UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Washington, D.C. 20523

PROJECT PAPER

Proposal and Recommendations
For the Review of the
Bilateral Assistance Subcommittee

WORLDWIDE - TITLE II OUTREACH

AID/BAS-024

UNCLASSIFIED

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

UNCLASSIFIED

AID/BAS-024

July 19, 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR THE BILATERAL ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

SUBJECT: Worldwide - Title II Outreach

Attached for your review are recommendations for authorization of a grant in an amount not to exceed Nine Million Four Hundred Thousand United States Dollars ($9,400,000) to comply with the Congressional mandate of reaching populations most in need of outside assistance.

No meeting has been scheduled for this grant proposal; however, your concurrence or objection is requested by close of business on Thursday, July 27, 1978. If you are a voting member, a poll sheet has been enclosed for your response.

Working Group on Bilateral Assistance
Office of Policy Development and Program Review

Attachments:
Project Description
Annexes I - VII

UNCLASSIFIED

TITLE II

OUTREACH

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT PAPER FACESHEET

1. TRANSACTION CODE: A (A = ADD, C = CHANGE, D = DELETE)

PP

2. DOCUMENT CODE: 3

3. COUNTRY/ENTITY: Worldwide

4. DOCUMENT REVISION NUMBER:

5. PROJECT NUMBER (7 digits): 904-0006

6. BUREAU/OFFICE: A. SYMBOL: PDC; B. CODE: 34

7. PROJECT TITLE (Maximum 40 characters): Title II Outreach

8. ESTIMATED FY OF PROJECT COMPLETION: FY 81

9. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION: A. INITIAL FY 78; B. QUARTER 1 (Enter 1, 2, 3, or 4); C. FINAL FY 81

10. ESTIMATED COSTS ($000 OR EQUIVALENT $1 –)

A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY 1978 B. FX	C. L/C	D. TOTAL	LIFE OF PROJECT E. FX	F. L/C	G. TOTAL
AID APPROPRIATED TOTAL						
(GRANT)	(800)	( )	(800)	(9,400)	( )	(9,400)
(LOAN)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
OTHER U.S. 1. Title II	1,000		1,000	28,000		28,000
OTHER U.S. 2.						
HOST COUNTRY	100		100			2.5
OTHER DONOR(S)	100		100			2.2
TOTALS						

11. PROPOSED BUDGET APPROPRIATED FUNDS ($000)

A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	PRIMARY TECH. CODE C. GRANT	D. LOAN	E. 1ST FY 78 F. GRANT	G. LOAN	H. 2ND FY 79 I. GRANT	J. LOAN	K. 3RD FY 80 L. GRANT	M. LOAN
(1) FN	383	320		800		2,800		3,000	
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
TOTALS									

A. APPROPRIATION	N. 4TH FY 81 O. GRANT	P. LOAN	Q. 5TH FY ___ R. GRANT	S. LOAN	LIFE OF PROJECT T. GRANT	U. LOAN
(1) FN	2,800				9,400	
(2)						
(3)						
(4)						
TOTALS						

12. IN-DEPTH EVALUATION SCHEDULED: MM 10 YY 81

13. DATA CHANGE INDICATOR. WERE CHANGES MADE IN THE PID FACESHEET DATA, BLOCKS 12, 13, 14, OR 15 OR IN PRP FACESHEET DATA, BLOCK 12? IF YES, ATTACH CHANGED PID FACESHEET.

1 = NO
2 = YES

14. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

SIGNATURE: Peggy A. Sheehan

TITLE: Chief, PDC/FFP/Title II

DATE SIGNED: MM DD YY

15. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID/W DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION: MM DD YY

AID 1330-4 (3-76)

PROJECT PAPER

TITLE II OUTREACH

1. Facesheet - Attached

2. Description of Project

The International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977 (IFDA) strengthens the emphasis of direct U.S. food aid under Public Law 480 - the Food for Peace program - on individual human needs and the use of food aid to promote economic development in poor countries. In the IFDA, Sec. 201(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (the Act) is amended as follows: "The minimum quantity of commodities distributed under this title:

"(1) for fiscal years 1978 through 1980 shall be 1,600,000 metric tons, of which not less than 1,300,000 metric tons shall be distributed through non-profit voluntary agencies and the World Food Program;

"(2) for fiscal year 1981 shall be 1,650,000 metric tons, of which not less than 1,350,000 metric tons shall be distributed through non-profit voluntary agencies and the World Food Program; and

"(3) for fiscal year 1982 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be 1,700,000 metric tons, of which not less than 1,400,000 metric tons shall be distributed through non-profit voluntary agencies and the World Food Program."

Section 202 of the Act is amended as follows:

"(b)(1) Assistance to needy persons under this title shall be directed insofar as practicable, toward community and other self-help activities designed to alleviate the causes of need for such assistance.

"(2) In order to assure that food commodities made available under this title are used effectively, indigenous workers shall be employed, to the extent feasible, to provide information on nutrition and conduct food distribution programs in the most remote villages.

"(3) In distributing food commodities under this title, priority shall be given, to the extent feasible, to those who are suffering from malnutrition by using means such as (A) giving priority within food programs for pre-school children to malnourished children, and (B) giving priority to the poorest regions of countries."

This legislation eliminates the previously fluctuating availability of commodities under Title II and provides for the possibility of long-range planning and programming. Program expansion worldwide can and must now be considered, and, in this environment, it should be possible to start new Title II programs and continue and expand ongoing activities in countries with the greatest identified needs in accordance with the Congressional intent.

Yet, Title II program expansion, and indeed even continuation, in the Least Developed Countries has been limited by the extremely high program costs prevailing, due largely to the long lines of communication involved. Neither the voluntary agencies nor the recipient governments have the resources to fund logistical costs for expanded or retargeted Title II programs. The decreased abilities of host governments and recipients, due to the sharp increases in food and energy costs, to participate in the financing of their food programs has stretched the financial resources of the voluntary agencies to their limits and, in fact, threatens the continuation of well-designed, effective ongoing programs. These financial constraints may result in a decrease in the scope of Title II nutritional and developmental programs and in the ability of these programs to serve the very populations which need them most. Voluntary agencies often are unable to respond to requests from needy groups for inclusion in feeding programs or to governmental requests for expansion of programs to the less developed areas. The poor majority is the most difficult, the most costly, and the least accessible segment of the population to reach. Developing new methods to reach this segment with meaningful programs is beyond the present resources of the voluntary agencies or the governments of the least developed countries.

Attached as Annex 1 is a list of countries ranked by 1976 GNP per capita and Title II Total Commodities Shipped by Program Sponsor in FY 1977. It is evident from these two charts that in many cases Food for Peace has been unable to program commodities in proportion to need; e.g., Burundi with a per capita GNP of $120 received $1,060,000 in Title II commodity assistance, whereas Tunisia with a GNP of $840 was the recipient of $5,338,000 worth of commodities.

The purpose of this project is to comply with Congressional intent that food aid reach populations in the poorest regions of countries by providing the necessary resources.

For some time we have been discussing the integration of PL 480 commodity resources and FAA dollar resources. The first and most crucial point of intervention for FAA dollar resources in the Title II program at the present time is funding for logistical support.

The difficulty encountered in securing the financial resources to support the in-country transportation, storage, distribution and other related administrative/ logistical costs is perhaps the single greatest problem in carrying out development grant food aid programs in the least developed countries. There are continuous recurring expenses which must be covered in order to transport, store and handle food. The costs involved in an orderly and regular movement of food to recipients can be foreseen. However, finding a source to guarantee these costs and meet these needs is extremely difficult in most of the LDCs. Possible sources of local currency were examined to determine if any existing mechanism could be used to generate currencies to finance costs of development food grants. Our findings were that 1) Section 204 currencies were not available in the countries to which this project is targeted and 2) both Section 206 and Title III programs are complex and require a degree of bureaucratic sophistication lacking in most of the Least Developed Countries for which this project is designed. If we find that any of these avenues can be used in specific countries they will be utilized prior to the approval of specific support grantsunder this project.

Programming Title II in many of the least developed countries is becoming largely an exercise of setting out a Program Plan based on estimates of diverse support resources that can be located. It is ineffectual programming when resources necessary to administer a project become the focal point, rather than the program goals. This has led in many countries to Title II programs being restricted to those areas in or near to points of commodity entry or major population centers.

In many areas the food production situation now seems to have eroded to one of chronic shortages to the extent that any climatic or other setback affecting production leads directly to an acute or emergency food deficit. Due to our inability to reach these areas on a regular basis, we now respond to these emergencies as they arise on an ad hoc basis after they become acute. A more logical approach would be larger regular Title II development programs with two purposes: (1) to provide food to a population in need, and (2) to work on the

root development problems that create the shortages. One of the most effective ways to develop an organizational infrastructure which is able to effectively program for emergencies is to increase regular Title II programming. Title II programs offer a vehicle for a more timely and organized response to the periodic food shortages that occur than the present ad hoc emergency response. By development of the administrative and operational infrastructure necessary to operate such activities as maternal/child health and food-for-work, we are also developing an organizational unit to be called upon in case of emergencies. Food-for-work can be used for a wide variety of labor-intensive development projects that lead directly to increased agricultural productivity and serve a function as disaster preparedness in such projects as well digging, irrigation and reforestation.

This project would allocate dollar funds to be programmed and used in conjunction with the expansion, continuation, and retargeting of Title II activities in the least developed countries by funding costs of these programs directly related to transportation, intermediate storage, fumigation, distribution and other related administrative/logistical costs in countries where no other funds are available for this purpose. Costs which will be fundedunder this project will be specified in the guidance transmitted to the field upon project approval.

