PD-AAH-120
15N-1345

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: Heifer Project International, Inc.

4. DOCUMENT REVISION NUMBER:

5. PROJECT NUMBER (7 digits): 932-0099

6. BUREAU/OFFICE: A. SYMBOL: PHA; B. CODE: 5

7. PROJECT TITLE (Maximum 40 characters): Development Program Grant-HPI

8. ESTIMATED FY OF PROJECT COMPLETION: FY 81

9. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION: A. INITIAL FY 77; B. QUARTER 4 (Enter 1, 2, 3, or 4); C. FINAL FY 79

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

A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY 77 B. FX	C. L/C	D. TOTAL	LIFE OF PROJECT E. FX	F. L/C	G. TOTAL
AID APPROPRIATED TOTAL	410.0	-	410.0	721.0	-	721.0
(GRANT)	(410.0)	(-)	(410.0)	(721.0)	(-)	(721.0)
(LOAN)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
OTHER U.S. 1. HPI	101.4	-	101.4	340.0		340.0
OTHER U.S. 2. WILRTC	57.5	-	57.5	148.1		148.1
HOST COUNTRY	41.5	-	41.0	194.0	-	194.0
OTHER DONOR(S)						
TOTALS	610.4		610.4	1,403.1		1,403.1

11. PROPOSED BUDGET APPROPRIATED FUNDS ($000)

A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	PRIMARY TECH. CODE C. GRANT	D. LOAN	E. 1ST FY 77 F. GRANT	G. LOAN	H. 2ND FY 78 I. GRANT	J. LOAN	K. 3RD FY 79 L. GRANT	M. LOAN
(1) PH	761	920J	-	410.0	-	162.0	-	149.0	-
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
			TOTALS	410.0	-	162.0		149.0	-

A. APPROPRIATION	N. 4TH FY ___ O. GRANT	P. LOAN	Q. 5TH FY ___ R. GRANT	S. LOAN	LIFE OF PROJECT T. GRANT	U. LOAN
(1)					721.0	-
(2)						
(3)						
(4)						
TOTALS						

12. IN-DEPTH EVALUATION SCHEDULED: MM 08 YY 80

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 (1 = NO, 2 = YES)

14. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

SIGNATURE: John A. Ulinski, Jr.

TITLE: Director, PHA/PVC

DATE SIGNED: MM 07 DD 13 YY 77

15. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID/W DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION: MM 04 DD 29 YY 77

AID 1330-4 (3-76)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page No.
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Grant Summary	2
III.	Background	3
IV.	Project Target	4
V.	Rationale	5
VI.	Implementation Plan	7
VII.	Logical Framework	12
VIII.	Job Descriptions	13
IX.	Budget, Funding Information	16
X.	Evaluation Plan	21

Appendices

A. HPI Board of Directors, Committees and Staff

B. WILRTC Staff

HEIFER PROJECT INTERNATIONAL-DPG/FOOD AND NUTRITION PROPOSAL

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Heifer Project International (HPI), a non-profit organization, is headquartered at 300 Spring Street, Suite 333, Little Rock, Arkansas. The organization was founded in 1944, in North Manchester, Indiana, by the Church of the Brethren. It was then known as Heifers for Relief.

2. Originally domestic in focus, HPI moved onto the international scene in 1946, first as a liaison agency between UNRRA and Poland and later as a training unit under the supervision of FAO. In both instances, HPI planned and executed agricultural instructional programs. The organization ceased being a relief agency in 1953, changed its name to Heifer Project, Incorporated, and started development work in Korea, the Philippines, Bolivia and Ecuador under the auspices of each of those governments. Entering into its first contracts with A.I.D. in 1960, Heifer provided assistance to Bolivia, Ecuador and the Dominican Republic. Contracts with Peace Corps to, among other things, recruit agricultural volunteers, train them and serve as back-stop once the recruits were overseas were awarded HPI in 1961. The work performed for the U.N., A.I.D., and the Peace Corps encouraged HPI to reach out for additional international work. By 1972 the organization had expanded its privately funded overseas activities considerably.

3. HPI's work with livestock smallholders is unique, progressing with the quiet assurance of a group which has achieved success on its own terms. Korea, Iran and Ecuador are good examples. Heifer's original stock of

chicks, hatching eggs, purebred cattle and pigs, donated up to 14 years ago, were the start of genetic strains, the offsprings of which provide quality protein and good earnings to collective and private owners even today. Including these countries, Heifer has delivered livestock to persons and communities in more than 90 countries and has approvingly managed to keep its livestock exchange program afloat on an international commercial plane without once resorting to the trappings of international commercial backing, an undertaking of no mean accomplishment.

II. GRANT SUMMARY

1. HPI, in pursuit of its efforts to assist small farm animal breeders achieve a better living through more efficient use of natural resources, will use the Development Program Grant to design an evaluation process that will enhance its capability to select the most appropriate recipients, manage the logistics of livestock pick-up and delivery to international sites and assist recipients receive maximum benefits once the livestock is under their full control.

2. Concurrent with the Development Program Grant, a Food and Nutrition Grant to HPI will allow that organization, in collaboration with Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center (WILRTC), to train smallholders in dairy production management by providing fundamental training in dairy husbandry to selected recipients. This non-formal training will not only result in improved meat and milk production but will also increase the numbers of persons capable of teaching the fundamentals of beef and dairy husbandry to other smallholders of the host country.

III. BACKGROUND

1. Heifer, through its worldwide ecumenical contacts has linked a network of field staff that serves as the primary source for both identifying specific needs and overseeing the farmer's performance once the livestock gift is delivered. This livestock development assistance activity came about not only because of its humanitarian appeal but also in response to the fact that because economic growth requires investment capital, the small farmer has practically no alternative to subsistence living. Mobility is further compounded by increased birth rates, displacement caused by natural disasters, destruction during times of territorial wars, and most recently, stifling inflation; conditions which characteristically strike the poor first. Although farm credit, subsidies and cooperatives have been in existence for as long as HPI has, HPI clients were generally disqualified for reasons over which they nor Heifer had the means to correct immediately.

2. Out of concern, then, for the plight of man, Heifer ingenuously struck a plan "to share gifts with individuals, families and institutions in the needy areas of the world on a basis that helps them meet their need through their own efforts". Starting as a one unit dairy farm operation, the Heifer activity grew to need several regional units. By 1972 these regional units were consolidated into one sprawling ranch of 34 pastures capable of handling a variety of livestock. The ranch, located approximately 40 miles outside Little Rock Arkansas on the Fourche River is used not only as a breeding center but also as a commercial farm which serves as the source of a good deal of the organization's operational capital.

