PD-AAK-167-B1

931/330004201

(2)

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT PAPER FACESHEET

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

DOCUMENT CODE: PP

3

1. COUNTRY ENTITY: Interregional

4. DOCUMENT REVISION NUMBER:

5. PROJECT NUMBER (7 digits): 931-1330

6. BUREAU/OFFICE: A. SYMBOL: DSB; B. CODE: 36

7. PROJECT TITLE (Maximum 40 characters): Environmental Grant to IIED

8. ESTIMATED FY OF PROJECT COMPLETION: FY 79

9. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION: A. INITIAL FY 78; B. QUARTER; C. FINAL FY 78

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

A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY 78 B. FX	C. L/C	D. TOTAL	LIFE OF PROJECT E. FX	F. L/C	G. TOTAL
AID APPROPRIATED TOTAL						
GRANT ST			100			100
LOAN						
OTHER U.S.						
HOST COUNTRY						
OTHER DONORS UNEP, Canada, Netherlands, Sweden, UK, and West Germany						
TOTALS			100			100

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 GRANT	I. LOAN	J. 3RD FY GRANT	K. LOAN
1	770	710		100					
2									
3									
4									
TOTALS				100					

A. APPROPRIATION	L. 4TH FY GRANT	M. LOAN	N. 5TH FY GRANT	O. LOAN	P. LIFE OF PROJECT GRANT	Q. LOAN
1						
2						
3						
4						
TOTALS						

12. INDEPTH EVALUATION SCHEDULE: MM / YY

13. DATA CHANGE INDICATOR. WERE CHANGES MADE IN THE PID FACESHEET DATA BLOCKS 10, 11, 14 OR 15 OR IN PP FACESHEET DATA BLOCK 13? IF YES, ATTACH CHANGED PID FACESHEET.

1 (1 = NO, 2 = YES)

14. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

SIGNATURE: Henry A. Arnold

TITLE: Director, DS/ST

DATE SIGNED: MM 06 DD 22 YY 78

15. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION

MM DD YY

I. Description and Purposes of the Project

II. Methodology

III. Financial Plan

IV. Implementation

V. Evaluation Plan

ANNEXES

I. IIED Grant Proposal

II. Initial Environmental Examination (IEE)

I. Description and Purposes of the Project

AID has recently received a request for a grant from the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) to help fund a study of the environmental practices and procedures of the major bilateral assistance agencies in seven countries. The countries to be studied include: United States, United Kingdom, Canada, the Netherlands, Sweden, Federal Republic of Germany and France.

The proposed study, "Bilateral Aid and the Environment: A Study of Seven Bilateral Development Assistance Agencies" (see IIED grant proposal, Annex I), is the centerpiece of the thirty-month program of the Institute.

The results of this study, in conjunction with the results of the just completed multilateral studies--"Multilateral Aid and the Environment: A Study of the Environmental Practices and Procedures of Nine Development Financing Agencies"*, May 1978, and "Banking on the Biosphere--Multilateral Aid and the Environment: The Environmental Policies and Practices of Nine Multilateral Aid Institutions" draft, March 1978--will establish an overview of the extent to which official development programs are being carried out in an environmentally sound manner.

Each of the seven countries to be studied has undergone an encouraging awakening in recent years to domestic problems of environmental protection and planning. Many non-governmental and public-interest organizations have sprung up in these countries. Although environmental considerations do not always prevail in domestic decision making processes, nevertheless, those factors are weighed increasingly before many critical decisions are made. It is therefore important to compare environmental procedures of aid agencies, where these have been established, and in other cases to discuss the implications of their absence. The proposed study will look for policy statements, procedural innovations,

---

* Agencies studied were:

The World Bank (IBRD)
The Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
The Organization of American States (OAS)
The Asian Development Bank (ASDB)
The African Development Bank (ADB)
Arab Bank for Economic Development in Africa (BADEA)
The Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
The European Development Fund (EDF)

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

and practical measures designed to foster environmentally sustainable development. It will also evaluate how well these new criteria are being implemented, and whether specific projects reflect an enhanced understanding of environmental problems.

Comparative analysis of environmental procedures and practices by an outside group which has gained considerable experience in this area through indepth studies of the major multilateral funding institutions can benefit AID in several ways: (1) by providing the basis and rationale for adoption and/or harmonization of donor environmental procedures, thus relieving AID of its present position of assuming the greatest burden for environmental assessment. Such a study could become the basis for a U.S. or joint U.S/Canada/Sweden/Netherlands, etc. initiative in the Development Advisory Committee (DAC) of the OECD for greater cooperation and action; (2) by providing insight and support from the environmental community which would help AID refine its present procedures so that the process can become a more effective tool in project design and reduce unnecessary paperwork. At the present time, AID, like other U.S. Federal agencies, does its environmental assessments or statements after a project has been identified. A more effective approach would incorporate environmental concerns at an earlier stage--in the development of the DAP; (3) by analyzing the effectiveness of AID existing procedures with agency personnel at all levels, including personnel and training staff, AID will obtain insight into its own training and personnel needs and the extent to which they are presently adequate.

Furthermore, a study of AID's treatment of environmental problems could illuminate the much discussed but little understood relationship between "environment" and "development". It may be that principles of sustainable development are closer at hand than is generally realized. For example, in the IIED's multilateral study, it was discovered that sound <u>environmental</u> practice is frequently indistinguishable from sound <u>developmental</u> practice. This observation also implies that AID can benefit from a study of the practices of other aid agencies, even when these are not officially designated as "environmental." In deciding how best to carry out its mandate, AID could only gain from learning what priorities other aid organizations have established, and how these have reflected a growing awareness of environmental problems.