It is in the current developmental context that the question of the essentially humanitarian and/or developmental nature of Title II food aid should be evaluated. A starting point might be that while development itself is basically humanitarian in nature, humanitarian undertakings are not necessarily developmental. Title II emergency and relief programs are clearly an example of the latter. They are aimed at assisting a population affected by a crisis situation return to the status quo. The goal of this project is to aid development in areas heretofore inaccessible to or in danger of losing Title II assistance due to financial constraints on the implementing organizations. A Logical Framework is attached as Annex II.

3.3 Project Analyses

Development was once considered to be the process of increasing production through the expansion of capital stock and investment in capital goods which would lead to the generation of new wealth. Industrialization was the key, and it was believed that the net increase and benefits of capital goods production would eventually "trickle down" through society as more and more jobs were created and purchasing power increased. It became apparent, however, that post-war models which worked in European reconstruction were not similarly successful when transplanted to third-world settings.

General development theories were modified to reflect the different problems, based on the realization that life for the vast majority of people in the poorest countries remained largely unaffected by this development model.

More recently, as exemplified by A.I.D.'s Congressional mandate, emphasis has been given to stimulating the development process by investing in people, "human capital", rather than goods, recognizing that human potential can't begin to be realized in the face of overwhelming poverty. It was recognized that certain social and human constraints hold back the development process from taking place.

With this recognition, a further change has occurred in defining the development process. Priority has shifted from measuring increases in production to improving the "quality of life" or general well-being of the individual in a society: the "basic needs" theory. Increased production becomes a possible means to this end, rather than an end in itself. Development programs and policy are now primarily directed toward the poor majority, with efforts being targeted at the poorest of the poor. Poverty benchmarks have been established for identification and measurement purposes. These benchmarks include not only the usual indicator of social well-being - per capita income - but such indicators as nutrition, life expectancy, infant mortality, birth rate and access to health services. Development is seen to occur when the individual standard of living is raised as measured against these benchmarks. One of the features of this model is the recognition that the various components of poverty go together, reinforcing one another as negative constraints to development or improved well-being.

The bulk of the poor in the developing countries live in the countries faced with the immediate task of providing goods and services to enable all their people to survive decently. The basic needs model gives high priority to meeting specified needs of the poorest people, not only of defined target groups, and not primarily in order to raise productivity, but as an end in itself.

The estimated numbers of people experiencing shortfalls in basic needs are shown in the table below.

Number (millions) of People Experiencing "Shortfalls" for Three Core Basic Needs 1/

	Population of Poor Countries	"Shortfall" Population	% of Total
Food			
Calorie)	1200	600	50
Protein		800	67
Water		800	67
Shelter		500	42
Number of Absolute Poor		750	63

These estimates pertain to 1975.

NOTE: The number of absolute poor, defined as those with per capita income of less than $75 in 1969 prices, was 750 million in 1975. This is a World Bank estimate used for various poverty studies.

At the time of the World Food Conference, the Food and Agricultural Organization estimated that there were some 460 million people whose food intake was so limited that there was a high risk of their being either acutely malnourished or hungry for a significant part of the year. 2/

1/ A. R. Khan, "Basic Needs: An Illustrative Exercise in Identification and Quantification with Reference to Bangladesh," mimeo, ILO, Geneva, November 1976.

2/ See Assessment of the World Food Situation background papers prepared for World Food Conference, November 1974 (E/Conf. 65/3, paras. 137-205, Pp 55-73).

Other responsible estimates are as high as 800 million. All told, a figure of approximately one billion is probably within a reasonable margin of error for those under an absolute poverty line below which it is not possible to meet the most essential human needs. 3/ A substantial majority of these people live in some 40 poorest countries having a population that also approximates one billion. 4/ Included in these are most of the Sahelian African countries. The balance of the very poor live in countries with incomes of $200 per capita and more, with the largest concentrations being in Brazil and Nigeria. The Title II program is presently reaching approximately 42 million recipients, or 5 percent of the world's poor.

The following chart gives a notional idea of the world distribution of gross poverty and malnutrition in the early 1970s and a rough indication of alternative per capita incomes by the year 2000 under varying growth scenarios:

3/ See "Employment, Growth and Basic Needs, "Report of the Director-General of the International Labor Office (ILO, 1976)" which estimates that of the 1,800 million people in the developing market economies in 1972, 1,210 million were "seriously poor" and 706 million were "destitute". (pp 20-23.)

4/ See "Focus on the Fourth World" by Helen C. Low and James W. Howe, in The U.S. and World Development: Agenda for Action, 1975, by James W. Howe and the staff of the Overseas Development Council (Washington, D.C.: Overseas Development Council, 1975).

STANDARD OF LIVING

	1970 1/									1980 1/	2000		
	Population (millions)	Per Capita GNP ($)	Life Expectancy (years)	Literacy %	Infant Mortality (per 1000 births)	Death Rates (per 1000)	Birth Rates (per 1000)	Acutely Poor (millions) (1972)	Under-nourished (millions) (1972)	Per Capita GNP ($)	Per Capita GNP ($)	GNP Growth Rate (%)	Population (millions)
High Income Countries (excl. Communist)	675	3100	71	98	15	10	16	100	28	4000	5000–6000	2 1/2–4	850
Middle Income Countries (excluding China)	725	410	56	65	83	12	40	300	100	540	550–1600	3 1/2–7	1150–1050
Low Income Countries	1000	105	48	30	138	17	42	650	332	108	105–214	2 1/2–5	2250–2100

1/ 1980 figures and 1970 figures for population and per capita income from Robert S. McNamara, "Address to Board of Governors of the World Bank Group," September 1, 1975, pp. 2-4 (Washington, D.C., World Bank Group 1975).

The basic needs strategy stresses the importance of direct efforts to redress absolute deprivation and, as such, has greatest relevance for societies where absolute poverty is concentrated. The problem of the basic needs approach is neither conceptual nor narrowly economic, financial or fiscal, but essentially one of access and delivery. This is the problem this project addresses.

We recognize that the essential long-term need is an effort to encourage increased local food production. But we must face the fact that we cannot tell how many years it will take for some of the more populous and poorest countries to adjust to the new foreign exchange burdens imposed by the increased costs of food and energy. Until they do, imported inputs necessary for increased food production will be scarce and resources for commercial importation of food limited. So long as these conditions persist, food aid will have to be continued.

The possibility of the added commodities being distributed under this project being a production disincentive has been examined. The first priority for food assistance in the LDCs is the vulnerable group of pregnant and lactating women and pre-school children. Commodities supplied to this group consist of fortified, blended foods not locally available which would not generally have a displacement effect in local markets. Moreover, Section 212 of the IFDA (the Bellmon Amendment) specifies that the Secretary of Agriculture is required to certify, prior to each shipment of donated Title II commodities, that the distribution will not result in a disincentive to agricultural production in a recipient country. The USDA certification is, in each case, based on information provided by the USAID and Embassy in the recipient country. Grant funds distributed under this project will be additive and unavailable from other sources.

Food aid is developmental and not merely humanitarian in terms of two major effects: nutritional and economic. The economic goal is immediate; the nutritional goal is long-term. Food causes an increase in food consumption for those whose diet is qualitatively and/or quantitatively below accepted standards, or it prevents the diet of

people "at risk" from falling below the minimum. Food assistance is direct -- it provides an immediate impact inside the house. Food assistance is continuous -- it provides a daily supplement to the family diet. Food distribution provides a unique opportunity to assess the health and economic conditions of a significant section of the population. Food programs are not welfare. Eighty percent of the potential workforce in the least developed countries is employed in some form. The benefits of better health and nutrition resulting from feeding programs can be expected to impact on the health and well-being of children and pregnant and nursing women and this would, in time, have a beneficial impact on the quality of the workforce. The food supplement releases for other essential needs some of the money which people are now spending on food. This money is usually spent on essentially locally, labor-intensively produced goods, resulting in additional employment for the community. Increased income in the form of food is not neutralized by increases in the prices of goods and services. Food always results in an increase in real income. The recipient would not accept food aid unless it were an economic aid to himself and his family.

Title II maternal/child health programs and food-for-work use indigenous personnel and provide jobs and training for persons with low-level skills. Food-for-work increases income and creates wealth for society. Hopefully, it also builds a pattern of community involvement and offers the poor majorities increased employment and more meaningful participation in the society immediately around them. The emphasis on the needs of children can be regarded either as a form of long-term investment or as a focus on basic needs. Healthier and better educated women, whether part of the labor force or not, will tend to have smaller families.

The Title II and dollar resources programmed under this project will be concentrated in areas which have a nutrition priority and are in need of grant resources. Priority will be given to programs which will try to reach people who, for one reason or another, do not get enough to eat through the normal function of the economy, especially the so-called vulnerable groups of pregnant and nursing mothers and pre-school children where malnutrition may have life-long effects. A number of studies in recent years has established that protein deficiency in the pre-school child retards physical development. There is increasing evidence that malnutrition in the early years of a child's life results also in permanent mental retardation. Malnourished children may emerge from childhood lacking the ability to reach their full genetic physical and intellectual potential, regardless of subsequent training. The implications of these findings cannot be overstated in relation to developing the human resources countries need in their developmental efforts.

Title II programs unquestionably have a positive effect on the nutritional well-being of those poor families reached. Although the interactions can be complex, Title II commodities usually help meet food needs while longer-term measures for increasing food production are being implemented. In addition, the Title II commodities frequently serve an educational function, attracting mothers to health centers for MCH programs, keeping children in school, or lowering the dropout and repeater levels, so that funds invested in education become more productive. Title II food-for-work projects are directed at employment generation, especially in rural areas, and are an important income redistribution mechanism in these areas. Food-for-work programs provide opportunities for employment for precisely that

segment of the population which has the fewest other employment opportunities. Off-season crop time, largely idle, is mobilized for local investment purposes, such as land leveling, irrigation works, road building, etc., from which the worker ultimately benefits in addition to the economic/nutritional benefit he/she receives in the form of food supplements. This expansion of employment opportunities benefits many individuals directly and others indirectly by benefiting the extended family.

