-0333	Economic Recov. & Dev.	[ESF]	105,000	1.3
	524-0336	Natural Resources Sustainability	[DA]	10,000	2.3
	524-0340	Legal & Reg. Judicial Reform	[ESF]	2,000	1.7
	524-0341	Strengthening Munic. Instit.	[ESF]	2,000	3.0
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>		162,000	1.74
		<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		120,000	1.39
		<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>		42,000	2.76
Panama	525-0308	Natural Resources Mgmt.	[DA]	3,000	2.7
	525-0312	Judicial Reform	[DA]	1,500	1.7
	525-1001	CLASP II	[DA]	1,000	0.7
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		5,500	2.06
Peru	527-0282	Ag. Tech. Transformation	[DA]	1,150	3.0
	527-0285	Child Survival Action	[DA]	4,167	3.7
	527-0319	Strength. Priv. Sector Health Inst.	[DA]	9,245	3.7
	527-0326	Priv. Commercial Family Planning	[DA]	2,496	2.7
	527-0358	Ag. Tech. Dissemination	[DA]	1,457	3.3
	527-0359	Credit & Rural Savings	[DA]	1,365	3.3
		<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>		19,880	3.48

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Caribbean Regional	538-0103	Basic Needs Trust Fund	[DA]	1,000	3.0
	538-0140	High Impact Ag. Mktg. and Prod.	[DA]	1,558	2.0
	538-0161	AIDS Commun. & Tech. Asst.	[DA]	1,247	3.0
	538-0171	Env. & Coastal Resources	[VA]	5,829	2.3
	538-0178	Sm. Enterprise Assistance II	[DA]	3,024	2.7
	538-0179	Pop. Pol. & Plan. Program	[DA]	1,479	2.7
	538-0182	Grenada Structural Adjustment	[ESF]	2,000	1.3
	538-0184	Eastern Carib Ag. Policy	[DA]	1,850	1.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>			17,987	2.29
	<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			2,400	1.47
	<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			15,587	2.42
LAC	597-0031	Central Am. Journalism Improv.	[DA]	2,500	1.3
	598-0000	Program Development & Support	[DA]	1,150	2.0
	598-0591	Human Rights Initiatives	[VA]	4,150	1.7
	598-0616	Inter-Country Tech. Transfer	[DA]	7,245	2.0
	598-0642	Regional Admin. of Justice	[ESF]	6,900	3.0
	598-0644	Int'l. Invest. Trng.	[ESF]	5,000	0.7
	598-0654	Rural Dev. Tech. Svcs.	[DA]	1,900	1.7
	598-0657	Health Tech. Svcs. Support	[DA]	3,410	3.0
	598-0661	Carib. & LA Schol. Prog. II	[DA]	16,500	0.7
	598-0669	Regional Adj. Support	[ESF]	1,050	2.0
	598-0770	Regional Legis. Mgmt.	[DA]	1,500	1.3
	598-0772	Priv. Sector Inst. Reform	[DA]	1,800	2.7
	598-0774	Advanced Trng. in Economics	[DA]	1,000	0.3
	598-0780	Environ. Support Project	[DA]	2,605	3.0
	598-0782	Parks in Peril	[DA]	2,000	2.7
	598-0784	Environ./Global Clim. Change	[DA]	5,000	2.7
	598-0785	Caribbean Basin Growers Assoc.	[DA]	1,000	1.0
	598-0786	Accelerated Immunization Act	[DA]	2,000	3.7
	598-0791	Technical Aid Center II	[DA]	2,000	1.7
	598-0798	Demo. Initiatives Tech. Supp.	[DA]	1,000	2.0
	598-0800	Accountability & Financial Mgmt.	[DA]	2,500	1.3
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA (DA + ESF)</i>			72,210	1.79
	<i>ESF Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			16,050	1.97
	<i>DA Country Total &amp; Weighted GPA</i>			56,160	1.74

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
ROCAP	596-0000	Program Dev. & Support	[DA]	1,100	0.7
	596-0129	Reg. Ag. Higher Educ.	[DA]	1,989	2.3
	596-0150	Reg. Env. & Nat. Res. Mgmt.	[DA]	6,327	2.7
	596-0165	Export Ind. Tech. Support	[DA]	1,000	1.3
	596-0170	Promo. of Trade thru Reg.	[DA]	2,000	1.0
<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>				12,416	2.07
Andean Narcotics Initiative	555-0001	Andean Narcotic Init.	[ESF]	250,000	1.7
	<i>Country Total and Weighted GPA</i>			250,000	1.70