Others who will benefit immediately from the proposed study are U.S. policy makers and those of other national and international aid organizations in terms of improved procedures to ensure environmental soundness in their development assistance programs. The ultimate beneficiaries, however, are the population of LDCs who benefit not only from the immediate products of the projects, but also from the long-term environmental concerns expressed by the policy makers which is essential if sustainable environment and development were to be achieved.

II. <u>Methodology</u>

To carry out the proposed inquiry the IIED intends to initiate coordinated research into the environmental practices and procedures of the aid agency in each of the countries to be included in the study. The institute will select and work with affiliated project teams in most or all of the countries involved.

Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) has been selected as the affiliated project team for the study to be undertaken in the United States. Each affiliate will, under the supervision of the IIED Assessment Project Team, carry out much of the actual research on the bilateral aid program in its country. The Institute has some useful experience organizing a similar network of associated organizations as part of its work in reviewing follow-up to the U.N. Human Settlements Conference.

1. Affiliated Project Team

The procedure of establishing local research affiliations has several advantages. First, each affiliated project team will be able to evaluate the operations of an aid agency in its domestic political context. In order to compare an aid agency's environmental work abroad to the priorities established at home, these local teams will utilize their knowledge of domestic environmental and aid attitudes, priorities and regulations. Second, local affiliates can be expected to have the confidence of and access to local organizations on which the success of the project in part depends. Third, it would be unwieldy and unduly time-consuming to assemble the central project team to carry out so large a study.

2. Research

This study will require approximately eighteen months to complete. During that period, IIED is expected to publish an interim working paper, to allow interested parties to offer comments and suggestions. The Institute has frequently used this technique with considerable success as a means of identifying gaps in knowledge. At the end of the project a comprehensive Final Report will be prepared and given the broadest possible dissemination around the world.

The Assessment Project Team believes that a closely coordinated methodology is essential to a comparative study. A period of several months will be used to work out detailed methodological instruction and guidelines for all the affiliated organizations, and to assure that these will be applied in practice. The research technique will mainly consist of the following steps:

(a) Background Research. Background research papers will be written as briefing documents for those members of the Team who visit the studied agencies. Management at each Institution will be contacted at the highest levels, both to gain full cooperation and to outline the specific aims of our research.

(b) Interviews. In each agency, interviews will be conducted with personnel at all levels charged formally or informally with environmental duties, as well as with regional and sectoral staff, technical advisors, legal and post-audit staff, and methodology economists. Where the studied agency includes a training division, its personnel will also be interviewed. Other government officials, technicians and consultants concerned with the programs and projects in the agencies in question may be approached where necessary and appropriate.

(c) Projects and Programs. To give practical focus to procedures and practices and in order to facilitate comparative analysis, an effort will be made to isolate one or two broad areas of development work in which all or most of the studied agencies engage, for more intensive study.

(d) Coordination of Affiliated Project Teams. Throughout the project, the IIED Assessment Team will work closely with each affiliated project team. At least three meetings would be held to bring together representatives of each affiliate with the IIED project team. A member of the IIED Team would travel to each bilateral aid agency to join representatives of the affiliated teams in some interviews with agency officials and other interested governmental officials.

The Institute would be in direct and regular communication with both the affiliated project team and the aid agency in question. Final responsibility for drafting reports, evaluating data and formulating recommendations would remain with the IIED. The reports and recommendations would not simply collate work gathered from the affiliated teams, but would result from an evaluation and review by the Assessment Project Team.

III. Financial Plan

Since the Institute is a non-profit public operating foundation, it is funded entirely by private foundations, UN agencies and governments. Thus, the proposed grant is highly appropriate in this context.

Funding for the proposed study is expected to come from several sources with the U.S. and Canada each contributing one-fourth of the central costs plus the local evaluation costs. The United Kingdom, Sweden and the Netherlands will together fund the other half of central costs and the Federal Republic of Germany will finance the evaluation of their bilateral aid organization. The United Nations Environment Program is funding start-up costs

of between $18,000 - $19,000. They were the principal financers of the study on the Development Financing Agencies.

If for some reason the U.S. funding was not secured, the project would probably fail because the other countries know the U.S. is the leader in taking the environment into account in development assistance and most would probably regard our non participation as a sign that we were not willing to be examined. When it comes to environmental assessment there is a desire on donor countries part to want to feel a part of the crowd and to appear forward thinking. Our willingness to share our approach and views is a wayfor others to build programs that meet their own needs. Our departure from the study would leave little incentive for them to participate.

The major components of AID's grant are as follows:

Affiliated portion.....	$44,000.00
One-fourth of the IIED portion.....	$56,000.00
	$ 100,000.00

The affiliated portion represents the funds needed to finance the study of the Agency by WRI who is the affiliated project team for the United States. A detailed breakdown of this portion of the budget is given in Table 1. The IIED budget, towards which AID is providing funding for one-fourth of the total, is represented in Table 2.

TABLE 1

VII. AFFILIATED PROJECT TEAM BUDGET
(as prepared by NRDC)

Thomas B. Stoel, Jr. - 1.5 work-months	$4,100	
S. Jacob Scherr - 3 work-months	5,300	
Professional - 7.5 work-months	11,200	
Secretaries	5,000	
Consultants*	2,000	
Total Salaries		$27,600
Fringe Benefits	3,800	
Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits		31,400
Rent	2,400	
Telephone	2,100	
Copying	300	
Postage	600	
Supplies	400	
Administration (accounting, etc.)	500	
Travel **	5,000	
Miscellaneous	1,000	
TOTAL	$44,300	

* These funds will be used to obtain short-term expert consultants to assist with reviews of AID's activities in one or more functional areas.