In total, Heifer Project is a going concern in all respects. It is an aware organization of extraordinary perception and intent.

IV. PROJECT TARGET

1. As stated earlier, HPI has been in business for 33 years and its leadership now questions what the future shall be for Heifer. There is need to evaluate the past in order to better analyze the future. Heifer feels it is at a critical junction in consideration of factors such as conservation and land utilization. They question whether it is more important to breed here and ship to cooperating countries or does the better feasibility lie in breeding on site? What of local purchase? Is it always the case that U.S. bred animals are superior for the need to which the animals are applied or could local stocks serve the purpose better. In other words, Heifer seeks the answer to the question - "What are we really doing?"

2. In addition to land use, logistics and animal selection, HPI recognizes that the organization's actions carry with it untold social implications. Having shifted from ecclesiastic emphasis to hard line development, Heifer believes it has a responsibility to weigh and measure its socio-cultural impact as well as enumerate the economic gains brought about through its efforts. The focus now is efficiency and impact as opposed to stop-gap donations. Social delivery, be it direct or a consequence of other HPI acts, is viewed now to be as important to HPI's future actions and postures as is any element of its operation.

3. Notwithstanding the external influences of its program, Heifer wishes to focus equal attention on its own staff. Although its Central

Office is composed of paid professionals, most of its field staff is made up of volunteers. A real assessment of the needs among this staff will, undoubtedly, reveal the necessity to upgrade, redirect, increase or even terminate some of the volunteer services in consideration of the new intent for greater efficiency and impact.

V. RATIONALE

1. Particularly among the poor in LDCs is there the unfounded belief that economic and social disparity is brought about by some freakishness of nature such as having been born in "the wrong family" as it were. Another point of view, supported by modernists, is that economic progress, the antecedent of social progress, is largely a creation of government rather than a product of individual or group effort. The pros and cons of these beliefs are, of course, arguable. There is, however, little room to dispute the fact that whether it be a freak of nature or a failure of government to act responsibly, there are some 650 million people living in absolute poverty. They exist on annual per capita incomes of not more than $50.00. About 100 million people, according to FAO, have incomes of above $50.00 per annum but less than the margin for subsistence living. It is the desire to abate these circumstances that guides the development efforts of Heifer Project International.

2. Moreover, HPI understands that aid alone will likely not break the insidious cycle of poverty for, in some instances, poverty is as much a state of mind as it is an external force. Herein lies the real attack mechanism of Heifer Project. For each animal sent to a cooperating country, Heifer secures agreement from the recipient "to share the increase or to provide a

way that others are able to share in the gift..." so that the receiver eventually himself becomes a donor. The social, psychological and economic promise of a system of this sort makes the real difference.

3. Heifer thus far has not been one to rush into the importation of technology which is beyond the educational comprehension or the traditional will of the intended recipients. In consequence, the stability of project life is less threatened by discouragement among project participants. In its action, Heifer makes no effort to disrupt the community fabric by, for example, sending traditional hog raisers to the ocean to fish because a batch of high powered motorized boats with refrigeration have become available. Instead, Heifer seeks only to improve the skill of the hog raiser, starting where he is and advancing his capability so that hog raising becomes not only economically attractive but also a means of social betterment.

4. Finally, it must not be overlooked that, although Heifer's front line beneficiary is the farm family in need, the multiplier effect of this program is such that it continuously increases quality protein output of the host country. The nutritional value alone makes this a worthwhile investment for A.I.D. Link nutrition with the learning planned for this exercise; the potential for increased personal income; the psychological comfort received when a recipient shares an offspring of a Heifer gift; the numerous social spin-offs; and we find a rural-based program that unequivocally meets the terms and conditions set forth in the Foreign Assistance Act.

VI. IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

In addition to a Development Program Grant to Heifer for the purpose of evaluating and analyzing its total operation, a Food and Nutrition Grant will also be awarded for the specific purpose of improving the milk and meat production management capability of Heifer recipients through training. Both grants will run concurrently as will actual implementation.

A. First Year

1. Devise an organizational plan for the start-up

2. Recruite, hire and orientate the Evaluation Director and his two person team

3. Recruite Consultants

4. Complete preliminary design system

5. Test preliminary design system in identified selected participating countries

6. Initiate workshops for staff and selected Board members.

7. First group of selected trainees arrive in Arkansas and complete two weeks of orientation and pre-experience training

8. Trainees complete nine weeks of intensive training at large commercial dairy

9. Trainees complete eight weeks of dairy farm experience with selected dairy farm families

10. Trainees complete one week post training review at Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center.

B. Second Year

1. Review preliminary results from first country evaluation

2. Submit interim report to A.I.D.

3. Make programatic revisions where necessary

4. Continue collection of data for analysis

5. Test revised design/evaluation using second group of countries

6. Continue workshops

7. Training to proceed as described in items seven through ten, year one

C. Third Year

1. Approve the final evaluation/design plan

2. Complete system for compilation and storage of base line data

3. Continue field workshops.

4. Final workshop for staff and Board members

5. Training to proceed as described in items seven through ten, year one

D. Description of Training

1. Trainee orientation will include a general review of topography and climate of the trainees host country; an introduction to the basic systems of dairy production in the U.S.; issuance of reference materials, training supplies and appropriate work clothing and personal effects if needed.

2. During the nine week technical period the trainees will be assigned to experienced dairyman specialized in breeding, gestation, calving, calf rearing, feeding and feed mill use, milking, sanitation maintenance and

record keeping. Classroom instruction will complement the technical training as follows:

A. Genetics

1. Principles of inheritance
2. Heritabilities of economic traits in dairy cattle
3. Applying genetic principles in sire selection
4. Daughter evaluation
5. Genetic-environmental relationships

B. Breeding and Reproduction

1. Anatomy of the reproductive system
2. Physiology of reproduction
3. Artificial insemination and natural service
4. Factors in reproductive efficiency

C. Calving

1. Preparation of the cow
2. Normal and abnormal presentations and difficult births
3. Caring for newborn calves

D. Principles of nutrition

1. Feed requirements of dairy cattle
2. Feedstuff evaluation
3. Ration formulation
4. Utilizing by-products and unusual feeds

E. Feeding dairy cattle

1. Calf raising pre and post weaning
2. Growing out heifers

3. Pregnant and dry cow feeding

4. Special problems of the high producer

F. Management and equipment

1. Calf rearing facilities

2. Handling and housing the cow

3. Milking equipment

4. Proper milking procedures

5. Managing bulls

6. Feed processing and handling methods

G. Record keeping and economics

H. Disease prevention and sanitation

I. Personnel management and supervision

Farm Dairy Experience:

The period of time spent on family farm dairy units will provide the trainees with many unique opportunities, some of which include:

1. An understanding of the operation of integrated family dairy farms in the U.S.

2. Knowledge of how economic and planning decisions are made by American farm families.

3. Appreciation of the American farm family "work ethic" that has made U.S. agriculture so successful.

4. Additional practical work experience in a different environment.

5. A unique "people-to-people" relationship.

Summary at WILRTC:

1. Summary of the total training experience.

2. Relating the experience to the trainee's home country.

3. Evaluation of the training experience.

4. Discussion of Phase II and Phase III in the host countries.

Criteria for trainee selection-

- College training or equivalent in agriculture, preferably in animal production or animal husbandry.
- Fluency in spoken and written English.
- Practical experience (at least 3 months) in dairy production.
- Demonstrated managerial ability.
- Ability to teach and train others.
- Willingness and capacity to do physical work required on a dairy farm.
- Commitment to return to country of origin and work in dairy training and/or management.
- Dependability.

