PD-AAR-964

AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

FY 83

SENEGAL

BEST AVAILABLE

JUNE 1981

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

Table of Contents

	Pages
1. Table I - Long Range Plan and Narrative	1
2. Table III - Projects Obligations by Appropriation Account: FY 1981-1983	7
3. Table IV - Project Budget Data	9
4. New Project Narratives:	
A. 0217 Family Health - Phase I	13
B. 0222 Youth Job Development	15
C. 0242 Rural Health Services - Phase II	16
D. 0246 Renewable Energy - Phase II	18
E. 0248 Family Health - Phase II	20
F. 0256 Rural Management (ENEA)	22
G. 0257 Land Resource Regeneration	24
H. 0258 Cooperatives Operations	26
I. 0259 Fuelwood Production - Phase II	28
J. 0260 PVO Sector Grant	30
K. 0261 Ag Sector Training (INDR)	32
5. Table V - Proposed Program Ranking	34
6. Proposed Program Ranking Narrative	35
7. Workforce and Operating Expenses	37
A. Table VIII - Operating Expense Summary	39
B. Table IX - Overseas Workforce Requirements Schedule	41
8. P.L. 480	
A. Title I/III Narrative	44
B. Table XI - PL 480 Title I/III Requirements	52
C. Table XIII - PL 480 Title II Narrative	57

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE I - LONG RANGE PLAN BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT ($ Thousands)

Country/Office SENEGAL

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE	FY 1981 EST	FY 1982 EST	FY 1983 REQUEST MIN	FY 1983 REQUEST CURR	FY 1983 REQUEST AAPL	PLANNING PERIOD 1984	PLANNING PERIOD 1985	PLANNING PERIOD 1986	PLANNING PERIOD 1987
Sahel Devel. Programs	14,234	18,000	16,500	18,500	22,000	25,000	28,000	32,000	36,000
Contraceptive Requir.	(452)	(669)	(900)	(900)	(900)				
Regional Funds 1/	2,425	2,475	1,825	1,825	1,825	2,170	2,325	2,475	2,550
Total DA	16,659	20,475	18,325	20,325	23,825	27,170	30,325	34,475	38,550
Economic Support Fund									
Grants		10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000				
Loans		-	-	-	-				
Total ESF		10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000				
Total DA and ESF	16,659	30,475	28,325	30,325	33,825	27,170	30,325	34,475	38,550

1/ Excludes funds for Regional Crop Protection Project

PL 480 (non-add)							
Title I	7,000	7,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
(of which Title III)	7,000	7,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Title II	6,873	8,170	9,179	9,900	10,700	8,800	7,040
Total Personnel							
USDH (Work Years)	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
FNDH (Work Years)	22	22	22	22	22	22	22

MANAGEMENT NARRATIVE FOR THE ABS

Table I Narrative

Part I

The Direct-Hire planning level required to carry out the FY 83 AAPL Program has been reduced by two U.S. Direct Hire positions - from 28 to 26 - below the level included in the USAID Annual Budget Submission for FY 82. With three IDI personnel, the total USDH level required in FY 1982 and beyond is 29. This 26 USDH level represents, however, an increase of 2 person years above the 24 person ceiling given to USAID/Senegal in the FY 1983 ABS Guidance. It will be evident from the foregoing that the USAID feels that it cannot discharge both its bilateral and regional responsibilities with a direct-hire personnel level of 24. We are, therefore, recommending that the USDH level of 26 (not including the 3 IDI's) be continued for FY 83.

This level in reality absorbs a reduction of an additional, third, position compared to FY 82. It has now been decided that the USAID must assume additional responsibilities with the transfer of the Sene-Gambia River Commission to Dakar. A position ceiling had been approved for the AID office in the Gambia for the implementation of the AID assistance program to the Sene-Gambia River Commission. USAID/Senegal will not claim this extra ceiling. Instead, the Mission will absorb this by reducing the direct-hire staff in the Regional Controller's Office from 3 to 2.