** Travel in connection with the Project will involve three trips to London for scheduled meetings with the IIED Assessment Project team and other Affiliated Project teams. One of these trips, most likely the one set for Month Eight or Nine of the Project, would be extended to include visits to AID Regional Offices and Missions in Africa.

TABLE 2

IIED BUDGET[1] (AID funding represents one-fourth of each item cost)

1. **Professional Salaries**			
Project Director: Robert O. Blake		$30,000	
Senior Staff: Brian Johnson, Robert E. Stein (9 work-months)		32,250[2]	
Program Associate: R. Thomas Hoffmann (12 work-months)		25,300[2]	
Research Assistance (3 work-months)		3,200[2]	
Sub-Total		$96,250	
2. **Support Staff**			
Full-time Secretary, Washington (18 work-months)		$20,700[2]	
Other Secretarial (IIED London and Washington Temporaries		4,500	
Sub-Total		$25,200	
Total Salaries		$121,450	
3. **Other Costs**		$ 9,300	
Office Expenses			
Telephone and Telex	$3,500		
Reproduction	1,500		
Postage	1,000		
Office Supplies	1,500		
Miscellaneous	1,300		
	$9,300		
Publication Costs		6,000	
IIED Travel[3]		39,600	
Contingencies		15,000	
		$69,900	
Total Other Costs		69,900	
4. **Overhead**[4]		$34,187	
TOTAL IIED BUDGET			$225,537

Budget Notes

1. This budget differs from the budget submitted with the IIED Environmental Assessment Program (dated January, 1978) by omitting the request for funds to support an IIED contribution to the Affiliated Project Teams. Thus, the total budget request is reduced from $288,537 to $225,537. The smaller figure includes all IIED costs, but no funds for the Affiliated Project Teams.

2. Includes benefits figured at 15% of salary.

3. The projected IIED travel budget is itemized in Budget Annex I, attached.

4. 25% of IIED costs, not including travel and contingencies.

BUDGET ANNEX I

TRAVEL*

Section 1. Washington/London, Round trips. Costs vary with time of year Low Season fare (YL) is $683; High Season fare (YH) is $821. Fares are all figured as high season.

Person	No. Trips	Fare	Sub-Total	Per Diem	Sub-Total	TOTAL
Hoffmann	4	821	$3,284.00	42(55)	$2,310.00	$5,594.00
Blake	5	821	4,105.00	42(55)	2,310.00	6,415.00
Stein	4	821	3,284.00	27(55)	1,485.00	4,769.00
Johnson	2	831	1,642.00	10(60)	600.00	2,242.00
						$19,020.00
				Inflation (10%) 1978:		1,902.00
						$20,922.00
				Inflation (10%) 1979:		2,092.20
						$23,014.20

Section 2. Round Trips to Agencies

Round trip	No. Trips	Fare	TOTAL
London/Paris	4	125.00	$500.00
London/Berlin	4	249.00	996.00
London/Stockholm	4	446.00	1,784.00
London/Amsterdam	4	134.00	536.00
Washington/Ottawa	4	127.44	509.76
			$4,325.76
		65 days Per Diem $60 ea.	3,900.00
			8,225.76
		Inflation (10%) 1978:	822.58
			9,048.23
		Inflation (10%) 1979:	904.83
			$9,953.17

* Cost estimates, including the provision to allow for inflation were provided by a professional travel agency. All air travel will be economy fare; hotels used will be moderate.

Section 3. Field Travel - (Hypothetical itineraries for purposes of estimating travel budget.)

A. Itinerary: London/Dakar, Senegal/Bamako, Mali/Niamey, Niger/Lagos, Nigeria/Dar es Salaam, Tanzania/London

Fare	$1,314.00
30 days ($80) Per Diem	2,400.00
	$3,714.00
Inflation (10%) 1978:	371.40
	4,085.40
Inflation (10%) 1979:	408.54
	$4,493.94

Inflation Total $779.94

B. Itinerary: Washington/Lima, Peru/Bogota, Columbia/Mexico City/Washington

Fare	$ 723.00
15 days ($70) Per Diem	1,050.00
	1,773.00
Inflation (10%) 1978:	177.30
	1,950.30
Inflation (10%) 1979:	195.03
	$2,145.33

Inflation Total $372.32

Assuming that field travel is performed in 1979, total cost for two trips: $6,639.27

Sections 1, 2, & 3, Totals. IIED Travel.

Section 1.	Trans-Atlantic	$23,014.20
Section 2.	Round Trips to Agencies	9,953.17
Section 3.	Field Travel	6,639.27
	TOTAL	$39,606.64

IV. Implementation

Projected Work Schedule: (beginning July 1, 1978)

Month One (with possible overlap to Month Two): Selection Affiliated Project teams.

Months Two-Three: Background research.

Month Four: Advise Affiliates on project methodology, and meeting in London to discuss methodology.

Months Five-Seven: First round of interviews to be conducted by the IIED Assessment team with local affiliated groups.

Months Eight-Nine: Preparation and distribution of interim Report. Second London Meeting.

Months Ten-Twelve: Second series of interviews, focusing in greater detail on specific problems identified during the earlier part of the study.

Months Eleven-Fourteen: Visits to field offices of aid agencies as necessary to supplement headquarters interviews. Possible use of consultants during this period.