AID 1020-28 (1-72)

VII

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project:
From FY 77 to FY 81
Total U.S. Funding $721,000
Date Prepared: June 22, 1977

Project Title & Number: Heifer Project International (HPI) - 932-0099

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: Bring about self-sustaining economic growth to livestock smallholders in LDCs	Measures of Goal Achievement: a) Amount of increase in disposable income b) Degree of increase of social amenities among target group c) Reduction in need for free public services d) Rate of increase in quality livestock	a) Internal Revenue records b) Local Government social service statistics c) Import/export statistics d) Production statistics - Ministry of Agriculture	Assumptions for achieving goal targets: a) Self-sufficiency is obtainable b) Self-sufficiency among livestock smallholders is essential c) Concerned governments accord high priority to increased self-sufficiency
Project Purpose: Improve the quality of meat and milk produced by Heifer Project recipient livestock smallholders	Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status. a) Increase in quantity of milk given per Heifer bred cow b) Measurable difference in quality of beef c) HPI recipient livestock farm management at level of excellence d) Established livestock extension program among HPI recipients	a) Comparison of annual milk yield and grade before and after b) Market demand for HPI recipient breed animals c) Third party appraisal d) Observation of project recipients	Assumptions for achieving purpose: a) Improved quality of meat and milk is beneficial b) Continuing demand for high quality dairy products c) Change among smallholders will have impact upon meat and dairy markets
Outputs: a) Improved in-house skill at project design/evaluation b) Revised implementation plans for selected ongoing HPI projects c) Completed trainees capable of training others d) Non formal curricula for livestock management training	Magnitude of Outputs: a) Four ongoing HPI activities evaluated b) One appropriate master project design/evaluation system c) All ongoing HPI activities assessed d) Sixty-three LDC nationals trained e) Training manuals in English and Spanish	a) Third party assessment of HPI's planning and evaluation b) Professional assessment of training manuals c) Observation of trainees' performance in host country	Assumptions for achieving outputs: a) Evaluation is essential to improved design skill b) Upgrading livestock management skills will benefit the particular LDC c) Improved project design and upgraded management are essential elements to long range progress
Inputs: $1,402,895 a) An Evaluation Design Team b) In-house and host country workshops c) Professional dairy farm instructors d) Equipment materials and technology for appropriate training e) Suitable training sites	Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) See Implementation Plan in PROP	a) HPI Central Office records b) On-site inspections c) Comparison of proposed with actual expenditures	Assumptions for providing inputs: a) HPI can locate and hire quality professionals b) Technology offered trainees will be appropriate c) Adequate training sites and conditions are obtainable d) All budget support available on schedule

VIII. JOB DESCRIPTION

Heifer will establish a permanent evaluation unit within its existing structure. The position titles and functions are as follows:

Title: Evaluation Director

Function: To be responsible for overall planning design and administration of the Evaluation Project during the term of the Project and provide program planning and evaluation assistance for on-going and new projects.

Line of Authority: The Evaluation Director is directly responsible to the Executive Director in the performance of his/her duties and responsibilities.

Responsibilities:

1. Administer the Development Program Grant within its stated conditions and requirements.
2. Develop the general plan and design for the evaluation in each of the selected countries.
3. Identify the type of consultants to be used in the evaluation project design and implementation.
4. Work with local individuals, institutions and consultants in the country where the evaluation project is being carried out.
5. Monitor and administer the evaluation project during implementation in the selected countries.
6. Develop program planning and evaluation methodologies for on-going and new projects and country programs.
7. Plan the design and content of the workshops for H.P.I. Board, Staff and Program Representatives.

8. Carry overall responsibility for evaluation with H.P.I.'s programs.

Title: Evaluation Team Leader

Function: To be responsible for the carrying out of the evaluation project within the selected countries.

Line of Authority: The Evaluation Team Leader will be directly responsible to the Evaluation Director and indirectly to the Executive Director.

Responsibilities:

1. To cooperate with the Evaluation Director in the design and methodology and implementation of the evaluation project within the country.

2. To assist in the selection of the evaluation team, including consultants, both outside and local.

3. To carry out the in-country administration and coordination of the evaluation project.

4. To provide leadership for the evaluation team in the evaluation project.

5. To provide assistance as needed to the Evaluation Director in implementing the project.

Title: Evaluation Team Associate

Function: To provide assistance to the Evaluation Director and Team Leader in carrying out the in-country Evaluation Project.

Line of Authority: The Evaluation Team Associate would be directly responsible to the Evaluation Director and Team Leader.

Responsibilities: The responsibilities of the Evaluation Team Associate may vary from one country to another depending on the specific need he or she may be filling in the implementation of the project.

This may be a part time position for each country evaluation, or a full time position during the term of the grant.

Title: Secretary to the Evaluation Director

Function: To provide secretarial assistance to the Evaluation Director.

Line of Authority: The secretary is directly responsible to the Evaluation Director.

Responsibilities: These include all and any of the normal responsibilities related to providing secretarial assistance.

Consultants

It is planned that consultants with a variety of different skills will be used within the implementation of the project. The actual number used in each country may vary with the needs of the design and methodology used.

They might include skills in data collection, sociology, anthropology, economics, animal science, etc.

The average number to be used will be around three in each country project. At least one of these would be an individual from that country.

The consultants used may be drawn from a variety of arrangements. These include those organizations that exist to provide evaluative services, individuals with specific skills, staff from Universities, organizations with special skills in animal husbandry (e.g. Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center) and others.

IX. BUDGET

The total cost of this project is $1,402,895 over three years. Of this amount, A.I.D.'s contribution will be $720,795. Other contributors to this project are-

Heifer Project International	339,900
Winrock International Livestock Research Training Center	148,200
Various host countries	194,000
Total others	682,100

See following pages for expenditure budgets by year and the proposed A.I.D. yearly obligational budget.