PL-480 food aid, particularly as provided under Title II, directly impacts upon the status and well-being of women. Implementation of projects such as maternal/child health clinics, training programs and mothers' clubs where Title II commodities are distributed and nutrition education is dispersed deeply involve women as MCH workers, trainers and motivators.

Recent studies have also shown that at least one-half of the rural labor force in the LDCs are women, and they often participate as laborers in food-for-work projects.

A major constraint on food aid as a development tool is the limited funds available for the establishment and support of delivery systems. Grant food aid is usually awkward and expensive to handle and absorb in the least developed countries and it is perishable and bulky and much less flexible to use than money in project assistance. It would be much easier for A.I.D. and the voluntary agencies to program Title II commodity assistance in countries and areas easiest to reach, with the more sophisticated infrastructure and nutrition strategies. However, the Congressional mandate and the basic needs theory argue for the harder job of reaching the "unreachables", and this project has been designed to accomplish that end.

Title II program activities abroad are carried out by cooperating sponsors, the majority of which are U.S. voluntary agencies registered with and approved by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. In 1976, 75 percent of the 1,062 million metric tons of Title II commodities shipped were provided to the voluntary agencies. These commodities fed approximately 40 million recipients in 78 countries and territories. Most of the voluntary agencies were formed after World War II to assist the victims of war-torn Europe and have had a quarter of a century of experience in administering feeding programs.

In terms of mother/child health, nutrition and food-for-work in a rural development context, the largest development impact is and will continue to be that of the voluntary agencies. They should therefore continue to have the largest claim on Title II resources and an increasing claim on A.I.D.'s DA dollars as a supplement to their existing levels of independent private inputs. Food is an extremely difficult resource to manage in the field, and, as a general rule, it is the voluntary agencies that have the experience, capabilities and systems in place to carry out and monitor Title II programs. The dollar input to this project, $9,400,000, would be less than one percent of the Title II budget over a three-year period. With this amount, the voluntary agencies would be able to arrange, in a way heretofore impossible, adequate in-country support in the least developed countries for such matters as delivery systems, storage, supervision, personnel training, tools and equipment, etc.

In almost all cases, the voluntary agencies are better placed and more capable than the USAIDs and the local governments in developing and managing Title II food aid programs by reason of their experience, personnel, and their relative freedom to be selective in program operations in country.

Voluntary agency programs are usually organized and carried out on a community or village-level based structure. The same administrative, logistic, transportation, storage and other program support requirements must be met in a voluntary agency or a government-to-government program. But the difference is that the felt needs are identified and pointed out by the voluntary agency at the community or village level. The voluntary agency there is in a position to serve as the agent for change by directly assisting the local people who will benefit from the program in putting together the requisite ingredients to support the Title II program along with whatever elements the voluntary agency itself can provide. Succeedingly higher levels of government may be brought into the program when and if necessary, but host government participation is not essential. The individual remains the focus of the program. The generation and articulation of demand are also necessary. It is in the area of "demand management" that strong cooperatives or local community organizations have an important role to play, and where the style of the voluntary agency comes to bear.

These programs often serve as a catalyst for the development of broader nutrition-related activities, such as maternal and child health centers providing a broad range of health and family planning services, and as an impetus for host governments and community groups to match such efforts with their own resources both in terms of funds, available commodities, or community commitment. Delivery systems already exist in many areas for Title II food distribution, so that integrated programs would not have to build new ones, but can add to existing structures. The advantages are that there is already management control and years of experience in human resource development.

There are, of course, enormous problems which have to be overcome in organizing programs in this manner. Voluntary agency resources, money and personnel don't begin to meet required program needs or potential program possibilities. The realization of the money/transport/storage/administration/ technical assistance linkages necessary for carrying out the programs which are actually generated by grass roots village participation and support are often very haphazard, impromptu, and catch-as-catch-can, but the guaranteed logistical support this project would provide would eliminate this problem.

4. Financial Plan

Attached as Annex III are the Summary Cost Estimate and Financial Plan and the Costing of Project Outputs table for this project.

Over the three-year life of project, it is estimated that $28,000,000 of Title II commodities and $9,400,000 of support funds will be utilized. Voluntary agencies will continue their current support to feeding programs and, where possible, increase it. They will also maintain a continuing dialogue with host governments in an effort to draw them more fully into the program.

Local governments, where possible, will be encouraged to provide such in-kind assistance as vehicles for transport or storage. Also, individual recipient contributions where appropriate and possible will be used. However, no persons will be excluded from programs if unable to pay.

Estimates of all the non-U.S. contributions to this project are included in the Annex tables.

Following are illustrative budgets and programs for some countries where the need for logistical support is acute if the mandate of reaching malnourished children and the poorest regions is to be met.

CAMEROON

The Mission strategy in the Cameroon is to support programs which both develop the economy and directly improve the lives of those who have least benefited from a developing economy. Accordingly, the North is a priority area of emphasis, where farmer income is estimated between $50 and $100 and where the percentage of children from ages 5 to 14 enrolled in school is less than one-half of the national average, in 1975, of 61 percent.

CRS has been maintaining a MCH Nutrition Education Program in Cameroon since 1970. In FY-1979 they will open an additional ten pre-school clinics in eastern Cameroon to serve 3,000 new recipients in addition to the 29,000 recipients in western Cameroon. A Cameroon National Nutrition Survey recently completed will describe the magnitude of the malnutrition problem, its geographical distribution and the population age groups most severely affected. The Mission hopes that CRS will use the results of this survey as a basis for broadening and strengthening its program, which an evaluation has shown is achieving its objective of maintaining pre-school children at an adequate rate of growth. Presumably, a high priority area for expansion would be the North, where a population of 44 per km^2 is found in the arid Mandara Mountains. However, to reach the 32,000 recipients in the FY-1979 Program Plan will cost:

CRS	-	$ 75,000
GOC	-	69,000
Participants	-	75,000
Volunteers	-	15,000
		$234,000

To reach 20,000 additional pre-school children identified as severely affected in the North would cost substantially more due to the longer transport distance, the difficult terrain, and the lack of Missionary volunteer assistance. We estimate that an outreach program to assist this high-need area would cost an additional $200,000 which would have to be met by CRS, the GOC and the participants.

HAITI

Haiti is a country with an estimated $120 GNP ($90 in the rural areas) which has been subjected to recurring drought over the last several years. It is also estimated that between 20 to 25 of the children under five suffer from second- and third-degree malnutrition and where 60 percent of the child population is judged to be underweight and suffering from first-degree malnutrition. The objective in Haiti is not only to reach these most vulnerable groups but to establish an in-place disaster infrastructure which can respond rapidly to emergencies.

MCH is considered to have the highest priority in Haiti, but lack of resources and infrastructure limits the expansion of the voluntary agencies in this area. Substantial funds and qualified personnel are needed for each new center that is opened. A clinic serving 30 children on a daily basis, or 100 children on a weekly basis, costs $2,000 per clinic/per year for supplies and salaries of local nutrition workers, not counting the cost of training and food. The voluntary agencies and the GOH have been sharing the cost of training, but establishing clinics to reach 10,000 more malnourished children would cost an additional $200,000.

RWANDA

To Rwanda, one of the poorest countries, the Title II program is of great importance in helping to offset malnutrition and extreme poverty. This is true especially during times of poor rainfall and inadequate harvests, conditions which have occurred with alarming frequency during the past few years. During the 1976 drought, donors were faced with the task of moving 1,600 MT of donated food over scattered all-weather trails that had fallen into disrepair in a nation without villages; its people live in family clusters. Recipient centers have to bear all costs of handling/transportation/personnel and supervision. An expansion of the regular program in the areas of MCH, School Feeding and Food-for-Work is planned and needed, but the added cost burden to recipients would amount to $110,000 to reach 20,000 new recipients.

UPPER VOLTA

During the Sahel Drought period of 1972 through 1975, the nutritionally vulnerable group of growing children in Upper Volta suffered first and foremost from the famine situation of those years. Even in normal times, indications are that the nutritional status of the growing child in Upper Volta is inferior to the nutritional status of growing children in neighboring countries. (According to the Sante-Nutrition of the Club des Amis du Sahel in their March 1977 analysis, only 49 percent of pre-school Voltair children have an acceptable weight for their age.) To respond to this need, CRS proposes establishing a Nutrition Intervention Program. To reach 135,000 recipients with 10,000 MT of food, CRS estimates, would cost $150,000 in transportation charges. To incorporate a growth surveillance system and provide adequate local nutrition program supervisors would cost an additional $100,000.

Summary of Costs and Recipients of Suggested Selective Program Expansion/Retargeting

	Additional Recipients	Cost
Expansion of MCH Nutrition Education program to North Cameroon	20,000	$200,000
Fifty additional MCH clinics in Haiti	10,000	200,000
Costs for expansion of regular Title II program in Rwanda	20,000	110,000
Nutrition Intervention Program for Upper Volta	135,000	250,000
TOTAL:	185,000	760,000

The above is only an illustrative budget for four possible areas for expansion and broadening of Title II programs to reach populations in need, but inaccessible because of support costs.

There are 32 countries on the IDA list with GNPs of $280 or less where Title II could provide resources to meet basic human needs, combat malnutrition, provide income supplements and stimulate community development. Program costs will be shared among voluntary agencies, host governments and with the approval of this project, DA funds. Dollar support would, in many instances, provide the last input needed for the delivery of this valuable resource. Actual areas of operation will be based on budget requests received from voluntary agencies in accordance with the implementation plan below.