Months Fifteen-Eighteen: Final London meeting. Drafting of Final Report. Editor to be employed during this period.

V. Evaluation Plan

Two reports will be prepared during the course of the project study. The first, an interim report, would be in the nature of a working paper and given limited circulation. It would be submitted to the studied agencies, other financial supporters of the project, and a limited number of non participants for review and comment. This report would be completed after nine months. Comments and suggestions would be reflected in the work carried out during the second half of the project, and in the Final Report.

The Final Report would be submitted, and broadly distributed upon completion of the project. A final draft will be discussed with each of the studied agencies in advance of publication.

Both the interim report and the draft final report will be reviewed by DS/ST and Mr. Albert C. Printz, Jr., Environmental Affairs Coordinator, in conjunction with the Committee on Environment and Development (COED).

A N N E X E S

I. IIED GRANT PROPOSAL

II. INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION IEE

ANNEX II

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION

The proposed project is concerned with transferring knowledge and understanding in the environment/natural resources field and will not have a significant effect or secondary effect on the environment. This activity will, however, improve capability in AID and developing countries to make more environmentally sound decisions regarding development which will contribute to the protection of the environment. Negative determination is therefore recommended.

While this project in itself would not create a need for an environmental assessment as required by AID regulations, it should be noted that the study of environmental procedures and practices of various bilateral agencies may bring into perspective the need for incorporating environmental concerns and factors into all levels of the project design process. This may be accomplished by presenting a more clear understanding of the term "Environmental Assessment" as it is appropriate to sound development. This realization may spur bilateral donors into re-examining their present environmental policies and to focus their future effort into making environmental assessment an even more integral component of project analysis. Should these events and actions occur, a significant improvement could be brought to the manner in which developing and developed countries evaluate human needs and set priorities for development.

ANNEX II

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION

The proposed project is concerned with transferring knowledge and understanding in the environment/natural resources field and will not have a significant effect or secondary effect on the environment. This activity will, however, improve capability in AID and developing countries to make more environmentally sound decisions regarding development which will contribute to the protection of the environment. Negative determination is therefore recommended.

While this project in itself would not create a need for an environmental assessment as required by AID regulations, it should be noted that the study of environmental procedures and practices of various bilateral agencies may bring into perspective the need for incorporating environmental concerns and factors into all levels of the project design process. This may be accomplished by presenting a more clear understanding of the term "Environmental Assessment" as it is appropriate to sound development. This realization may spur bilateral donors into re-examining their present environmental policies and to focus their future effort into making environmental assessment an even more integral component of project analysis. Should these events and actions occur, a significant improvement could be brought to the manner in which developing and developed countries evaluate human needs and set priorities for development.

IIED INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
President: Barbara Ward Baroness Jackson of Lodsworth, D.B.E.

TOWARDS SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

IIED Environmental Assessment Program

Request to

U.S. Agency for International Development

for Support for:

Bilateral Aid and the Environment:
A Study of Seven Bilateral Development Assistance Agencies

March, 1978

IIED Assessment Project Team

PROGRAM TITLE: Towards Sustainable Development
IIED Environmental Assessment Program

PROJECT TITLE: Bilateral Aid and the Environment
A Study of Seven Bilateral Development Assistance Agencies

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The International Institute for Environment and Deve opment was established in January, 1971, as the International Institute for Environmental Affairs,* to analyze and bring a positive influence to bear on areas with an important international dimension where economic policy and environmental considerations coincide and where there is a potential for both conflict and reconciliation between them. Currently, the Institute is concerned with issues of future energy and food supplies, the development of adequate shelter and clean water for mankind, the continued good health of the world's oceans and the environmental consequences of major aid programs. The Institute runs an environmental information unit for the press, called EARTHSCAN, and maintains close working contact with many non-governmental organizations working in similar fields around the world.

For the past year, one of the IIED's principal undertakings has been to conduct a research program on the environmental policies and programs of the international development community. Thus far, an interim report has been published concerning Multilateral Aid and the Environment:

---

* The name of the Institute was changed in 1974. The IIED is a non-profit public operating foundation with offices located in London and Washington. It is funded by private foundations, U.N. agencies and governments. A list of its International Board of Directors and

PROGRAM TITLE: Towards Sustainable Development
IIED Environmental Assessment Program

PROJECT TITLE: Bilateral Aid and the Environment
A Study of Seven Bilateral Development Assistance Agencies

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The International Institute for Environment and Development was established in January, 1971, as the International Institute for Environmental Affairs,* to analyze and bring a positive influence to bear on areas with an important international dimension where economic policy and environmental considerations coincide and where there is a potential for both conflict and reconciliation between them. Currently, the Institute is concerned with issues of future energy and food supplies, the development of adequate shelter and clean water for mankind, the continued good health of the world's oceans and the environmental consequences of major aid programs. The Institute runs an environmental information unit for the press, called EARTHSCAN, and maintains close working contact with many non-governmental organizations working in similar fields around the world.

For the past year, one of the IIED's principal undertakings has been to conduct a research program on the environmental policies and programs of the international development community. Thus far, an interim report has been published concerning Multilateral Aid and the Environment:

---

* The name of the Institute was changed in 1974. The IIED is a non-profit public operating foundation with offices located in London and Washington. It is funded by private foundations, U.N. agencies and governments. A list of its International Board of Directors and Council is attached to this proposal as VIII, below.

an appreciation of the finite demands which can be made on human and natural resources. The planning and execution of development programs must reflect this understanding and appreciation so as to assure, insofar as possible, that the intended development goals will be achieved.