Expenditure Budget-Year I

	USAID	HPI	WILRC	Host Countries	Total
1. Salaries					
Evaluation Director	18,000	-	-	-	18,000
Evaluation Team Leader	15,000	-	-	-	15,000
Evaluation Team Associate	13,000	-	-	-	13,000
Secretary (2 Part-Time)	7,500	-	-	-	7,500
Training Staff	18,000	1,000	8,000	-	27,000
Benefits (@ 16% for 3)	8,600	5,900	-	-	14,500
				-	
2. Consultants	15,000	3,000	-	-	18,000
3. International Travel and Technician Support	12,000	4,500	2,000	1,000	19,500
4. Domestic Travel	2,500	1,500	-	-	4,000
5. Per Diem					
1. International					
(a) U. S. Staff and Consultants	9,000	3,900	-	-	12,900
(b) Local Consultants	5,000	-	-	-	5,000
2. Domestic	1,000	1,800	-	-	2,800
6. Trainee Selection Process	2,000	5,000	2,500	1,000	10,500
7. Training Materials etc.	29,000	19,500	35,000	3,500	87,000
8. Trainee Expenses	50,000	3,000	-	-	53,000
9. Trainee International Travel	-	-	-	12,000	12,000
10. Trainee Salaries	-	-	-	24,000	24,000
11. Office Expenses	4,000	8,800	-	-	12,800
12. Workshops	3,000	1,500	-	-	4,500
13. Other Direct Costs	2,400	41,990	10,000	-	54,390
	215,000	101,390	57,500	41,500	415.390

Expenditure Budget-Year II

	USAID	HPI	WILRC	Host Countries	Total
1. Salaries					
Evaluation Director	18,900	-	-	-	18,900
Evaluation Team Leader	15,750	-	-	-	15,750
Evaluation Team Associate	13,650	-	-	-	13,650
Secretary (2 Part-Time)	7,875	-	-	-	7,875
Training Staff	18,000	500	5,000	-	23,500
Benefits (@ 16% for 3)	9,000	6,490	-	-	15,490
2. Consultants	32,000	6,500	-	-	38,500
3. International Travel and Technician Support	21,000	13,000	6,000	1,000	41,000
4. Domestic Travel	8,000	3,500	-	-	11,500
5. Per Diem					
1. International					
(a) U. S. Staff and Consultants	20,000	6,000	-	-	26,000
(b) Local Consultants	12,000	-	-	-	12,000
2. Domestic	2,000	2,800	-	-	4,800
6. Trainee Selection Process	2,000	3,500	2,000	1,000	8,500
7. Training Materials etc.	21,500	12,000	24,500	2,500	60,500
8. Trainee Expenses	50,000	4,000	-	-	54,000
9. Trainee International Travel	-	-	-	24,000	24,000
10. Trainee Salaries	-	-	-	48,000	48,000
11. Office Expenses	6,000	9,600	-	-	15,600
12. Workshops	3,000	3,000	-	-	6,000
13. Other Direct Costs	5,000	53,280	14,200	-	72,480
	265,675	124,170	51,700	76,500	518,045

Expenditure Budget-Year III

	USAID	HPI	WILRC	Host Countries	Total
1. Salaries					
Evaluation Director	19,850	-	-	-	19,850
Evaluation Team Leader	16,600	-	-	-	16,600
Evaluation Team Associate	14,400	-	-	-	14,400
Secretary (2 Part-Time)	8,270	-	-	-	8,270
Training Staff	18,000	500	5,000	-	23,500
Benefits (@ 16% for 3)	9,500	7,140	-	-	16,640
2. Consultants	18,000	3,500	-	-	21,500
3. International Travel and Technician Support	15,000	9,000	4,000	1,000	29,000
4. Domestic Travel	5,000	3,000	-	-	8,000
5. Per Diem					
1. International					
(a) U. S. Staff and Consultants	15,000	5,500	-	-	20,500
(b) Local Consultants	8,000	-	-	-	8,000
2. Domestic	2,000	2,000	-	-	4,000
6. Trainee Selection Process	2,000	3,500	1,500	1,000	8,000
7. Training Materials etc.	15,500	6,500	18,500	2,000	42,500
8. Trainee Expenses	50,000	3,000	-	-	53,000
9. Trainee International Travel	-	-	-	24,000	24,000
10. Trainee Salaries	-	-	-	48,000	48,000
11. Office Expenses	6,000	10,700	-	-	16,700
12. Workshops	12,000	7,500	-	-	19,500
13. Other Direct Costs	5,000	52,500	10,000	-	67,500
	240,120	114,340	39,000	76,000	469,460

AID Obligational Budget

	Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Total
1. Personnel (Salary and Budget)	131,100	97,175	86,620	314,895
2. International Travel	44,000	41,000	32,000	117,000
3. Domestic Travel	3,500	10,000	7,000	20,500
4. Participant Training	222,000	-	-	222,000
5. Workshops	3,000	3,000	12,000	18,000
6. Other Direct Costs	6,400	11,000	11,000	28,400
Total	410,000	162,175	148,620	720,795

Due to the source of funds for the training component (FY 77 Food and Nutrition) participant training and related elements are forward funded in this budget.

Income Generation

According to an audit performed by Rasco, Burris and Winter, Certified Public Accountants, as of December 31, 1975, HPI had assets totaling $779,231 against liabilities of $188,500. Current assets, according to information from HPI representatives, is that assets have since grown in excess of $1.5 million in unrestricted public funds. The total debt on the ranch was to have been amortized in June 1977. This appears adequate evidence of HPI's ability to sustain the evaluation unit and the training function once A.I.D.'s support is withdrawn.

X. Evaluation Plan

1. Because this is essentially a design/evaluation activity, Heifer will constantly evaluate and inform A.I.D. of its findings in periodic reports. The first of these reports is to be submitted to A.I.D. at the beginning of operational year two. This in the form of an interim self-evaluation. Toward the end of operational year three, Heifer will submit a final self evaluation report to A.I.D. as well as a report on the final design/evaluation system to be adopted by HPI.

2. In addition, A.I.D. will schedule its usual end of project evaluation using the logical framework as its ultimate measure of standard. The timing for this major evaluation will be scheduled for a time convenient to A.I.D., Heifer Project International, WILRTC, and participating host countries.

Appendix A

HPI Board of Directors

American Baptist Churches

Matthew Giuffrida
American Baptist Churches
Valley Forge, Pa.

Church of the Brethren
World Ministries Commission

Shantilal Bhagat
1451 Dundee Ave.
Elgin, Il.

Disciples of Christ

Miss Marilynne Hill
222 S. Downey Ave.
Indianapolis, In.