If a ceiling of 24 person years is imposed on the combined Senegal and OMVS-OMVG program management, as was proposed in the FY 1983 ABS Guidance, we would recommend deferring indefinitely U.S. participation in the OMVS Integrated Development Program. The OMVS office would then be responsible for Agronomic Research, Groundwater Monitoring, and Fiscal Allocation. One direct-hire person with contract support and support from the USAID/Senegal Agricultural Division could possibly handle these responsibilities. We would also have to decline responsibility for the OMVG Programs thereby reducing the OMVS Office from 4 to 1. The other position could be saved by moving the headquarters for the Regional Crop Protection Program from Dakar to another site, for example, the Cameroon. Responsibility for the bilateral portion of this project would then be absorbed by the Agricultural Division.

The title of the USAID/OMVS office will be changed to the USAID/River Basin Office since it will be responsible for programs in both Senegal and Gambia River Systems (OMVG). A separate ABS for this program is being submitted totalling $71 million over the FY 82-87 period. Because of the magnitude of this River Basin program, a special program management contract will be required for the OMVS Integrated Development Project which is budgeted at $57 million over the next six years. The office proper will be manned by 4 direct-hire personnel. These will include:

1 River Basin Coordinator
1 Program Officer
2 Project Managers.

The balance of 22 positions are assigned to USAID/Senegal. Of these, 6 have responsibilities which extend beyond the Senegal bilateral program. These 6 direct-hire officers with regional responsibilities beyond those of the River Basin functions are:

1. Regional Food for Peace Officer with responsibility for the Gambia and for substantial trans-shipments of food from the port of Dakar to Mauritania;

2. Project Manager for the Regional Crop Protection Program operating in 7 countries;

3. Project Design Officer who is responsible for design of the OMVS and Gambia River Programs as well as for bilateral Senegal Programs;

4. 2 Financial Management Officers:
   The Regional Controller and the Budget and Fiscal Officer with responsibilities for Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde, the OVMS, OMVG as well as for Senegal. The assignment of a Controller to the Gambia as well as the development of local staff capacities will permit in FY 83 the elimination of the Financial Analyst previously assigned to this office.

5. The USAID Project Support Officer assists Mauritania, Cape Verde, Guinea-Bissau and The Gambia with commodity procurement and Dakar port clearances.

Of the 26 U.S. direct-hire positions (plus 3 IDI's), 4 in the River Basin office have no bilateral responsibilities whatsoever and 6 more spend between 90% (Crop Protection Officer) and 15% (Food for Peace Officer) of their time on programs other than USAID/Senegal. USAID considers that the 16 person direct-hire workforce which is entirely devoted to bilateral affairs plus the 6 others directly associated with USAID but with regional responsibilities, should be sufficient to manage the $22 million AAPL and the $24 million PL 480 Programs (plus emergency shipments, if any) in FY 83. We would anticipate that it may be possible to reduce this level by 1 or even 2 positions by FY 84 because of the development of Senegalese professionals to take the place of Americans. We have not definitely programmed this reduction, however.

The USAID staffing is organized as follows:

- Director's Office with Deputy Director and 1 American Secretary.
- Management Office under the responsibility of 1 American Management Officer.
- Food for Peace Office with the Regional Food for Peace Officer and 1 IDI. This office has overall responsibility for Title III Programs which in FY 83 are expected to reach $15 million annually and for Title II Programs estimated at $9 million annually.
- Health Office with a direct-hire Chief and 1 IDI is responsible for rural health and family planning programs with Life of Project costs totalling $28 million. USAID is attempting to recruit on a contract basis an officer who would be responsible for population activities under the direction of the Health Officer.

- Project Design Office is comprised of 4 direct-hire positions:

. Senior Resources Development Officer
. Assistant Project Development Officer
. USAID Engineer
. Human Resources Development Officer

This office has overall responsibility for all elements of project pre-feasibility and planning. It also conducts quarterly project review which are carried out for every activity in the USAID and regional portfolios. The USAID Engineer also conducts continuing onsite inspections for the very substantial construction program.