5. Implementation Plan

Upon approval of this project paper, the Office of Food for Peace will send procedural guidelines to the field and to voluntary agency headquarters to be used by agencies wishing to submit a grant proposal under this project. (See Annex IV.)* Guidelines will identify the general areas of activity in which AID will consider grant proposals and procedures for submission.

The voluntary agencies submitting a grant proposal under this project will be required to submit a new or amended Annual Estimate of Requirements (AER) for the feeding programs they feel qualify for this special assistance. This AER will list recipients by category, ration levels, and the volume of commodities needed to reach these recipients. For the special area programs under this project, agencies will have to submit with the AER a requested budget for logistical support (Annex V)* which will list estimated dollar or local currency costs for commodity movement, storage, management, administration, maintenance and operations, as well as a brief program description narrative (Annex VI)* on the target group to be reached, where they fall within the economic strata of the country, where they are located, degree of vulnerability/malnourishment, and why they cannot be reached without additional dollar support.* The AER, budget request, and program description will be reviewed and approved by (a) the Mission, (b) the voluntary agency headquarters, and (c) the Office of Food for Peace. Upon completion of this approval/review process, commodity requests will be submitted to the Interagency Staff Subcommittee and the full Interagency Staff Committee for approval. Upon completion of this procedure, authorization for the program and the dollar grant will be transmitted to the field.

*While these annexes substantially describe the costs and types of programs to be financed under the project, the instructions therein are in draft and will be further refined and cleared with SER, GC, and appropriate Bureau personnel prior to their release to the field.

Appropriate Mission personnel will have the authority to disburse the grant upon request of the voluntary agency and the responsibility of voucher approval to determine that the grant is being spent in accordance with the budget submittal.

Preference for grants will be given to voluntary agencies who have a demonstrated track record in the programming of Title II commodities, although consideration will also be given to those PVOs who have fielded personnel or have operational familiarity with the target area even if they have not handled Title II commodities previously. It should be emphasized that the purpose of this project is to extend the availability of Title II resources to persons of great need living in logistically difficult areas, rather than to expand the number of Title II sponsors. If it is deemed desired to establish and expand the use of Title II resources by agencies which have not participated in the program previously, this should be the purpose of another project paper granting DPG funds.

6. Evaluation Plan

In order to assure that the objectives of the Title II Outreach program are being attained, a rigorous evaluation system will be used for each project. In order to establish measurable achievements, objectively verifiable indicators will be required in the planning stage of each project to be funded. Mission personnel, with support from the Office of Food for Peace, will be responsible for monitoring the individual programs to assure that intended recipient groups are being reached with the planned commodities. The quarterly Commodity and Recipient Status Reports will report recipient numbers reached with specified rations. If a development objective has been specified, Mission/volags will have the responsibility of evaluating progress towards this objective prior to submission of a grant request for program continuation in the following year.

Depending on the individual program circumstances, after 12-18 months of operation, a Special Evaluation will be conducted to determine whether the intended project objectives are being attained and whether any programmatic adjustments are required. Findings will also be sought with regard to such matters as logistics, commodity preferences, and sociological spin-offs that might help planning efforts in other countries through "lessons learned".

Finally, an end-of-project evaluation will be conducted to verify that the goal and purpose of the project were reached and to identify any additional unplanned outputs that would be useful information to planners.

During the life of the project, PDC/FFP will attempt to incorporate in their evaluation scope of work a methodology that would permit some form of cost/benefit analysis to be employed in judging the economic efficiency of the type of assistance to be provided through this project.

Annex I

BANK BORROWERS AND IDA ELIGIBLE COUNTRIES

(Ranked by 1976 GNP Per Capita)[1/]

Income Group and Country	1976 GNP per Capita
Over $1,135	
Bahamas	3,310
Oman	2,840
Gabon	2,390
Greece	2,590
Trinidad and Tobago	2,240
Iran	1,930
Portugal	1,690
Yugoslavia	1,680
Argentina	1,550
Barbados	1,550
Cyprus	1,480
Romania	1,450
Iraq	1,390
Uruguay	1,390
Panama	1,310
Fiji	1,150
Brazil	1,140
$551 - 1135	
Mexico	1,090
Jamaica	1,070
Chile	1,050
Costa Rica	1,040
Algeria	990
Turkey	990
Malaysia	860
Tunisia	840
Nicaragua	800
Peru	800
Dominican Republic	780
Syrian Arab Rep.	780
Mauritius	680
Korea, Rep. of	670
Ecuador	640
Paraguay	640
Colombia	630
Guatemala	630
Guyana	610
Ivory Coast	610
Ghana	580
Jordan	560
Lebanon	n.a.
$281 - 550	
Morocco	540
Congo	520
El Salvador	490
Papua New Guinea	490
Swaziland	470
Liberia	450
Zambia	440
$281 - 550 (Cont'd)	
Botswana	410
Philippines	410
Bolivia	390
Honduras	390
Senegal	390
Nigeria	380
Thailand	380
Grenada	370 [2/]
Western Samoa	350
Mauritania	340
Equatorial Guinea	330
Cameroon	310
Sudan	290
$280 or less	
Egypt	280
Yemen, Peoples Dem. Rep. of	280
Togo	260
Sri Lanka	250
Yemen, Arab Rep.	250
Indonesia	240
Kenya	240
Central African Empire	230
Haiti	200
Madagascar	200
Sierra Leone	200
Comoros	180
Gambia, The	180
Tanzania	180
Guinea	170
Lesotho	170
Pakistan	170
Afghanistan	160
Niger	160
India	150
Guinea-Bissau	140
Malawi	140
Zaire	140
Benin	130
Burma	120
Burundi	120
Chad	120
Nepal	120
Bangladesh	110
Somalia	110
Upper Volta	110
Ethiopia	100
Mali	100
Rwanda	100
Lao P.D.R.	n.a.
Viet Nam	n.a.

1/ Atlas methodology; base 1974-76.
2/ 1975

EPDES
6/23/77

This document has a restricted distribution and may be used by recipients only in the performance of their official duties. Its contents may not otherwise be disclosed without World Bank authorization.

TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 480 - TOTAL COMMODITIES SHIPPED BY PROGRAM SPONSOR - FISCAL YEAR 1977

Definitions: Blended food products - CSM (corn soya mix); CSB (corn soya blend); WSB (wheat soya blend); NFDM (Nonfat-dry milk); Volag (American voluntary agencies and UNICEF, unless otherwise noted); WFP (World Food Program); S.F. (Soy Fortified).

Country and Program Sponsor	Total CCC 1/ (thousand dollars)	Total	COMMODITIES (THOUSAND POUNDS)												
			Wheat	Wheat 2/ Flour	Bulgur 3/	S.F. Cornmeal	Grain sorghum	S.F. Sorghum Grits	CSM 4/	NFDM	WSB	Vegoil 5/	Rice	Other 6/
NEAR EAST (TOTAL)	53,693	446,937	91,595	234,917	19,560	.....	.....	160	6,784	14,511	35,924	20,357	14,215	8,913
Afghanistan - WFP	669	1,531	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,531	.....	.....
Algeria - WFP	6,129	26,289	.....	19,272	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,138	.....	2,879	.....	.....
Bhutan - WFP	155	1,114	.....	.....	600	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	459	55	.....	.....
Egypt (Total)	11,958	118,330	.....	81,628	9,146	.....	.....	.....	1,294	1,961	21,274	3,017	.....	.....
CARE	299	1,294	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,294	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
CRS	6,508	50,150	.....	15,974	9,146	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,268	21,274	2,488	.....	.....
WFP	5,151	66,876	.....	65,654	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	693	.....	529	.....	.....
Gaza - CARE	1,654	13,716	.....	7,441	.....	.....	.....	.....	598	.....	2,445	293	2,969	.....
Jordan (Total)	1,605	17,062	752	14,617	281	.....	.....	.....	367	205	.....	130	.....	.....
CARE	270	1,353	.....	725	135	.....	.....	.....	117	205	.....	71	.....	.....
UNICEF	26	150	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WFP	1,389	15,659	752	13,912	146	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	849	.....	.....
Jordan West Bank (Total)	1,511	12,222	.....	7,056	410	.....	.....	.....	603	100	1,043	408	2,602	.....
CARE	996	7,607	.....	3,678	.....	.....	.....	.....	268	.....	1,007	245	2,[illegible]	.....
CRS	316	2,683	.....	1,893	306	.....	.....	.....	220	100	.....	19	105	.....
LWR	199	1,932	.....	1,485	104	.....	.....	.....	98	.....	36	104	105	.....
Lebanon (Total)	4,016	27,543	.....	12,359	9,002	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,969	1,000	1,594	1,619	.....
CRS	3,287	24,647	.....	11,659	9,002	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,392	1,000	1,594	.....	.....
WFP	729	2,896	.....	700	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	577	.....	.....	1,619	.....
Morocco (Total)	15,955	98,537	.....	61,931	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,623	4,060	9,393	7,505	5,262	8,563
AJDC	52	287	.....	196	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30	.....	11	50	.....
CRS	15,903	98,250	.....	61,735	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,823	4,030	9,393	7,494	5,212	8,563 7/
Syria - WFP	3,846	70,308	58,095	11,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,213	.....
Tunisia (Total)	5,338	53,517	27,230	19,593	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,199	1,707	.....	1,857	581	350
CARE	2,957	33,841	19,091	11,506	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,399	897	.....	251	347	350 7/
CRS	1,862	17,431	7,239	8,087	.....	.....	.....	.....	800	810	.....	261	234	.....
WFP	519	2,245	900	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,345	.....	.....
Turkey - WFP	196	367	.....	.....	121	.....	.....	.....	.....	246	.....	.....	.....	.....
Yemen (Total)	581	6,411	5,518	.....	.....	.....	.....	160	.....	125	310	208	.....	.....
CRS	389	4,075	3,358	.....	.....	.....	.....	160	.....	125	310	122	.....	.....
WFP	192	2,336	2,160	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	176	.....	.....
LATIN AMERICA (TOTAL)	72,994	382,585	1,755	86,384	41,054	19,142	6,614	4,060	37,046	35,989	47,259	18,053	10,056	63,373
Barbados - WFP	152	605	.....	440	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	165	.....	.....	.....	.....
Bolivia (Total)	6,885	35,853	.....	14,424	1,109	.....	.....	1,553	7,271	3,000	3,080	2,120	.....	3,287
CARE	393	1,962	.....	645	.....	.....	.....	.....	379	.....	400	290	.....	338 7/
CRS	5,474	26,027	.....	8,852	899	.....	.....	1,343	6,207	3,000	2,475	1,207	.....	1,384 7/
WFP	643	5,208	.....	3,778	.....	.....	.....	.....	415	.....	.....	452	.....	564 7/
Govt.-to-Govt.	375	2,656	.....	1,149	210	.....	.....	210	210	.....	205	220	.....	450 7/
Brazil - WFP	1,046	4,199	.....	2,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,099	900	.....	.....	.....	.....

TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 480 - TOTAL COMMODITIES SHIPPED BY PROGRAM SPONSOR - FISCAL YEAR 1977

Definitions: Blended food products - CSM (corn soya mix); CSB (corn soya blend); WSB (wheat soya blend); NFDM (Nonfat-dry milk); Volag (American voluntary agencies and UNICEF, unless otherwise noted); WFP (World Food Program); S.F. (Soy Fortified).

Country and Program Sponsor	Total CCC[1] (thousand dollars)	Total	COMMODITIES (THOUSAND POUNDS)												
			Wheat	Wheat[2] Flour	Bulgur[3]	S.F. Cornmeal	Grain sorghum	S.F. Sorghum Grits	CSM[4]	NFDM	WSB	Volag[5]	Rice	Other[6]
Chile (Total)	17,952	72,408	.....	21,052	2,227	2,658	.....	299	2,655	13,668	15,402	3,709	1,750	8,898
CARE	10,340	29,791	.....	5,958	.....	959	.....	.....	.....	10,897	8,878	1,481	1,000	6172
CRS	5,195	20,018	.....	13,590	2,209	1,699	.....	269	498	2,171	4,466	2,016	750	1,350[7]
SAWS	2,417	13,599	.....	1,504	18	.....	.....	30	2,157	600	2,058	302	.....	6,930[7]
Colombia (Total)	5,156	41,114	.....	16,476	9,238	2,748	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,431	.....	10,221
CARE	3,049	23,561	.....	8,852	6,882	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,290	.....	6,537[7]
CRS	1,053	8,197	.....	2,828	2,356	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	524	.....	2,439[7]
WFP	1,054	9,356	.....	4,796	.....	2,748	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	617	.....	1,195[1]
Costa Rica (Total)	3,902	10,913	.....	2,118	.....	.....	.....	.....	380	4,172	960	332	.....	2,951
CARE	3,579	8,732	.....	550	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,104	960	167	.....	2,951[1]
WFP	323	2,181	.....	1,568	.....	.....	.....	.....	380	68	.....	165	.....	.....
Dominican Republic (Total)	9,850	53,204	.....	2,365	5,629	2,748	.....	.....	10,880	1,657	11,216	2,243	2,800	13,666
CARE	5,767	34,577	.....	27	3,049	.....	.....	.....	8,255	.....	8,538	549	1,800	12,390[7]
CRS	3,918	17,788	.....	2,285	2,420	2,748	.....	.....	2,498	1,591	2,536	1,689	1,000	1,021[7]
CWS	165	839	.....	53	160	.....	.....	.....	127	66	142	5	.....	286[1]
Ecuador (Total)	1,095	7,838	.....	3,588	400	.....	.....	.....	1,298	242	520	79	.....	1,711
CARE	203	1,264	.....	172	.....	.....	.....	.....	215	.....	.....	.....	.....	877[7]
CRS	476	2,546	.....	711	.....	.....	.....	.....	564	242	275	.....	.....	754[7]
WFP	416	4,028	.....	2,705	400	.....	.....	.....	519	.....	245	79	.....	80[7]
El Salvador (Total)	2,479	14,137	.....	2,934	1,048	.....	.....	.....	337	1,434	4,742	842	.....	2,800
CRS	1,417	6,964	.....	.....	1,048	.....	.....	.....	.....	863	4,742	291	.....	.....
WFP	1,062	7,173	.....	2,934	.....	.....	.....	.....	337	551	.....	551	.....	2,800[8]
Guatemala (Total)	4,655	23,128	.....	9,248	2,745	.....	.....	2,208	1,959	2,802	600	445	.....	3,121
CARE	3,366	16,674	.....	7,492	2,425	.....	.....	1,968	610	2,277	.....	.....	.....	1,902[8]
CRS	1,186	5,647	.....	959	320	.....	.....	240	1,349	525	600	335	.....	1,219[7]
WFP	103	907	.....	797	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	110	.....	.....
Guyana - WFP	7	105	.....	105	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Haiti (Total)	8,999	54,509	.....	1,546	21,031	6,951	.....	.....	4,128	3,632	5,219	2,312	5,406	4,284
CARE	4,055	22,468	.....	.....	14,639	.....	.....	.....	1,595	2,228	1,892	904	1,000	230[8]
CRS	2,775	18,173	.....	653	3,016	1,498	.....	.....	1,143	606	2,644	616	4,406	3,591[9]
CWS	1,236	5,457	.....	.....	2,119	.....	.....	.....	1,173	639	593	470	.....	463[9]
WFP	933	8,391	.....	893	1,257	5,453	.....	.....	217	159	90	322	.....	.....
Honduras (Total)	2,866	17,450	.....	1,135	2,224	.....	.....	.....	1,116	1,087	4,410	1,189	750	5,548
CARE	1,383	7,235	.....	516	1,240	.....	.....	.....	.....	719	4,410	350	.....	.....
CRS	844	3,471	.....	.....	984	.....	.....	.....	661	368	.....	433	750	275[7]
WFP	639	6,753	.....	619	.....	.....	.....	.....	455	.....	.....	406	.....	5,273[8]
Jamaica (Total)	4	31	.....	.....	.....	22	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	9[7]
Nicaragua - WFP	296	2,155	.....	1,035	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	89	.....	.....	.....	1,030[7]
Panama (Total)	2,355	7,100	.....	.....	55	70	.....	.....	2,418	1,768	.....	418	.....	2,371
CARE	2,255	6,732	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,348	1,693	.....	380	.....	2,311[7]
CRS	100	368	.....	.....	55	70	.....	.....	70	75	.....	38	.....	60[7]
Paraguay - WFP	196	357	.....	107	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	219	.....	31	.....	.....

3

TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 480 - TOTAL COMMODITIES SHIPPED BY PROGRAM SPONSOR - FISCAL YEAR 1977

Definitions: Blended food products - CSM (corn soya mix); CSB (corn soya blend); WSB (wheat soya blend); NFDM (Nonfat-dry milk); Volag (American voluntary agencies and UNICEF, unless otherwise noted); WFP (World Food Program); S.F. (Soy Fortified).

Country and Program Sponsor	Total CCC[1] (thousand dollars)	Total	COMMODITIES (THOUSAND POUNDS)											
			Wheat	Wheat[2] Flour	Bulgur[3]	S. F. Corn-meal	Grain sor-ghum	S.F. Sor-ghum Grits	CSM[4]	NFDM	WSB	Vegoil[5]	Rice	Other[6]
Peru (Total)	5,099	37,470	1,755	7,611	5,348	3,945	6,614	.....	3,505	1,153	1,110	2,703	250	3,[illegible]
CRS	2,274	13,955	.....	2,739	3,100	1,935	.....	.....	1,297	622	.....	1,314	250	2,703[7]
CWS	172	1,249	.....	260	328	.....	.....	.....	34	.....	310	74	.....	134[7]
SAWS	656	3,708	.....	604	520	643	.....	.....	100	251	800	260	.....	500[7]
WFP	1,074	11,070	1,755	210	.....	1,367	6,614	.....	250	280	.....	594	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	923	7,488	.....	3,798	1,400	.....	.....	.....	1,829	.....	.....	461	.....	.....
AFRICA (TOTAL)	64,844	530,034	91,692	45,577	29,390	48,622	62,777	107,820	48,968	17,832	12,988	12,674	20,570	41,134
Angola - WFP	196	3,856	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,856[8]
Benin (Total)	581	4,290	.....	.....	451	1,887	641	.....	519	148	510	134	.....	.....
CRS	213	1,215	.....	.....	451	106	.....	.....	.....	148	510	.....	.....	.....
WFP	368	3,075	.....	.....	.....	1,781	641	.....	519	.....	.....	134	.....	.....
Botswana - WFP	2,268	10,800	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	10,741	59	.....	.....	.....	.....
Burundi (Total)	1,061	7,730	.....	1,229	3,457	482	996	.....	1,189	145	.....	632	.....	.....
CRS	706	4,049	.....	.....	2,470	.....	.....	.....	1,044	145	.....	390	.....	.....
WFP	355	3,681	.....	1,229	987	482	996	.....	145	.....	.....	242	.....	.....
Cameroon (Total)	702	1,645	.....	.....	.....	275	.....	.....	518	599	22	224	.....	7
CRS	698	1,616	.....	.....	.....	275	.....	.....	518	599	.....	224	.....	.....
WFP	4	29	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	22	.....	.....	7[7]
Cape Verde Is. (Total)	2,391	28,160	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	515	.....	533	3,300	23,812
WFP	702	2,863	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	515	.....	533	.....	1,815[9]
Govt.-to-Govt.	1,689	25,297	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,300	21,997[9]
Central African Emp. - WFP	60	304	.....	.....	.....	264	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	40	.....	.....
Chad (Total)	4,223	43,216	.....	11,858	6,950	.....	.....	22,816	.....	500	.....	92	1,000	.....
CARE	643	2,792	.....	.....	1,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	500	.....	92	1,000	.....
WFP	907	11,858	.....	11,858	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	2,673	28,566	.....	.....	5,750	.....	.....	22,816	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Congo - WFP	859	6,064	.....	2,551	.....	290	.....	1,514	.....	178	.....	421	1,110	.....
Ethiopia (Total)	4,686	46,598	32,904	.....	.....	.....	1,831	2,231	7,975	399	.....	1,258	.....	.....
CRS	2,592	11,494	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,831	2,231	5,775	399	.....	1,258	.....	.....
WFP	1,705	32,904	32,904	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	389	2,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,200	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Gambia (Total)	672	4,704	.....	377	1,400	.....	.....	100	.....	102	455	66	2,204	.....
CRS	169	748	.....	.....	25	.....	.....	100	.....	102	455	66	.....	.....
WFP	128	1,752	.....	377	1,375	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	375	2,204	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,204	.....
Ghana (Total)	5,995	54,675	.....	.....	4,875	.....	22,054	17,742	.....	1,879	6,698	1,627	.....	.....
CRS	4,164	26,892	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	17,742	.....	1,599	6,476	1,075	.....	.....
WFP	765	5,729	.....	.....	4,875	.....	.....	.....	.....	280	222	352	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	1,066	22,054	.....	.....	.....	.....	22,054	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Guinea - WFP	143	1,138	.....	929	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	209	.....	.....
Guinea Bissau-Govt.-to-Govt.	1,176	9,744	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,335	4,409[9]
Ivory Coast - WFP	61	292	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	160	132	.....	.....

TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 480 - TOTAL COMMODITIES SHIPPED BY PROGRAM SPONSOR - FISCAL YEAR 1977

Definitions: Blended food products - CSM (corn soya mix); CSB (corn soya blend); WSB (wheat soya blend); NFDM (Nonfat-dry milk); Volag (American voluntary agencies and UNICEF, unless otherwise noted); WFP (World Food Program); S.F. (Soy Fortified.)

Country and Program Sponsor	Total CCC[1] (thousand dollars)	Total	COMMODITIES (THOUSAND POUNDS)												
			Wheat	Wheat[2] Flour	Bulgur[3]	S. F. Cornmeal	Grain sorghum	S.F. Sorghum Grits	CSM[4]	NFDM	WSB	Vegoil[5]	Rice	Other[6]
Lesotho (Total)	4,273	27,302	.....	430	1,763	17,760	.....	.....	2,743	1,868	600	800	750	498
CRS	2,940	14,250	.....	430	1,763	5,992	.....	.....	2,303	1,868	.....	646	750	498[11]
WFP	1,333	13,052	.....	.....	.....	11,768	.....	.....	440	.....	600	154	.....	.....
Liberia - WFP	34	288	.....	.....	.....	200	.....	.....	33	.....	.....	.....	55	.....
Madagascar (Total)	978	2,567	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,663	455	.....	449	.....	.....
CRS	926	2,501	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,663	455	.....	383	.....	.....
WFP	52	66	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	66	.....	.....
Malawi - WFP	400	1,768	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,768	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mali - WFP	38	340	.....	197	.....	.....	.....	.....	4	.....	.....	.....	139	.....
Mauritania (Total)	1,664	16,297	10,968	639	.....	.....	.....	2,908	389	776	.....	121	496	.....
CRS	596	1,673	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	609	389	609	.....	66	.....	.....
WFP	813	12,325	10,968	639	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	167	.....	55	496	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	255	2,299	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,299	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Mauritius - WFP	126	595	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	110	.....	44	.....	441[9]
Mozambique (Total)	3,723	53,552	47,820	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,318	.....	.....	.....	2,414	.....
WFP	747	3,318	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,318	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	2,976	50,234	47,820	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,414	.....
Niger - WFP	225	996	.....	.....	.....	593	.....	.....	65	49	111	178	.....	.....
Rwanda (Total)	1,250	11,226	.....	1,897	136	340	5,512	.....	.....	347	1,849	480	.....	665
CRS	798	4,625	.....	1,449	.....	340	.....	.....	.....	280	1,490	392	.....	665[9]
WFP	181	1,089	.....	398	136	.....	.....	.....	.....	67	400	88	.....	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	271	5,512	.....	.....	.....	.....	5,512	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Sao Tome & Principe - WFP	61	595	.....	143	.....	419	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	33	.....	.....
Senegal (Total)	2,948	21,075	.....	.....	190	7,596	2,579	4,959	3,537	714	.....	.....	1,000	500
CRS	2,698	17,608	.....	.....	.....	6,953	.....	4,959	3,537	659	.....	.....	1,000	500[11]
WFP	250	3,467	.....	.....	190	643	2,579	.....	.....	55	.....	.....	.....	.....
Seychelles - CRS	129	394	.....	.....	88	.....	.....	.....	166	100	.....	40	.....	.....
Sierra Leone (Total)	1,092	8,225	.....	.....	5,264	105	.....	70	1,208	.....	.....	915	165	498
CARE	437	2,762	.....	.....	1,390	.....	.....	.....	1,208	.....	.....	164	.....	.....
CRS	559	4,626	.....	.....	3,443	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	685	.....	498[11]
WFP	96	837	.....	.....	431	105	.....	70	.....	.....	.....	66	165	.....
Somalia - WFP	575	4,261	.....	2,896	.....	.....	.....	.....	800	58	.....	507	.....	.....
Sudan (Total)	1,836	22,482	.....	21,972	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	.....	160	.....	.....
CRS	307	510	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	350	.....	160	.....	.....
WFP	1,529	21,972	.....	21,972	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Swaziland - WFP	107	425	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	370	.....	.....	55	.....	.....
Tanzania (Total)	8,354	57,968	.....	.....	668	826	.....	44,070	5,798	2,217	.....	762	.....	3,627
CRS	3,466	10,271	.....	.....	668	826	.....	.....	5,798	2,217	.....	762	.....	.....
WFP	218	3,627	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,627[9]
Govt.-to-Govt.	4,670	44,070	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	44,070	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 480 - TOTAL COMMODITIES SHIPPED BY PROGRAM SPONSOR - FISCAL YEAR 1977

efinitions: Blended food oducts - CSM (corn soya mix); CSB (corn soya blend); WSB (wheat soya blend); NFDM (Nonfat-dry milk); Volag (American voluntary agencies and UNICEF, unless otherwise noted); WFP (World Food Program); S.F. (Soy Fortified).

Country and Program Sponsor	Total CCC[1] (thousand dollars)	Total	COMMODITIES (THOUSAND POUNDS)											
			Wheat	Wheat[2] Flour	Bulgur[3]	S. F. Corn-meal	Grain sor-ghum	S.F. Sor-ghum Grits	CSM[4]	NFDM	WSB	Vegoil[5]	Rice	Other[6]
Togo (Total)	2,349	22,691	.....	.....	2,256	4,576	8,541	1,000	249	450	2,443	738	500	1,929
CRS	825	6,193	.....	.....	1,526	1,654	.....	.....	.....	99	1,914	500	500	.....
WFP	776	4,699	.....	.....	.....	1,923	.....	.....	249	360	.....	238	.....	1,929[9]
Govt.-to-Govt.	748	11,799	.....	.....	730	999	8,541	1,000	.....	.....	529	.....	.....	.....
Upper Volta (Total)	7,940	46,032	.....	509	.....	13,000	11,023	10,410	2,198	5,300	.....	1,481	2,102	.....
CRS	5,916	22,177	.....	.....	.....	12,494	.....	.....	2,198	5,259	.....	1,226	1,000	.....
WFP	420	2,422	.....	509	.....	515	.....	.....	.....	41	.....	255	1,102	.....
Govt.-to-Govt.	1,604	21,433	.....	.....	.....	.....	11,023	10,410	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Zambia - WFP	134	1,181	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	189	.....	.....	110	.....	882[9]
ASIA (TOTAL)	170,015	1,583,476	864,920	42,400	394,591	.....	.....	5,737	132,141	57,701	11,419	33,736	9,079	31,[illegible]
Bangladesh (Total)	17,336	349,351	342,786	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,395	.....	2,170	.....	.....	.....	.....
CARE	10,034	219,772	219,772	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WFP	7,302	129,579	123,014	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,395	.....	2,170	.....	.....	.....	.....
India (Total)	103,930	1,042,820	522,685	5,895	365,095	.....	.....	.....	65,572	20,260	8,302	31,907	6,079	16,175
CARE	64,193	682,525	349,373	5,895	240,064	.....	.....	.....	51,183	7,046	.....	19,573	.....	9,391[10]
CRS	30,522	266,470	151,903	.....	57,695	.....	.....	.....	14,389	11,025	8,302	10,213	6,079	6,784[11]
CWS	1,291	18,687	11,531	.....	6,425	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	731	.....	.....
LWR	888	13,847	9,798	.....	3,637	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	412	.....	.....
WFP	7,036	61,291	.....	.....	58,134	.....	.....	.....	.....	2,189	.....	968	.....	.....
Indonesia (Total)	6,644	35,423	.....	30	23,997	.....	.....	249	2,229	5,213	388	.....	3,000	317
CARE	28	212	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	54	.....	.....	158	.....	.....	.....
CRS	2,412	17,198	.....	.....	11,049	.....	.....	.....	2,229	690	230	.....	3,000	.....
CWS	387	3,424	.....	30	2,749	.....	.....	195	.....	133	.....	.....	.....	317[7]
WFP	3,817	14,589	.....	.....	10,199	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,390	.....	.....	.....	.....
Nepal - WFP	894	3,176	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	715	2,404	57	.....	.....
Pakistan (Total)	227	293	-551	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	252	.....	592
CARE	262	844	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	252	.....	592[8]
Govt.-to-Govt.	-35	-551	-551	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Philippine Is. (Total)	37,212	126,976	.....	24,303	4,639	.....	.....	1,093	52,920	29,343	.....	.....	.....	14,678
CARE	7,249	32,449	.....	18,254	1,095	.....	.....	135	1,497	5,565	.....	.....	.....	5,903[7]
CRS	14,749	70,777	.....	4,927	3,529	.....	.....	958	51,093	1,734	.....	.....	.....	8,536[7]
WFP	187	1,706	.....	1,122	15	.....	.....	.....	330	.....	.....	.....	.....	239[7]
Govt.-to-Govt.	15,027	22,044	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	22,044	.....	.....	.....	.....
Singapore - WFP	43	325	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	325	.....	.....	.....
Sri Lanka (Total)	3,729	25,112	.....	12,172	.....	.....	.....	.....	11,420	.....	.....	1,520	.....	.....
CARE	3,473	21,812	.....	8,872	.....	.....	.....	.....	11,420	.....	.....	1,520	.....	.....
WFP	256	3,300	.....	3,300	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
EUROPE (TOTAL)	434	617	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	617	.....	.....	.....	.....
Romania - Govt.-to-Govt.	434	617	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	617	.....	.....	.....	.....

TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 480 - TOTAL COMMODITIES SHIPPED BY PROGRAM SPONSOR - FISCAL YEAR 1977

Definitions: Blended food products - CSM (corn soya mix); CSB (corn soya blend); WSB (wheat soya blend); NFDM (Nonfat-dry milk); Volag (American voluntary agencies and UNICEF, unless otherwise noted); WFP (World Food Program); S.F. (Soy Fortified).

Country and Program Sponsor	Total CCC 1/ (thousand dollars)	Total	COMMODITIES (THOUSAND POUNDS)											
			Wheat	Wheat 2/ Flour	Bulgur 3/	S. F. Cornmeal	Grain sorghum	S.F. Sorghum Grits	CSM 4/	NFDM	WSB	Vegoil 5/	Rice	Other 6/
Subtotals, Voluntary Agencies	264,276	2,058,209	772,145	223,486	407,639	38,192	1,831	30,993	198,057	84,500	101,728	69,401	35,669	24,569
AJDC	52	287	.....	196	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	30	.....	11	50	.....
CARE	126,885	1,173,895	588,236	80,583	272,119	959	.....	2,157	82,403	36,131	28,638	27,832	10,478	44,309
CRS	129,902	821,135	162,580	138,771	119,460	36,500	1,831	28,611	111,815	46,650	69,101	39,200	25,036	41,450
CWS	3,251	29,656	11,531	343	11,781	.....	.....	195	1,334	838	1,045	1,280	.....	1,309
LWR	1,087	15,779	9,798	1,485	3,741	.....	.....	.....	98	.....	36	516	105	.....
SAWS	3,073	17,307	.....	2,108	538	643	.....	30	2,257	851	2,858	562	.....	7,460
UNICEF	26	150	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	150	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
WFP	63,094	627,774	230,548	180,845	78,866	28,573	10,430	5,979	22,643	19,480	5,123	15,628	5,899	23,746
Govt.-to-Govt.	34,610	257,666	47,269	4,947	8,090	999	47,130	80,805	4,239	22,661	734	681	13,253	26,858
GRAND TOTAL	361,980	2,943,649	1,049,962	409,378	494,595	67,764	59,391	117,777	224,939	126,650	107,590	85,710	54,821	145,172

1/ CCC - Commodity Credit Corporation.
2/ Soy-Fortified and Regular.
3/ Soy-Fortified and Regular.
4/ Instant and Regular.
5/ Includes 16,924 Thousand Pounds Peanut Oil and 68,786 Thousand Pounds Soybean Oil.
6/ Includes 52,628 Thousand Pounds Soy-Fortified Rolled Oats; 4,156 Thousand Pounds Whey Soy Drink Mix; 51,083 Thousand Pounds Corn; 15,950 Thousand Pounds Defatted Soy Flour and 21,355 Thousand Pounds Peas.
7/ Soy-Fortified Rolled Oats.
8/ Whey Soy Drink Mix.
9/ Corn.
10/ Defatted Soy Flour.
11/ Peas.

NOTE: Negative figures are due to carry-over/adjustment from FY 1976/TQ.

Modification No. 4

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project: From FY 79 to FY 81
Total U. S. Funding 9.4
Date Prepared:

Project Title & Number: Title II Outreach 904-0006

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: To assist in development in the lower income segments of the LLDCs.	Measures of Goal Achievement: # Integrated services being provided # Inplace infrastructures for emergency feeding. # Community development projects undertaken.	Program descriptions Evaluations	Assumptions About Linkage Between Project Purpose and Program-Sector Goal: That feeding programs will have a developmental impact.
Project Purpose: To comply with the Congressional mandate of reaching populations most in need of outside assistance.	Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status. New groups being reached with programs. # _____ recipients being reached with # lbs. in selected areas.	Program description Narratives AERs Program Plans Commodity & Recipient Reports	Assumptions About Linkage Between Outputs and Project Purpose: Recipients will accept food assistance. Areas are reachable if programs supported. Governments will allow access.
Outputs: Expanded and retargeted Title II programs in the LDCs.	Magnitude of Outputs: Magnitude & type of programs expanded. Magnitude & type of programs retargeted.	Current & prior AERs Program Plans	Assumptions About Linkage Between Inputs and Outputs: That logistical support costs are element restricting expansion/retargeting of Title II in LLDCs.
Inputs: U.S.: Grant $ 9.4 Title II 28.0 Volags: Administration & Support 2.2 Host Governments: Support Costs 2.5	Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) 1979: Grant $2.8 Commodities $8.5 Other Support $1.3 1980: Grant: $3.0 Commodities $9.5 Other Support $1.6 1981: Grant $3.6 Commodities $10.0 Other Support $1.8	Project approval doc. Title II budget Budget requests	

ANNEX II

COSTING OF PROJECT OUTPUTS/INPUTS
(In $000 or equivalent)
Project Paper

___New
___Rev # ___

Project # 904-0006 Title Title II Outreach

Project Inputs	Project Outputs				TOTAL
	# 1	# 2	# 3	# 4	
AID Appropriated Support grant	9.400				9.400
Other U.S.* Title II Commodities	28.000				28.000
Host Country Administrative & Support Costs - warehouses, transportation, facilities, etc.	2.500				2.500
Other Donors* Administrative & Support Costs - personnel, equipment, offices, etc.	2.200				2.200
Total	42.100				42.100

* Single line entry is acceptable unless this item is more than 25% of the project or more than $1 million.

(This is a phototype form; it can be modified to suit particular projects.)

SUMMARY COST ESTIMATE AND FINANCIAL PLAN
(US $ 000)

PROJECT PAPER

Source	AID** FX	AID** IC	Host Country FX	Host Country IC	Other(s)+ FX	Other(s)+ IC	Total
Use*							
Grant	9.400				28.000		37.400
Title II Commodities							
Support costs by host government				2.500			2.500
Administrative & support costs by volags						2.200	2.200
Inflation factor							
Contingency							
Total	9.400			2.500	28.000	2.200	42.100

* List major project elements (inputs)

** Under AID, separately list in columns loans & grants; in all cases have a column showing Total AID.

\+ May be used for non-AID; e.g., HIG, P.L. 480 Title II, etc., furnished by the United States outside of AID-appropriated funds. Where other donors are involved, a separate column should be added for each significant donor.

(This is a prototype form; it can be modified to suit particular projects.)

PROJECTION OF EXPENDITURES BY FISCAL YEAR
(US $ 000)

PROJECT PAPER

Fiscal Year	AID**	Host Country	Other(s)+ T.II	/Volags	Total
FY-1978	.800	.100	1.000	.100	2.000
FY-1979	2.800	.700	8.500	.600	12.600
FY-1980	3.000	1.000	9.500	.900	14.400
FY-1981	2.800	.700	9.000	.600	13.100
Inflation factor					
Contingency					
Total	9.400	2.500	28.000	2.200	42.100

** Under AID, separately list in columns loans & grants; in all cases have a column showing Total AID.

+ May be used for non-AID; e.g., HIG, P.L. 480 Title II, etc., furnished by the United States outside of AID-appropriated funds. Where other donors are involved, a separate column should be added for each significant donor.

UNCLASSIFIED

TO: AIDTO CIRCULAR A-_____

FROM: AID/Washington
E.O. 11652: N/A

SUBJECT: PL-480 Logistical Support Grants for Title II Outreach

1. The International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1977 strengthens the emphasis of direct U.S. food aid under Public Law 480 - the Food for Peace Program - on individual human needs and the use of food aid to promote economic development in poor countries. To this end, the legislated minimum tonnage under Title II increases from 1,600,000 MT in 1980 to 1,700,000 in 1982, with a subminimum of 1,300,000 to 1,400,000 MT which shall be distributed through non-profit voluntary agencies and the World Food Program. Moreover, the legislated priorities are "directed ... toward community and other self-help activities ... ", to see that "... indigenous workers shall be employed to the extent feasible to provide information on nutrition and conduct food distribution programs in the most remote villages" and "to the extent feasible, to those who are suffering from malnutrition by ... (A) giving priority ... to malnourished children, and ... to the poorest regions of countries".