Robert Bacon
RR #4
Hutchinson, KS

Episcopal Church
Division of World Relief and Interchurch Aid

Charles Taylor
1 Pleasant Valley Farm Rd.
Little Rock, Ar.

Wade Egbert
815 Second Ave.
New York, N.Y.

*Mrs. Marion Bingley

Lutheran Church
Missouri Synod

Rev. Melvin Witt
500 N. Broadway
St. Louis, Mo.

William F. Helmich
RR #1
Box 275
Alexander, Ar.

Appendix A (Continued)

HPI Board of Directors

Mennonite Central Committee

John Hostetler
21 South 12th St.
Akron, Pa.

Edgar Stoesz
21 South 12th St.
Akron, Pa.

Vera & Walter Morris Foundation, Inc.

Walter Morris
P. O. Box 176
Bigelow, Ar.

George Norris
Rt. #1
Box 9
Virginia, Il.

National Catholic Rural Life Conference

Father John McRaith
3801 Grand Ave.
Des Moines, Ia.

Joseph Meisner
1503 Anotnony St.
Columbia, Mo.

United Church Board for World Ministries

Rev. Ted Van Dyck
1720 Chouteau Ave.
St. Louis, Mo.

Hazel T. Johns
815 Second Ave.
New York, N.Y.

*Al Bartholomew

United Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief

Mrs. Doreen Tilghman
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y.

HPI Board of Directors

United Methodist Committee for Overseas Relief (Continued)

Charles Postel
South Side Stock Farm
Rockbridge, Il.

United Presbyterian Church
Program Agency

William K. DuVal
475 Riverside Drive
New York, N.Y.

*Douglas Brian

Presbyterian Church in the U. S.

James Cogswell
341 Ponce de Leon Ave., NE
Atlanta, Ga.

Associate Agency Representatives

Fellowship of Reconciliation

Frank Tunglen
4264 Verdugo View Dr.
Log Angeles, Ca.

Massachusetts State Grange

Wyman E. Hawkes
Elm St.
RD #1
Berkley, Ma.

*C. Goodfield
Barre Road
Hardwich, Ma.

National Farmers Union

Joseph Fichter
28 Vine St. East
Oxford, Oh.

*Alternates

Appendix A (Continued)

Directors-at-Large

Irving Chappell
Trundy Road
Cape Elizabeth, Me.

Milo Yoder
1911 S. Main St.
Goshen, In.

Hurley Couchman
3100 Illinois Ave.
Modesto, Ca.

Robert Deans
1041 Anthony Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Mi.

William Wegner
2027 Goodale Ave.
St. Louis, Mo.

Reginald Helfferich
RFD #2 Papermill Rd.
Marlborough, Ct.

Chris Kimmel
RFD #3
Shelocta, Pa.

LaVere Flora
2332 8th St.
LaVern, Ca.

Andrew Torrence
516 Montgomery Rd.
Tuskegee Institute
Tuskegee, Al.

Elias Sanchez
Apartado Postel 163-C
Tegucigalpa, D.C.
Honduras, C. A.

Executive Committee - 1976

William DuVal -Chairman

Rev. Ted Van Dyck -Vice Chairman

John Hostetler -Treasurer

Edwin Geers -Secretary

William Wegner

Dr. Robert Deans

Charles Postel

Mrs. Doreen Tilghman

Hurley Couchman

HPI Committees

Nominating Committee

Ted Van Dyck -Chairman
Charles Postel
Marilynne Hill
Edwin Geers -Staff

The Nominating Committee's function is to bring before the Board of Directors, names of nominees for election to the Board of Directors-at-Large.

Program Committee

Andrew Torrence -Chairman
Robert Bacon
Robert Deans
Edwin Geers -Staff
Thurl Metzger -Staff

The Program Committee's function is to review existing project areas and project requests and submit to the Board of Directors.

Finance Committee

John Hostetler -Chairman
Shantilal Bhagat
Charles Taylor
Edwin Geers -Staff
William Long -Staff

The Finance Committee's function is to review budgets and expenditures and prepare the budget for the following year to be sumbitted to the Board for approval.

Ranch Committee

Charles Postel -Chairman
George Norris
Irving Chappell
Ray Record
Edwin Geers -Staff
Thurl Metzger -Staff

The Ranch Committee's function is to review the operations of the International Livestock Center, prepare the budget and submit to the Board.

HPI Committees (Continued)

Ranch Activities Committee

Doreen Tilghman -Chairperson
Charles Postel
John Hostetler
Edwin Geers -Staff
Ray Daley -Ranch Manager

The Ranch Activities Committee's function is to select groups that request work camps at the International Livestock Center. This Committee also reviews the activities and needs for promotion at the Ranch.

Development Committee

Reginald Helfferich -Chairman
Walter Morris
Milo Yoder
Hurley Couchman
Charles Taylor
Edwin Geers -Staff
Jerry Bedford -Staff

The Dev lopment Committee replaced the Capital Fund Committee. This Committee's responsibility is to look at overall promotion and fund raising of HPI.

Personnel Committee

William Wegner -Chairman
Doreen Tilghman
Melvin Witt
Edwin Geers -Staff

The Personnel Committee's responsibility is to review HPI personnel, salaries, benefits, to assist the Executive Director in his personnel decisions.

HPI Personnel

International Headquarters P. O. Box 808 Suite 333, 300 Spring Bldg. Little Rock, Ar.	Edwin Geers -Executive Director Thurl Metzger -Director of Int'l Programs William Long -Director of Finance Jerry Bedford -Director of Development Gloria Howell -Secretary June Morris -Secretary Cindy Glover -Secretary

Regional Offices

Pacific Southwest 809 Oakglade Dr. Monrovia, Ca.	Ray C. Smith -Director Elaine Smith -Secretary
Pacific Central P. O. Box 1332 Modesto, Ca.	Bill E. Beck -Director Marie Hartung -Secretary Nora Neste -Secretary
Midwest P. O. Box 767 Goshen, In.	David Boothby -Director Pat Boothby -Secretary
New England 16 Leyden St. Plymouth, Ma.	Rosalee Sinn -Director Beverly Frazier -Secretary

International Livestock Center

Rt. #2 Perryville, Ar.	Ray Daley -Ranch Manager Warren Chitwood -Herdsman Curtis Lipps -Farm Manager Ivan Slagle -Assistant Herdsman Norman Brand -Maintenance Assistance J. L. Maxwell -Farm Hand Karrol Butler -Secretary

Field Program Staff

Wallace Eash Mississippi	Heifer Project Mississippi Community Development Program P. O. Box 725

HPI Personnel (Continued)