Aid agencies influence the development policies of the governments of developing countries both by the volume of assistance they provide and by the example established by their programs. Unfortunately, too often development aid programs do not reflect in principle or practice the lesson made clear, sometimes tragically in recent years, that neither sustained development nor a sustaining environment can be sacrificed for the sake of the other. Many developing nations have a scarce or uncertain natural resource base which heightens the need to undertake only environmentally sustainable development projects. In addition, the cumulative progress of national development inevitably affects not just the environment of a nation, but of a continent or the entire planet.

By establishing an environmental assessment program, the IIED hopes to advance this emerging interest where it exists and encourage development decision-makers to establish environmental policies where they have not done so. The Institute has never been an organization content solely to perform research and to rely only upon publication channels to promote its results. It has always valued its role as a stimulant of public debate and a catalyst of responsible decision-making. A great deal more research must be done into the policies and programs of many of the groups which initiate or implement development projects. Simultaneously, policy-

makers in governments and aid institutions must be exposed to the reasons for including environmental factors in any program intended to promote sustainable development.

Five groups at which the IIED Program is aimed can be identified:

1. Officials concerned with multilateral and bilateral development assistance of donor countries.

2. Environmental experts concerned more directly with development, including in particular, operational staff of aid agencies and national development ministries, whose work could have an important influence on the environmental dimension of development projects.

3. Officials of governments of developing countries which draw on the funds of these organizations.

4. Agencies within donor governments that are concerned with the development process.

5. Citizen groups; environment and/or development oriented private organizations; and, largely through the media, the public.

The proposed program aims at these particular audiences because the cumulative impact of reaching all of them could accomplish three objectives. First, the involvement and commitment of governments in developing countries to environmentally sound development of their human and natural resources is, and must be, an important objective of IIED's assessment program. The second objective involves directly improving the environmental work of the aid institutions and other involved organizations. The agencies are world-wide leaders in the development field, and it is surely time to try to persuade them of the responsibilities of that position. The third objective of the program is to catalyze the concern and involvement of as many organizations and individuals as possible. Whenever possible, IIED will

solicit the active support or co-sponsorship of other like-minded organizations. In this way, it will be possible not just to disseminate IIED's views, but to create an informal network of research organizations and citizen groups who will take up similar and related issues. Indeed, the foundations of such a network have already been set out in the concept of locating "affiliated project teams" to conduct aspects of the research in the study of bilateral aid agencies.

III. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

The proposed project "Bilateral Aid and The Environment: A Study of Seven Bilateral Development Assistance Agencies," is the centerpiece of the thirty-month program envisioned by the IIED. The results of this study, when read in conjunction with the results of the just-completed multilateral study, will establish an overview of the extent to which official development programs are being carried out in an environmentally sound manner.

Each of the seven countries to be included in the proposed study has undergone an encouraging awakening in recent years to domestic problems of environmental protection and planning. Many non-governmental and public-interest organizations have sprung up in these countries. Although environmental considerations do not always prevail in domestic decision making processes, nevertheless, those factors are weighed increasingly before many critical decisions are made. It is important to compare environmental procedures of aid agencies, where these have been established, and in other cases to discuss the implications of their

absence. Thus, the proposed study will look for policy statements, procedural innovations, and practical measures designed to foster environmentally sustainable development. It will also evaluate how well these new criteria are being implemented, and whether specific projects reflect an enhanced understanding of environmental problems.

The U.S. Agency for International Development has recently emerged as a leader in the field. Like the World Bank among multilateral aid agencies, it alone among bilateral agencies has established clear enforceable environmental review procedures. It has also established an environmental coordinating office. In addition, AID operates under the mandate of "New Directions in Development Assistance" established by the Congress, which had as its principal purpose to make U.S. aid programs more directly responsive to the most pervasive problems of poor people in the less developed countries. Most recently, the maintenance of the natural resource base of developing countries, and the furtherance of principles of sustainable development, was adopted as one of AID's priority missions.

Against this background, it is clear that a study of AID's treatment of environmental problems could illuminate the much discussed but little understood relationship between "environment" and "development" It may be that principles of sustainable development are closer at hand than is generally realized. For example, in the IIED's multilateral study it was discovered that sound <u>environmental</u> practice is frequently indistinguishable from sound <u>developmental</u> practice. This observation

also implies that AID can benefit from a study of the practices of other aid agencies, even when these are not officially designated as "environmental." In deciding how best to carry out its mandate, AID could only gain from learning what priorities other aid organizations have established, and how these have reflected a growing awareness of environmental problems.

The sheer volume of aid which flows from the agencies to be included in this study presses its urgency, since postponement of a serious evaluation of the environmental effects of this aid can only exacerbate the problem. The policy-makers in governments, aid agencies and international institutions to whom a report of the study would be distributed are becoming increasingly concerned with the matter. Fortunately, an interest has also been shown by developing nations in caring for their environment, and where appropriate receiving international or foreign advice and assistance. Many developing countries have recognized that their environmental problems are unique to their particular circumstances of development, and must not be overlooked by their development plan.

IV. WORK PLAN

To carry out the proposed inquiry the IIED intends to initiate coordinated research into the environmental practices and procedures of the aid agency in each of the countries to be included in the study.

The Institute will select and work with affiliated project teams in most or all of the countries involved. Each affiliate will, under the supervision of the IIED Assessment Project Team, carry out much of the actual research on the bilateral aid program in its country. The Institute has some useful experience organizing a similar network of associated organizations as part of its work in reviewing follow-up to the U.N. Human Settlements Conference.