## CENTRALLY FUNDED -- FY 93

931-0054	Intl. Fertilizer Dev. Center	[DA]	3,000	3.0
931-1254	CRSP Sorghum/Millet	[DA]	2,600	3.3
931-1310	CRSP Beans & Cowpeas	[DA]	2,600	3.3
931-1311	CRSP-Program Soils Mgmt.	[DA]	3,670	3.7
931-1328	CRSP-Program Small Ruminants	[DA]	2,700	3.3
936-4023	CRSP-Pond Dynamics	[DA]	1,000	3.3
936-4048	CRSP Peanuts	[DA]	1,600	3.3
936-4177	Improved BNF through Bio-Tech.	[DA]	1,140	3.3
936-4195	Postharvest Systems	[DA]	1,500	3.7
936-4198	Sustainable Ag. Systems/CRSP	[DA]	2,200	3.3
936-4200	Ag. Program Dev. & Support	[DA]	2,000	2.3
936-5116	Vitamin A for Health	[DA]	3,000	4.0
936-5117	Wom./Infant Nutrition	[DA]	1,525	4.0
936-5730	Renewable Energy Appl./Trng.	[DA]	2,000	2.7
936-5734	Energy Training	[DA]	2,400	1.7
936-5737	Biomass Energy Systems & Tech.	[DA]	2,000	2.7
936-5738	Priv. Sector Energy Dev.	[DA]	2,400	1.0
936-5741	Energy Tech. Innovation	[DA]	2,000	1.3
936-5743	Energy Efficiency Project	[DA]	2,200	2.0
936-5744	Energy & Envir. Policy & Planning	[DA]	2,000	2.0
936-5518	Coastal Resources Management	[DA]	1,200	2.7
936-5547	Forestry Fuelwood R&D	[DA]	2,000	3.0
936-5554	Conservation of Bio-Diversity	[DA]	2,700	2.7
936-5555	Envir. Policy & Analysis	[DA]	3,450	2.7
936-5556	Forest Mgmt. & Conserv.	[DA]	2,200	3.3
936-5559	Envir. Pollution Prev.	[DA]	2,750	2.7
936-5562	Envir. Plan. & Mgmt. II	[DA]	3,100	2.7
936-5053	HBCU Research Grants	[DA]	2,000	2.0

44



# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Centrally Funded, cont'd	936-5055	Technical Advisory Support Serv.	[DA]	1,700	1.3
	936-5063	U.S. University Dev. Linkage	[DA]	5,300	2.0
	936-5065	Higher Educ. & Development	[DA]	8,000	1.3
	936-0071	Training Eval. & Support	[DA]	2,750	0.7
	936-5818	Learning Tech. for Basic Educ	[DA]	1,175	3.3
	936-5823	Impr. Effic. of Ed. Systems II	[DA]	1,325	2.7
	936-5832	Adv. Basic Educ./Literacy	[DA]	1,275	3.0
	936-5929	Health Resources Support	[DA]	5,000	2.7
	936-5951	Child Surv. Act. Prog. Support	[DA]	1,500	3.3
	936-5966	Maternal Neonatal Health & Nutr.	[DA]	5,840	3.7
	936-5968	Tech. for Child Health	[DA]	2,250	3.7
	936-5969	Tech. for PHC II	[DA]	1,500	2.7
	936-5972	AIDS Tech Supp	[DA]	23,965	3.0
	936-5974	Health Care Fin. & Sustain. I	[DA]	5,011	3.0
	936-5979	Malaria Vacc. R&D	[DA]	8,500	3.3
	936-5982	Tech. & Res. for Child Health	[DA]	2,700	3.0
	936-5984	Comm. & Mktg. for Child Surv.	[DA]	3,780	3.3
	936-5986	Diarrheal Dis. & Res. Coord. (DD)	[DA]	3,500	4.0
	936-5991	Data for Decision Making	[DA]	3,500	2.0
	936-5992	Research in Child Surv.	[DA]	1,300	3.3
	936-5994	Environmental Health	[DA]	7,459	3.0
	936-5995	Workforce 2000	[DA]	1,500	3.0
	936-5600	Innovative Scientific Res. II	[DA]	8,700	3.0
	936-3018	Contraceptives Procurement	[DA]	18,600	2.3
	936-3023	Dem. & Fam. Health Surveys	[DA]	5,000	2.0
	936-3024	Population Technical Assistance	[DA]	2,100	2.3
	936-3030	Strat. for Impr. Service Delivery	[DA]	7,000	2.3
	936-3031	FP Trng. for Paramed. Aux.	[DA]	5,240	1.7
	936-3032	Pop. Infor. Prog. III	[DA]	2,000	1.0
	936-3035	Pop. Policy Initiatives	[DA]	3,000	3.0
	936-3038	FP Logistics Mgmt.	[DA]	5,100	1.7
	936-3041	Family Health International	[DA]	7,900	1.3
	936-3042	FP Services-Path Finder	[DA]	8,000	1.7
	936-3043	Expan./Improv. of FP Prog.	[DA]	6,000	2.7
	936-3044	Contraceptive R & D	[DA]	4,000	1.3
	936-3045	Trng. Reproductive Health II	[DA]	6,000	1.3
	936-3046	Demographic Data Initiative	[DA]	4,060	2.0
	936-3048	Serv. Exp. & Tech. Supp.	[DA]	9,000	1.3
	936-3049	Voluntary Sterilization-AVS	[DA]	11,000	2.3
	936-3050	Pop. Council Prog. Phase II	[DA]	5,500	4.0
	936-3051	Contracept. Social Mktg. II	[DA]	5,000	1.7
	936-3052	Pop. Comm. Serv. II	[DA]	5,600	2.0
	936-3055	Fam. Plng. Mgmt. Dev.	[DA]	4,000	2.0
	936-3056	Promote Fin. Invest. & Trans.	[DA]	7,200	2.3