Field Program Staff (Continued)

Fred Harder Guatemala	48 Calle 0-89 Monte Maria Guatemala - Zona 12 - Guatemala
John Dieterly, Jr. Belize	P. O. Box 36 Belmopan, Belize
Elvero R. Henning, D. V. M. Tanzania	Kitulo Ranch Box 755 Mbeya, Tanzania East Africa
Charles Burwell Cameroon	IEMBT Bambui Centre P. M. B. 50, Bamenda, Mezam Division North-West Province United Republic of Cameroon - Africa

Appendix B

WINROCK INTERNATIONAL LIVESTOCK RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTER

Name	Position	Speciality
R. O. Wheeler, Ph.D.	President	Econometrics & Economic Development
F. L. (Monte) Bell, M.S.	Training Program Specialist	Sheep & Beef Cattle Range Production & Management; Animal Nutrition & Reproduction
R. Dennis Child, Ph.D.	Range Scientist	Range Management; Systems Science
C. E. Cluck, M.Ag.	Administrative Officer	Range Management; Physical Geology
G. E. Cooper, Ph.D.	Animal Nutritionist	Ruminant Nutrition; Small Ruminant Production Systems
H. A. Fitzhugh, Ph.D.	Director of Research	Livestock Genetics; Systems Science; Economic Evaluation of Livestock Production Systems
H. A. Glimp, Ph.D	Director of Training & Development	Ruminant Nutrition; Beef Cattle, Sheep & Goat Production; Livestock Management Training
C. H. Mannasmith, DVM	Veterinarian	Animal Health & Diseases; Livestock Production
A. Martinez, Ph.D.	Associate Director Development & Training	Ruminant Nutrition & Management; Agri-Business Analysis & Development
Richard Newton	Training Program Specialist	Facilities & Equipment Design, Cost Analysis & Construction; Beef Cattle & Dairy Goat Production
Thanh D. Nguyen, Ph.D.	Research Nutritionist	Animal Nutrition; Waste Recycling
Walt Rowden, M.S.	Associate Director of Training	Beef Cattle & Sheep Management
M. E. Sarhan, Ph.D.	Research Economist	Economic Development; Quantitative Methods, Macro-Economics & International Trade

WINROCK INTERNATIONAL LIVESTOCK RESEARCH AND TRAINING CENTER

Name	Position	Speciality
Randy Smith	Communications Specialist	Video Systems, Photography Training Materials Development
E. L. (Ted) Williams, MBA	Program Officer	Overall Program & Financial Development

Special Consultants

T. C. Byerly, Ph.D.	Consultant	Biological Efficiency of Production; Livestock Genetics & Reporduction; Research Administration
R. D. Child, M.S.	Consultant	Beef Cattle Production; Ranch Management; Forage Production
H. J. Hodgson, Ph.D.	Consultant	Forage Corp Breeding, Production & Utilization; Forage-Ruminant Production
W. W. Konkle, B.A.	Editorial Consultant	Agricultural Science Writing & Editing
L. J. Nygaard, Ph.D.	Consultant	Ruminant Nutrition; Beef Cattle & Sheep Production; Feedlot & Feed Mill Management
O. J. Scoville, Ph.D.	Consultant	Production Economics; Farm Management; Agricultural Policy

PD-AAH-926

932-0099

AA/PHA

JUL 25 4 25 AM '77

ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR - PHA

FROM: PHA/PVC, John A. Ulinski, Jr.

PROBLEM: Request for approval of the attached Project Paper precedent to the obligation of grants to Heifer Project International (HPI).

DISCUSSION: A Project Paper on behalf of Heifer Project International, Inc. (HPI) is attached for your approval. The paper delineates a three-year course of intensive, analytical evaluation of Heifer's works combined with participant training for Heifer recipients. Total project cost is $1.403 million, of which A.I.D. is asked to contribute $721,000. The remaining $682,000 is to be contributed by HPI, Winrock International Livestock Research and Training Center (WILTRC), and host governments.

HPI, a non-profit organization, was established 33 years ago for the purpose of assisting small farm animal breeders achieve a better living by providing them with high quality livestock for breeding purposes. HPI ships livestock (cattle for milk, beef and breeding, goats, chickens, and pigs) to deserving poor farmers with the stipulation that the first offspring is shared with someone in the community equally as deserving and needy. The multiplier effect of such a program has far-reaching implications.

HPI, having some time ago shifted from an ecclesiastic emphasis to hard line development, has reached the juncture where it questions what the future posture of its organization should be and what actions need the organization take to bring about greater efficiency and more relevant performance in the context of current needs of poor smallholders. The answer, Heifer believes, lies in assessment of its past works coupled with the expectation that these results will lead to realistic modification of its future actions.

Moreover, HPI has long recognized that one of the weakest links is in the handling of livestock once it has been transferred to the LDC recipient. In consequence, HPI, in collaboration with

WILRTC, will establish a livestock management training seminar for selected recipients to teach, through non-formal procedures, the fundamentals of range management. WILRTC, a Winthrop Rockefeller endowment, is extremely well equipped to carry out this function.

Funds for the analytical self-evaluation are to be drawn against Section 106 - Special Development Activities. Training program costs for a three-year period will be drawn from the Food and Nutrition account - Section 103. The 106 funds (total $421,000) are to be obligated on a yearly basis over three years. Due to the nature of the allocation, 103 funds (total $300,000) will be fully obligated in fiscal year 1977 but expended over a three-year period.

Congressional Notification for these obligations was sent to Congress June 29, 1977. Expiration date was July 13. No questions were raised by the Congress.

RECOMMENDATION: That you sign this Action Memorandum, indicating your approval of the attached Project Paper.

Approved: _____

Disapproved: _____

Date: AUG 1977

Attachment: a/s

Clearance: DAA/PHA, A.R.Furman _____ Date _____
GC, P.Scott _____ Date 7/18/77
PHA/PROG, C.D.McMakin _____ Date 7/22/77

PHA/PVC/OPNS:VLC Anderson:ds:7/12/77:X28985

ENVIRONMENTAL THRESHOLD DETERMINATION

TO: AA/PHA, Sander M. Levin Date: July 12, 1977

FROM: PHA/PROG, C. D. McMakin

SUBJECT: Environmental Threshold Determination

Project Title: DPG and Food and Nutrition Grant to Heifer Project International

Project #: 932-0099

Specific Activity (if applicable) _____

REFERENCE: Initial Environmental/Examination (IEE) contained on Attached Paper dated July 12, 1977

I recommend that you make the following determination:

XX 1. The proposed agency action is not a major Federal action which will have a significant effect on the human environment.