2. For a number of years, highlighted by the Food for Development Seminars held in Africa in June-July 1976, the voluntary agencies have been asking for assistance in the form of program support costs to ensure that Title II is used most effectively in the achievement of Agency and country development goals. With the congressionally expressed intent that feeding programs should be targeted to the malnourished in the poorest and most remote areas, the need for support funds for Title II programs has become even more acute.

3. To meet this essential need and enable PL-480 to respond to the Congressional intent, the Office of Food for Peace has obtained project funds to be used in logistical support of feeding programs incapable of implementation without such assistance.

4. Support will be made available under "logistical support grants" in areas such as the following: (a) hiring of trucks/rail cars for transportation of commodities; (b) rental of storage facilities; (c) fumigation of transport and/or storage facilities; (d) rental of transport for logistical/distribution personnel; (e) local logistic/monitoring/distribution personnel costs; (f) maintenance/operating expenses of transport; (g) repair/maintenance of storage facilities.

Purchase of vehicles will not normally be approved under this project. In exceptional circumstances, vehicle purchase may be considered on a case-by-case basis accompanied by a financial analysis.

The following costs would not be considered for funding under this project: (a) salary/maintenance costs for voluntary agency program Directors and headquarters staff; (b) rental/purchase of vehicles for staff supervisory personnel; (c) rental/construction of administrative buildings.

5. To be considered for a logistical support grant a program must be (a) additive and unable to be implemented without the grant, (b) targeted to recipients who, because of their economic or nutritional condition, have the greatest need, and (c) be programmed in accordance with FFP priorities. The extent to which the proposed programs support the achievement of specific country development objectives will be a significant factor in considering program approval.

6. To apply for a grant, voluntary agencies will submit a new or amended Annual Estimate of Requirements (AER), a requested budget for logistical support (Attachment A) and a brief program narrative (Attachment B). The AER, budget request and program description will be reviewed and approved/disapproved by the Mission, voluntary agency headquarters, and the Office of Food for Peace, and, in addition, the commodity request will be approved by the ISC. Upon completion of the approval process, the dollar grant will be transmitted to the field. Appropriate Mission personnel will have the authority to disburse the grant and the responsibility for voucher approval and monitoring. All call-forwards for commodities must also contain a statement that the requirements of the Bellmon Amendment are being met.

7. We feel this is an important opportunity to expand and broaden Title II feeding programs to reach humanitarian and developmental goals. However, to assure that these goals are being met, it will be essential that Mission/voluntary agency personnel carefully plan, implement and monitor programs assisted by these grants to ascertain that the intended target groups and developmental objectives are being reached. Programs that fail in this regard will not be considered for continued support.

The tieing of PL-480 commodities and DA funds is an important new concept in food aid, but one that must be programmed and managed carefully if it is to succeed.

(Attachment 1)

PL-480 Title II Outreach Project

Country Project Budget Submission Fiscal Year _____

COUNTRY _____ Voluntary Agency _____

	Previous FY___*		Current Request
	Auth.	Actual Expend.	
1. PL-480 Title II Commodity Movement Costs:			
A. Contracting direct movement of commodity:			
B. Long term leasing of trucks:			
C. Short term hire of trucks:			
D. Other (specify):			
2. Commodity Storage Costs:			
A. Direct Storage Charges:			
B. Renting Storage Facilities:			
C. In/Out Movement Costs:			
D. Other (Specify):			
3. Commodity Management Costs: (When not included in 1 & 2 above)			
A. Fumigation:			
B. Repacking or Restoration:			
(1) Materials:			
(2) Labor:			
C. Other (specify):			
4. Commodity Administration Costs:			
A. Office expenses directly related to commodity management:			
(1) Office Space:			
(2) Supplies and equipment:			
B. Staff:			
(1) Local national commodity management officer:			
(2) Warehouse manager:			
(3) Other (specify):			

*If applicable.

5. Maintenance and Operating Costs for Commodity Movement trucks:

A. Staffing:			
(1) Truck drivers:			
(2) Mechanics:			
(3) Other (specify):			
B. POL:			
C. Spare parts:			

To show additionality, insert below volag and host government budgets for Title II feeding programs for two previous years in country, if applicable, and current year as projected.

	FY _____	FY_____	FY_____
VOLAG:	$_____	$_____	$_____
H.G.:	$_____	$_____	$_____

Drafted:PDC/FFP:NFox

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Include brief narrative on following:

1. Target Group
   A. Economic condition

   B. Location

   C. Degree of vulnerability/malnourishment

2. Additionality (why cannot be reached without additional resources)

3. Developmental objective if planned, such as:
   A. Provision of integrated services
      (1) Nutrition education

      (2) Health services

      (3) Family planning

      (4) Other

   B. Community development
      (1) Irrigation projects

      (2) Cooperatives

      (3) Reforestation

      (4) Other

   C. Disaster prevention
      (1) Drought or flood prevention projects

      (2) Establishment of delivery infrastructure

      (3) Other

D. Other

STATUTORY CHECKLIST

All statutory checklist items have been examined, and below are listed those that would apply to worldwide Title II programs assisted with Development Assistance funds:

6C(1)-Country Checklist -- Not applicable.

6C(2)-Project Checklist:

A. GENERAL CRITERIA FOR PROJECT

1. App. Unnumbered; FAA Sec. 653(b)

(a) Describe how Committees on Appropriations of Senate and House have been or will be notified concerning the project; (b) is assistance within (Operational Year Budget) country or international organization allocation reported to Congress (or not more than $1 million over that figure plus 10%)?	By Congressional Notification for FY-1978. Included 1979 Congressional Presentation.

2. FAA Sec. 611(a)(1). Prior to obligation in excess of $100,000, will there be (a) engineering, financial, and other plans necessary to carry out the assistance and (b) a reasonably firm estimate of the cost to the U.S. of the assistance?

(a) No. See Financial Plan.

Numbers 3 through 10 -- Not applicable.

B. FUNDING CRITERIA FOR PROJECT

1. Development Assistance Project Criteria

(a) FAA Sec. 102(c); Sec. 111; Sec. 281a

Extent to which activity will (a) effectively involve the poor in development, by extending access to economy at local level, increasing labor-intensive production, spreading investment out from cities to small towns and rural areas; and (b) help develop cooperatives, especially by technical assistance, to assist rural and urban poor to help themselves toward better life, and otherwise encourage democratic private and local governmental institutions?

See Project Analyses.

(b) FAA Sec. 103, 103A, 104, 105, 106, 107
Is assistance being made available: (include only applicable paragraph - e.g., a, b, etc. -- which corresponds to source of funds used. If more than one fund source is used for project, include relevant paragraph for each fund source.)

(1) (103) for agriculture, rural development or nutrition; if so, extent to which activity is specifically designedto increase productivity and income of rural poor; (103A) if for agricultural research, is full account taken of needs of small farmers; — See Project Analyses.

(2) (104) for population planning or health; if so, extent to which activity extends low-cost, integrated delivery systems to provide health and family planning services, especially to rural areas and poor; — See Project Analyses.

(3) (105) for education, public administration, or human resources development; if so, extent to which activity strengthens non-formal education, makes formal education more relevant, especially for rural families and urban poor, or strengthens management capability of institutions enabling the poor to participate in development; — See Project Analyses.

(4) (106) for technical assistance, energy, research, reconstruction, and selected development problems; if so, extent activity is: — See Project Analyses.

(a) technical cooperation and development, especially with U.S. private and voluntary, or regional and international development, organizations; — See Project Analyses.

(4) (b) through (4) (f) -- Not applicable.

(5) (107) -- Not applicable.

(c) FAA Sec. 110(a); Sec. 208(e). Is the recipient country willing to contribute funds to the project, and in what manner has or will it provide assurances that it will provide at least 25% of the costs of the program, project, or activity with respect to which the assistance is to be furnished (or has the latter cost-sharing requirement been waived for a "relatively least-developed" country)?	See Summary Cost Estimate and Financial Plan.
(d) FAA Sec. 110(b). Will grant capital assistance be disbursed for project over more than 3 years? If so, has justification satisfactory to Congress been made, and efforts for other financing?	No.
(e) FAA Sec. 207; Sec. 113. Extent to which assistance reflects appropriate emphasis on; (1) encouraging development of democratic, economic, political, and social institutions; (2) self-help in meeting the country's food needs; (3) improving availability of trained worker-power in the country; (4) programs designed to meet the country's health needs; (5) other important areas of economic, political, and social development, including industry; free labor unions, cooperatives, and Voluntary Agencies; transportation and communication; planning and public administration; urban development, and modernization of existing laws; or (6) integrating women into the recipient country's national economy.	See Project Analyses.
(f) FAA Sec. 281(b). Describe extent which program recognizes the particular needs, desires, and capacities of the people of the country; utilizes the country's intellectual resources to encourage institutional development; and supports civic education and training in skills required for effective participation in governmental and political processes essential to self-government.	See Project Analyses.

(g) FAA Sec. 201(b)(2)-(4) and -(8); Sec. 201(e); Sec. 211(a)(1)-(3) and -(8). Does the activity give reasonable promise of contributing to the development: of economic resources, or to the increase of productive capacities and self-sustaining economic growth; or of educational or other institutions directed toward social progress? Is it related to and consistent with other development activities, and will it contribute to realizable long-range objectives? And does project paper provide information and conclusion on an activity's economic and technical soundness?

See Project Analyses.

(h) -- Not applicable.