1. Affiliated Project Team

The procedure of establishing local research affiliations has several advantages. First, each affiliated project team will be able to evaluate the operations of an aid agency in its domestic political context. In order to compare an aid agency's environmental work abroad to the priorities established at home, these local teams will utilize their knowledge of domestic environmental and aid attitudes, priorities and regulations. Second, local affiliates can be expected to have the confidence of and access to local organizations on which the success of the project in part depends. Third, it would be unwieldy and unduly time-consuming to assemble one central project team to carry out so large a study.

2. Research Methodology

This study will require approximately eighteen months to complete. During that period, we expect to publish an interim working paper, to allow interested parties to offer comments and suggestions. The

Institute has frequently used this technique with considerable success as a means of identifying gaps in knowledge. At the end of the project a comprehensive Final Report will be prepared and given the broadest possible dissemination around the world.

The Assessment Project Team believes that a closely coordinated methodology is essential to a comparative study. A period of several months will be used to work out detailed methodological instruction and guidelines for all the affiliated organizations, and to assure that these will be applied in practice. The research technique will mainly consist of the following steps:

(a) Background Research. Background research papers will be written as briefing documents for those members of the Team who visit the studied agencies. Management at each Institution will be contacted at the highest levels, both to gain full cooperation and to outline the specific aims of our research.

(b) Interviews. In each agency, interviews will be conducted with personnel at all levels charged formally or informally with environmental duties, as well as with regional and sectoral staff, technical advisors, legal and post-audit staff, and methodology economists. Where the studied agency includes a training division, its personnel will also be interviewed. Other government officials, technicians and consultants concerned with the programs and projects in the agencies in question may be approached where necessary and appropriate.

(c) Projects and Programs. To give practical focus to procedures and practices and in order to facilitate comparative analysis, an effort will be made to isolate one or two broad areas of development work in which all or most of the studied agencies engage, for more intensive study.

(d) Coordination of Affiliated Project Teams. Throughout the project, the IIED Assessment Team will work closely with each affiliated project team. At least three meetings would be held to bring together representatives of each affiliate with the IIED Project team. A member of the IIED Team would travel to each bilateral aid agency to join representatives of the affiliated teams in some interviews with agency officials and other interested governmental officials.

The Institute would of course be in direct and regular communication with both the affiliated project team and the aid agency in question. Final responsibility for drafting reports, evaluating data and formulating recommendations would remain with the IIED. The reports and recommendations would not simply collate work gathered from the affiliated teams, but would result from an evaluation and review by the Assessment Project Team.

3. Project Work Schedule *

Month One (with possible overlap to Month Two): Selection of Affiliated Project teams.

Months Two-Three: Background research.

Month Four: Advise Affiliates on project methodology, and meeting in London to discuss methodology.

* Note that the IIED Project Work Schedule covers eighteen months while the schedules of Affiliated Project Team's may be somewhat shorter. The additional three months will allow IIED to select and prepare all the teams and to prepare the Final Report of the Project.

Months Five-Seven: First round of interviews to be conducted by the IIED Assessment team with local affiliated groups.

Months Eight-Nine: Preparation and distribution of interim report. Second London Meeting.

Months Ten-Twelve: Second series of interviews, focusing in greater detail on specific problems identified during the earlier part of the study.

Months Eleven-Fourteen: Visits to field offices of aid agencies as necessary to supplement headquarters interviews. Possible use of consultants during this period.

Months Fifteen-Eighteen: Final London meeting. Drafting of Final Report. Editor to be employed during this period.

4. Principal IIED Project Staff

Brian Johnson, Program Co-Director, London: Mr. Johnson is a Senior Fellow of the IIED, a Fellow of the Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, and was formerly Director of the Institute for the Study of International Organizations. He was a co-director of the Institute's multilateral study, has acted as a Consultant to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, UNESCO, UNEP, UNDP and the International Planned Parenthood Federation. He has written and lectured on international economic and environmental subjects.

Robert E. Stein, Program Co-Director, Washington, D.C.: Mr. Stein is Director of the Institute's North American office and was a co-director of the Institute's multilateral study. He has worked in the legal offices of the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. At the American Society of International Law he has served as Acting Director of Studies. From 1970 to 1972 he was a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. He is the author and editor of works dealing with management of international environmental activities.

Robert O. Blake, Bilateral Project Director, Washington, D.C. Mr. Blake served in the U.S. Foreign Service for thirty years before retiring in 1977 with the rank of Career Minister. He was Senior Advisor on international environmental policy to the Administrator of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency during 1976-77, and for three years prior to that period he was Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations. He has served as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Mali and Minister and Deputy Chief of Mission of the U.S. Embassy in Paris, France. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and of the Board of Directors of the Natural Resources Defense Council.

P. Thomas Hoffmann, Program Associate, Washington, D.C.: Mr. Hoffmann is an Associate in the Washington office of IIED. He has law degrees from Lincoln College, University of Oxford and New York University School of Law where he was a Root-Tilden Fellow. He is a member of the Board of Trustees of the International Development Conference.

5. Affiliated Project Team Staff

We expect the Affiliated Project Team studying AID to be the International Project of the Natural Resources Defense Council. Principal Investigators would be Thomas B. Stoel, Jr. and S. Jacob Scherr. A third professional staff member would be hired once project funding is assured. These arrangements remain subject to final discussion between IIED and AID.