_____ 2. The proposed agency action is a major Federal action which will have a significant effect on the human environment, and:

_____ a. An Environmental Assessment is required; or

_____ b. An Environmental Impact Statement is required.

The cost of and schedule for this requirement is fully described in the referenced document.

_____ 3. Our environmental examination is not complete. We will submit the analysis no later than _____ with our recommendation for an environmental threshold decision.

Approved: _____

Disapproved: _____

Date: 9 AUG 1977

PROJECT AUTHORIZATION AND REQUEST FOR ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS

PART II

Name of Country/Entity: WORLDWIDE

Name of Project: HPI

Heifer Project International

Number of Project: 932-0009

Pursuant to Sections 103 and 106 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, I hereby authorize a total level of A.I.D. appropriated funding planned for this centrally funded project of not to exceed Seven Hundred Twenty One Thousand U. S. dollars ($721,000) of which the entire amount will be grant funded during the period fiscal year 1977 through fiscal year 1979, in accordance with the attached Project Paper.

Sander M. Levin, AA/PHA

Date 3 AUG 1977

Clearances:

DAA/PHA:AFurman _____ Date _____

PHA/PVC:JAUlinski Jr. _____ Date 7/19/77

PHA/PROG:CDMcMakin _____ Date 7/22/77

GR 7/19/77

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT AUTHORIZATION AND REQUEST FOR ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS PART I

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

PAF

2. DOCUMENT CODE: 5

3. COUNTRY/ENTITY: Heifer Project International, Inc

4. DOCUMENT REVISION NUMBER:

5. PROJECT NUMBER (7 digits): 932-0099

6. BUREAU/OFFICE: A. SYMBOL: PHA; B. CODE: 5

7. PROJECT TITLE (Maximum 40 characters): Development Program Grant (HPI)

8. PROJECT APPROVAL DECISION — ACTION TAKEN: A (A = APPROVED, D = DISAPPROVED, DE = DEAUTHORIZED)

9. EST. PERIOD OF IMPLEMENTATION: YRS. 03 QTRS 12

10. APPROVED BUDGET AID APPROPRIATED FUNDS ($000)

A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	PRIMARY TECH. CODE C. GRANT	PRIMARY TECH. CODE D. LOAN	E. 1ST FY 77 F. GRANT	E. 1ST FY 77 G. LOAN	H. 2ND FY 78 I. GRANT	H. 2ND FY 78 J. LOAN	K. 3RD FY 79 L. GRANT	K. 3RD FY 79 M. LOAN
(1) SC	761	920J	-	110.0	-	162.0	-	149.0	-
(2) FN	119	078	-	300.0	-	-	-	-	-
(3)									
(4)									
TOTALS				410.0	-	162.0	-	149.0	-

A. APPROPRIATION	N. 4TH FY O. GRANT	N. 4TH FY P. LOAN	Q. 5TH FY R. GRANT	Q. 5TH FY S. LOAN	LIFE OF PROJECT T. GRANT	LIFE OF PROJECT U. LOAN
(1) SC	-	-	-	-	421.0	-
(2) FN	-	-	-	-	300.0	-
(3)						
(4)						
TOTALS	-	-	-	-	721.0	-

11. PROJECT FUNDING AUTHORIZED (ENTER APPROPRIATE CODE(S)) 1 = LIFE OF PROJECT, 2 = INCREMENTAL LIFE OF PROJECT

A. GRANT	B. LOAN
2	-

C. PROJECT FUNDING AUTHORIZED THRU FY 79

12. INITIAL PROJECT FUNDING ALLOTMENT REQUESTED ($000)

B. ALLOTMENT REQUEST NO.

A. APPROPRIATION	C. GRANT	D. LOAN
(1) SC	110.0	-
(2) FN	300.0	-
(3)		
(4)		
TOTALS	410.0	-

13. FUNDS RESERVED FOR ALLOTMENT

TYPED NAME (Chief, SER/FM/FSD)

SIGNATURE

DATE

14. SOURCE/ORIGIN OF GOODS AND SERVICES: [X] 000 [ ] 941 [ ] LOCAL [ ] OTHER

15. FOR AMENDMENTS, NATURE OF CHANGE PROPOSED

FOR PPC/PIAS USE ONLY	16. AUTHORIZING OFFICE SYMBOL	17. ACTION DATE (MM DD YY)	18. ACTION REFERENCE (Optional)	ACTION REFERENCE DATE (MM DD YY)

AID 1330-6 (7-76)

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION

Project Location: Support to Heifer Project International, Inc. Headquarters in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Project Title: Development Program Grant (DPG) to Heifer Project International, Inc.

Funding: The Project Paper is to approve funding from FY 1977 through FY 1979 in the amount of $721,000.

IEE Prepared by: Elizabeth P. Roche Date: July 13, 1977

Environmental Action Recommended: It is recommended that this project receive a negative determination and that no additional environmental examinations be carried out on this project. This grant provides core support and contributes to a training program for a private voluntary organization, categories of AID projects specifically cited as "by their general nature ordinarily have little or no effect on the environment and therefore usually do not require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment (or an Environment Impact Statement)."

Assistant Administrator's Decision: Date:

Contents of the Initial Environmental Examination

I. Examination of the Nature, Scope and Magnitude of Environmental Impacts

Description of Project

The project purpose is to establish a project design, planning and evaluation unit within the organization in order to expand its programs in various LDCs more efficiently. Funds also will be provided by AID to assist HPI, in collaboration with Winrock International Livestock Training and Research Center in Arkansas, refine its small-holder livestock farm management training program.

The nature of this project, core support to a PVO and to a training program categorizes it as one of those AID projects which ordinarily has little or no impact on the environment.

IMPACT IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION FORM

Impact Areas and Sub-areas 1/	Impact Identification and Evaluation 2/
A. LAND USE	
1. Changing the character of the land through:	
a. Increasing the population	N
b. Extracting natural resources	N
c. Land clearing	N
d. Changing soil character	N
2. Altering natural defenses	N
3. Foreclosing important uses	N
4. Jeopardizing man or his works	N
5. Other factors	
_____	_____
_____	_____
B. WATER QUALITY	
1. Physical state of water	N
2. Chemical and biological states	N
3. Ecological balance	N
4. Other factors	
_____	_____
_____	_____

1/ See Explanatory Notes for this form.