# ANNEX

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project #</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Funds</u>	<u>Amount (000s)</u>	<u>Grade</u>
Centrally Funded, cont'd	936-3058	CARE	[DA]	2,000	3.7
	936-3059	Access to Family Plan. thru Women	[DA]	2,000	2.0
	936-3060	Family Planning Evaluation	[DA]	2,000	1.3
	936-3061	Natural Family Planning	[DA]	2,000	0.0
	930-0100	WID Strategies & Res.	[DA]	2,000	2.3
	932-0862	UN Fund for Pop. Activities	[DA]	10,000	1.7
	936-4111	Int. Ag. Research Centers	[DA]	1,500	3.0
	936-4111.88	CGIAR	[DA]	42,000	3.0
	936-5965	Global AIDS Program-WHO	[DA]	26,000	3.0
	930-0185	Aid/Israel Coop. Dev. Program	[DA]	5,000	2.0
	936-5602	US/Israel Prg. for Coop. Dev. Res.	[DA]	2,500	2.0
	938-0158	Matching Grants to PVO's	[DA]	17,938	3.7
	938-0192	Cooperative Grants to PVOs	[DA]	5,800	3.7
	938-0230	Development Education	[DA]	2,500	3.3
	938-0238	Ocean Freight Reimbursement	[DA]	3,000	3.7
	938-0244	Oppor. Ind. Cntrs. Intl. (OICI)	[DA]	2,000	2.7
	938-0284	Vitamin A	[DA]	2,000	3.7
	938-0500	Tech Supp./Child Surv.	[DA]	15,000	3.7
	938-0537	Rotary International	[DA]	1,000	3.7
	940-1008	Housing & Urban Programs	[DA]	3,500	2.3
	940-2003	Investment and Guaranty Services	[DA]	1,500	2.7
	940-0001	Prog. Dev. & Support	[DA]	1,700	2.0
	940-0016	Privatiz. and Dev.	[DA]	1,000	2.3
	940-0019	IESC Intl. Tech. Transfer	[DA]	5,000	1.0
	936-5448	Growth & Equity thru Micro Inv.	[DA]	1,270	3.3
	940-0015	Instit. Reform & Informal Sect.	[DA]	2,200	3.0
	940-0403	Anti-Pov. Lending for Enterp.	[DA]	10,000	4.0
	930-0085	Integrated Studies & Systems	[DA]	5,103	3.0
	930-0232	Inform. as Tool in Dev.	[DA]	2,008	1.7
	930-0600	Peace Corps	[DA]	2,000	3.7
	<i>Centrally Funded Total and Weighted GPA</i>			483,284	2.66

**PREVIOUS MONOGRAPHS  
IN THE RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE SERIES**

- #1    The Quality of Foreign Aid**  
by Roy L. Prosterman and Jeffrey M. Riedinger, June 1984.
  
- #2    Egyptian Development and U.S. Aid: A 6-Year Report**  
by Prosterman and Riedinger, Nov. 1985.
  
- #3    Indonesian Development and U.S. Aid**  
by Prosterman and Riedinger, Jan. 1987.
  
- #4    Foreign Aid: A Current Assessment**  
by Roy L. Prosterman and Timothy Hanstad, Feb. 1989.
  
- #5    Foreign Aid: An Assessment of the Proposed FY 1991 Program**  
by Prosterman and Hanstad, June 1990.
  
- #6    The Prospects for Individual Peasant Farming in the U.S.S.R.**  
by Prosterman and Hanstad, Jan. 1991.
  
- #7    Foreign Aid: A Report Card for the Proposed FY 1992 Program**  
by Prosterman and Hanstad, May 1991.
  
- #8    An Update on Individual Peasant Farming in the U.S.S.R.**  
by Prosterman and Hanstad, October 1991.
  
- #9    Egyptian Development and U.S. Aid: A 25-Year Perspective**  
by Prosterman and Hanstad, March 1992.

Additional copies of the present monograph and copies of prior monographs may be ordered from the Rural Development Institute, 1100 N.E. Campus Parkway, Seattle, Washington 98105, U.S.A.