6. Financial Support for the Project

It was hoped but not anticipated, that each of the seven aid agencies to be studied would contribute toward meeting the overall cost of the project. The Institute now expects, with some confidence, that the Canadian International Development Agency and the U.N. Environment Programme will each contribute roughly one-fourth of the total project costs. A fourth major donor may be found among the Dutch or Swedish aid agencies. Or, if AID, CIDA and UNEP provide three-fourths of the needed funds, the remaining funds could also be generated from foundation and private sources.

V. PROJECT REPORTING SCHEDULE

According to the Project Work Schedule, two reports will be prepared. The first, an interim report, would be in the nature of a working paper and given limited circulation. It would be submitted to the studied agencies, other financial supporters of the project, and a limited number of non-participants for review and comment. This report would be completed after nine months. Comments and suggestions would be reflected in the work carried out during the second half of the project, and in the Final Report.

The Final Report would be submitted, and broadly distributed, upon completion of the project. A final draft will be discussed with each of the studied agencies in advance of publication.

VI. IIED BUDGET[1]

1. Professional Salaries

Project Director: Robert O. Blake	$30,000
Senior Staff: Brian Johnson Robert E. Stein (9-work-months)	32,250[2]
Program Associate : R. Thomas Hoffmann (12 work-months)	25,300[2]
Research Assistance (3 work-months)	9,200[2]
Sub-Total	$96,250

2. Support Staff

Full-time Secretary, Washington (18 work-months)	$20,700[2]
Other Secretarial (IIED London and Washington Temporaries)	4,500
Sub-Total	$25,200
Total Salaries	$121,450

3. Other Costs

Office Expenses		$ 9,300
Telephone and Telex	$3,500	
Reproduction	1,500	
Postage	1,000	
Office Supplies	1,500	
Miscellaneous	1,800	
	$9,300	
Publication Costs		6,000
IIED Travel[3]		39,600
Contingencies		15,000
		$69,900
Total Other Costs		69,900

4. Overhead[4]

$34,187

TOTAL IIED BUDGET $225,537

Budget Notes

1. This budget differs from the budget submitted with the IIED Environmental Assessment Program (dated January, 1978) by omitting the request for funds to support an IIED contribution to the Affiliated Project Teams. Thus, the total budget request is reduced from $288,537 to $225,537. The smaller figure includes all IIED costs, but no funds for the Affiliated Project Teams.

2. Includes benefits figured at 15% of salary.

3. The projected IIED travel budget is itemized in Budget Annex I, attached.

4. 25% of IIED costs, not including travel and contingencies.

BUDGET ANNEX I

TRAVEL*

Section 1. Washington/London, Round trips. Costs vary with time of year Low Season fare (YL) is $683; High Season fare (YH) is $821. Fares are all figured as high season.

Person	No. Trips	Fare	Sub-Total	Per Diem	Sub-Total	TOTAL
Hoffmann	4	821	$3,284.00	42(55)	$2,310.00	$5,594.00
Blake	5	821	4,105.00	42(55)	2,310.00	6,415.00
Stein	4	821	3,284.00	27(55)	1,485.00	4,769.00
Johnson	2	831	1,642.00	10(60)	600.00	2,242.00
						$19,020.00
				Inflation (10%) 1978:		1,902.00
						$20,922.00
				Inflation (10%) 1979:		2,092.20
						$23,014.20

Section 2. Round Trips to Agencies

Round trip	No. Trips	Fare	TOTAL
London/Paris	4	125.00	$500.00
London/Berlin	4	249.00	996.00
London/Stockholm	4	446.00	1,784.00
London/Amsterdam	4	134.00	536.00
Washington/Ottawa	4	127.44	509.76
			$4,325.76
		65 days Per Diem $60 ea.	3,900.00
			8,225.76
		Inflation (10%) 1978:	822.58
			9,048.23
		Inflation (10%) 1979:	904.83
			$9,953.17

* Cost estimates, including the provision to allow for inflation were provided by a professional travel agency. All air travel will be economy fare; hotels used will be moderate.

Section 3. Field Travel - (Hypothetical itineraries for purposes of estimating travel budget.)

A. Itinerary: London/Dakar, Senegal/Bamako, Mali/Niamey, Niger/Lagos, Nigeria/Dar es Salaam, Tanzania/London

Fare	$1,314.00
30 days ($80) Per Diem	2,400.00
	$3,714.00
Inflation (10%) 1978:	371.40
	4,085.40
Inflation (10%) 1979:	408.54
	$4,493.94

Inflation Total $779.94

B. Itinerary: Washington/Lima, Peru/Bogota, Columbia/Mexico City/Washington

Fare	$ 723.00
15 days ($70) Per Diem	1,050.00
	1,773.00
Inflation (10%) 1978:	177.30
	1,950.30
Inflation (10%) 1979:	195.03
	$2,145.33

Inflation Total $372.32

Assuming that field travel is performed in 1979, total cost for two trips: $6,639.27

Sections 1, 2, & 3, Totals. IIED Travel.

Section 1.	Trans-Atlantic	$23,014.20
Section 2.	Round Trips to Agencies	9,953.17
Section 3.	Field Travel	6,639.27
	TOTAL	$39,606.64

VII. AFFILIATED PROJECT TEAM BUDGET
(as prepared by NRDC)

Thomas B. Stoel, Jr. - 1.5 work-months	$4,100	
S. Jacob Scherr - 3 work-months	5,300	
Professional - 7.5 work-months	11,200	
Secretaries	5,000	
Consultants*	2,000	
Total Salaries		$27,600
Fringe Benefits	3,800	
Total Salaries and Fringe Benefits		31,400
Rent	2,400	
Telephone	2,100	
Copying	900	
Postage	600	
Supplies	400	
Administration (accounting, etc.)	500	
Travel **	5,000	
Miscellaneous	1,000	
TOTAL	$44,300	

* These funds will be used to obtain short-term expert consultants to assist with reviews of AID's activities in one or more functional areas.