2/ Use the following symbols:
N - No environmental impact
L - Little environmental impact
M - Moderate environmental impact
H - High environmental impact
U - Unknown environmental impact

IMPACT IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION FORM

C. ATMOSPHERIC

1. Air additives ---------- N
2. Air pollution ---------- N
3. Noise pollution ---------- N
4. Other factors

_____ _____

_____ _____

D. NATURAL RESOURCES

1. Diversion, altered use of water ---------- N
2. Irreversible, inefficient commitments ---------- N
3. Other factors

_____ _____

_____ _____

E. CULTURAL

1. Altering physical symbols ---------- N
2. Dilution of cultural traditions ---------- N
3. Other factors

_____ _____

_____ _____

F. SOCIOECONOMIC

1. Changes in economic/employment patterns ---------- N
2. Changes in population ---------- N
3. Changes in cultural patterns ---------- N
4. Other factors

_____ _____

_____ _____

G. HEALTH

1. Changing a natural environment _____ N

2. Eliminating an ecosystem element _____ N

3. Other factors

_____ _____

_____ _____

H. GENERAL

1. International impacts _____ N

2. Controversial impacts _____ N

3. Larger program impacts _____ N

4. Other factors

_____ _____

_____ _____

I. OTHER POSSIBLE IMPACTS (not listed above)

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

See attached Discussion of Impacts.

II. Recommendation for Environmental Action

This project should receive a "Negative Determination" because it is a grant for core support to a PVO Headquarters. It is to improve their organization's capability to plan, develop, and evaluate its projects and to improve its training program. Any likely environmental impact is a number of steps removed from this form of core support and would be assessed on a case-by-case basis if, and when, any country-specific projects are proposed for separate AID fundings (i.e., Operational Program Grants).

AID 1025-1 (7-71) (FACE SHEET)

NONCAPITAL PROJECT PAPER (PROP)

I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1. PROJECT TITLE: Heifer Project International, Inc.

APPENDIX ATTACHED: [X] YES [ ] NO

2. PROJECT NO. (M.O. 1095.2): 932-0099

3. RECIPIENT (specify)
[ ] COUNTRY N.A.
[ ] REGIONAL ____ [X] INTERREGIONAL ____

4. LIFE OF PROJECT
BEGINS FY 77
ENDS FY 81

5. SUBMISSION
[X] ORIGINAL 06/29/77 DATE
[ ] REV. NO. ____ DATE
CONTR./PASA NO. ____

II. FUNDING ($000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

A. FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR	B. TOTAL $	C. PERSONNEL (1) $	C. PERSONNEL (2) MM	D. PARTICIPANTS (1) $	D. PARTICIPANTS (2) MM	E. COMMODITIES $	F. OTHER COSTS $	G. PASA/CONTR. (1) $	G. PASA/CONTR. (2) MM	H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATE: $ US ____ (U.S. OWNED) (1) U.S. GRANT LOAN	(2) COOP COUNTRY (A) JOINT	(2) COOP COUNTRY (B) BUDGET
1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY												
2. OPRN FY 77	410.0	178.6	12	222.0	36	3.0	6.4					
3. BUDGET FY 78	162.0	148.2	12	-		3.0	11.0					
4. BUDGET +1 FY 79	149.0	125.6	12	-		12.0	11.0					
5. BUDGET +2 FY												
6. BUDGET +3 FY												
7. ALL SUBQ. FY												
8. GRAND TOTAL	721.0	452.4	36	222.0	36	18.0	28.4					

9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS $682.1

(A) NAME OF DONOR	(B) KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES	(C) AMOUNT

III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

	TITLE	DATE
1. DRAFTER: PHA/PVC/OPNS:Vivian L. C. Anderson	Project Manager	06/29/77
2. CLEARANCE OFFICER: PHA/PVC/OPNS:Maurice Kohan	Section Chief	6/30/77

IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

PHA/PVC:Cleo F. Shook Date 6/30/77
PHA/PVC:Judity Gilmore Date 7/5/77

2. CLEARANCES

BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE	BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE
PHA/PVC	John A. Ulinski, Jr.	7/1/77	PPC/DPR	John Welty	7/6/77
LA/MRSD	John Rothberg	7/6/77	PHA/PROG	Elizabeth Roche	7/14/77
AFR/DP	Charles D. Ward	[illegible]	PHA/PROG	C. David McMakin	7/27/77

3. APPROVAL AAs OR OFFICE DIRECTORS
SIGNATURE: Sander Levin
DATE: AUG 1977
TITLE: Assistant Administrator, PHA

4. APPROVAL A/AID (See M.O. 1025.1 VI C.)
SIGNATURE
DATE
ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DOCUMENT FACESHEET

To Be Completed By Originating Office

1. TRANSACTION CODE: A (A = Add, C = Change, D = Delete)

PID

2. DOCUMENT CODE: 1

3. COUNTRY/ENTITY: Heifer Project International, Inc.

4. DOCUMENT REVISION NUMBER:

5. PROJECT NUMBER (7 digits): 932-0099

6. BUREAU/OFFICE: A. Symbol: PHA; B. Code: 5

7. PROJECT TITLE (maximum 40 characters): Development Program Grant-HPI

8. PROPOSED NEXT DOCUMENT: A. 2 = PRP, 3 = PP; B. DATE (MM YY)

9. ESTIMATED FY OF AUTHORIZATION/OBLIGATION: a. INITIAL FY 77; b. FINAL FY 79

10. ESTIMATED COSTS ($000 or equivalent, $1 =)

FUNDING SOURCE		Life of Project
a. AID Appropriated		721.0
b. OTHER U.S.	1.	340.0
	2.	148.1
c. Host Country		194.0
d. Other Donor(s)		
TOTAL		1,403.1

11. PROPOSED BUDGET AID APPROPRIATED FUNDS ($000)

A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	PRIMARY TECH. CODE C. Grant	PRIMARY TECH. CODE D. Loan	E. FIRST FY 77 F. Grant	E. FIRST FY 77 G. Loan	LIFE OF PROJECT H. Grant	LIFE OF PROJECT I. Loan
(1) SC	761	920J	-	410.0	-	721.0	-
(2)							
(3)							
(4)							
			TOTAL	410.0	-	721.0	

12. SECONDARY TECHNICAL CODES (maximum six codes of three positions each): 078, 095

13. SPECIAL CONCERNS CODES (maximum six codes of four positions each): BRW, BSW, PVOU

14. SECONDARY PURPOSE CODE: 119

15. PROJECT GOAL (maximum 240 characters)

Bring about self-sustaining economic growth to livestock smallholders in LDCs.

16. PROJECT PURPOSE (maximum 480 characters)

Improve the quality of meat and milk produced by Heifer Project recipient livestock smallholders.

17. PLANNING RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS (staff/funds)

None

18. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

Signature: John A. Ulinski, Jr.

Title: Director, PHA/PVC

Date Signed (MM DD YY): 01 13 77

19. Date Document Received in AID/W, or for AID/W Documents, Date of Distribution (MM DD YY): 04 29 77

AID 1330-2 (3-76)