** Travel in connection with the Project will involve three trips to London for scheduled meetings with the IIED Assessment Project team and other Affiliated Project teams. One of these trips, most likely the one set for Month Eight or Nine of the Project, would be extended to include visits to AID Regional Offices and Missions in Africa.

VIII.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Co-Chairmen

Robert O. Anderson,* Chairman of the Board, ARCO, Chairman of the Board of the Aspen Institute, Expert on Energy/Environmental Problems

Sir John Foster,* K.B.E., QC, Member of Parliament for over twenty-five years, member of the International Commission of Jurists, prominent British tax lawyer

Abdlatif Y. Al-Hammad, Director General of the Kuwait Fund for Arab Economic Development

Henrik Beer,* Secretary-General, League of Red Cross Societies, Senior Consultant to the United Nations Environment Programme on Non-Governmental Activities

Thornton Bradshaw, President of ARCO, Trustee of the Aspen Institute and Member of the Board, Foreign Policy Association.

Antonio Carrillo-Flores, former Ambassador to the United States from Mexico, Finance Minister, Mexico, Secretary-General of the United Nations Population Conference

Baroness Jackson,* President of the IIED, Member House of Lords, world renowned writer and speaker on environment and development issues

Akliilu Lemma, Professor, Institute of Pathobiology, Ethiopia, expert on environmental health problems with emphasis on tropical diseases and water-borne diseases, Consultant to the Aspen Institute

Ian MacGregor, Chairman of the Board, AMAX, Member of the Board of Resources for the Future and Vice-President of the International Chamber of Commerce

Max Nicholson, former member of the British Council on Scientific Policy, Convener of the Conservation Section of the International Biological Program, former Director-General of the United Kingdom Nature Conservancy, now Chairman, Land Use Consultants, Ltd.

Saburo Okita, President Economic Cooperation Fund of Japan, member of the Commission on International Development of the IBID, original member of the Club of Rome

Aurelio Peccei, founder of The Club of Rome, former Senior Executive of Fiat and Olivetti

Enrique Penalosa, private consultant, formerly Secretary-General of Habitat, United Nations Conference on Human Settlement, and previously Administrative Manager of the Inter-American Development Bank

Otto Soemarwoto, Director of Bio-Management, Indonesia, well known leader from a developing country in the area of development and the environment

Maurice F. Strong,* Chairman of the Board, Petro-Canada, formerly Executive Director United Nations Environment Programme, Secretary-General United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, former President Canadian International Development Agency, former President Power Corporation of Canada

* Members of the Executive Committee

COUNCIL

Harrison Brown, formerly Foreign Secretary, United States National Academy of Sciences, Professor, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California

Gerardo Budowski, Director of Forestry Department Centro Agronomica Tropical De Investigacion Y Ensenanza, former Secretary-General of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Morges, Switzerland

Carlos Chagas, Biophysicist, member of United Nations Advisory Committee on Science and Technology (ACAST), Director Instituto de Biofisica

Khun Pradisth Cheosakul, President National Research Council, Thailand

Rajiishwar Dayal, former Senior Fellow Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, formerly Secretary Foreign Ministry of India and member of United Nations Commission on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

Robert Gardiner, former Executive Secretary United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, now in Ghana as Commissioner for Economic Planning

Christian Halby, financial consultant, formerly officer of the Danish Foreign Service

Felipe Herrera, formerly Executive Director Inter-American Development Bank, well known economist

Rt.Hon. Roy Jenkins, President, Commission of the European Communities, former Home Secretary United Kingdom, Chancellor of the Exchequer, prominent historian

Robert S. McNamara, President International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, former United States Secretary of Defense, member of the Board of Trustees, the Aspen Institute and the Ford Foundation, former President of Ford Motor Company

Arvid Pardo, Professor Department of Political Science, University of Southern California, former Senior Fellow and Coordinator of Oceans Program for the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, formerly Ambassador from Malta to the United States, Soviet Union, and the United Nations, considered "father" of the UN Law of the Sea Conference

Raul Prebisch, formerly Executive Secretary United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America, former Secretary-General for the UN Conference on Trade and Development, director-General, Latin American Institute of Economics and Social Planning

Jack Raymond, former New York Times reporter and first President of the International Institute for Environmental Affairs, the predecessor to IIED

Walter Orr Roberts, world renowned climatologist, founder of the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado

Ro Chung-Hyun, prominent Korean urbanist and professor at Yonsei University

James Rouse, well known developer, President, Rouse Associates, developer of Columbia Maryland, and other areas

Joseph E. Slater, President, the Aspen Institute, and former Senior Officer of the Ford Foundation

Soedjatmoko, former Ambassador from Indonesia to the United States, now Director of Indonesian Planning Agency, present member of the Board of Trustees of the Ford Foundation

Víctor Urquidi, President, El Colegio de Mexico, member of the Club of Rome, prominent Mexican educator

Lord Zuckerman, formerly Chief Scientific Adviser to the British Government, honorary Secretary, London Zoological Society, former Chairman Defense Research Policy Committee, former Committee on Scientific Manpower, Chief Scientific Adviser, Secretary of State for Defense in the British Government, member United Kingdom World Commission on Environmental Pollution