- Project Support Office is managed by 1 direct-hire American. He is responsible for all USAID/Senegal procurement as well as assisting AID operations in The Gambia, Mauritania, Cape Verde and Guinea-Bissau. This office also supplies logistical support for all outlying project sites. This support includes provisioning and equipping teams responsible for project implementation, supplying of housing and all aspects of logistical support. The annual procurement managed by this office averages a total of $2.5 million.

- Regional Controller Office is as noted above. The number of direct-hire Americans in this office will be reduced from 3 to 2 with the arrival of the Controller for The Gambia.

- Program Office has responsibility for all aspects of program planning, budgeting and evaluation. This office will continue with 3 USDH positions. These include:

. Program Officer
. Deputy Program Officer
. Program Economist.

- As noted above, the River Basin Development Office is responsible for River Basin portfolios in excess of $95 million (total, all years). It will be staffed with:

. River Basin Coordinator
. Program Officer
. 2 Project Managers.

Because of difficulties in recruitment, the direct-hire irrigation engineer position has been dropped and will be filled through a contract.

- Agricultural Division has responsibility for implementation of Title III and dollar financed activities with life of project financing (authorized programs only) totaling $96 million. This division consist of:

. Senior Agricultural Development Officer
. Deputy Agricultural Development Officer

The Deputy Agricultural Development Officer has responsibility for project operations and has reporting directly to him 4 direct-hire project managers and one IDI.

- Regional Crop Protection Office is run by 1 RASA employee from USDA.

The management strategy which the USAID has had under implementation for the past year and a half is proving successful. It is only by strictly adhering to this strategy that USAID can discharge its overall program responsibilities for a program of this magnitude within a ceiling of 26 positions. The projects presented in the FY 83 ABS reflect the 3 principal objectives of this management strategy. These are:

- increasing the efficiency and rate of project implementation;

- reducing the cost and increasing the continuity of all USAID management components by means of the Senegalization of the USAID staff; and

- development of project selection criteria which facilitate program management.

Implementation. The strategy outline presented in the CDSS and reflected in the ABS will have significant impact upon implementation by concentrating AID programs in three geographic areas; the Casamance, the Peanut Basin and the Senegal River Basin. By working increasingly through PVOs and Peace Corps at the village level, project administration will be significantly simplified. The Project Support Office provides further assistance through strengthening project implementation as does the strict adherence to quarterly project reviews which include a detailed analysis of every project in the USAID/Senegal and OMVS portfolios.

USAID now has under full implementation a local staff development program which is substantially upgrading the capabilities of non-American personnel. Senegalese staff are already beginning to assume responsibilities frequently reserved for American personnel in program operations, budgeting and training. The success of this program means that it will be possible to reduce the number of American direct-hire at the current level for FY 82 and 83 from 28 to 26, and to consider the further reduction of that number by FY 84 with replacement by well-trained local staff.

As a result of the Joint Assessment, it has been possible to identify aspects of project selection and design which impede program execution. These include overly complex technical assistance including sophisticated equipment, complicated management structures and institutional support for administratively cumbersome Senegalese organizations. By moving toward more simply designed activities which can be executed with a different level of expertise, we believe projects can be implemented much more rapidly.

The increasing focus upon non-project aid will greatly facilitate the transfer of resources to Senegal. At the same time, the generation of host country owned local currency will aid project implementation by providing more flexible financing, especially with respect to local procurement of goods and services. Difficult and

time-consuming waiver processes, currently utilized because of restraints placed upon appropriated dollars, will be substantially reduced.

The implementation of these measures, as outlined in last year's ABS(pp. 4-6), has already permitted the reduction of the total Mission pipeline - from $27,925,000 on March 31, 1980 to $25,600,000 on March 31, 1981 - despite the obligation of 45% of the USAID's Operational Year Budget by that date. As Table IV of this submission indicates, the USAID expects this pipeline will be reduced even more significantly in FY 82, with expenditures exceeding obligations under the Sahel Account by over $5 million. Given Senegal's record of Service pipeline problems in the past, however, the USAID has chosen to limit forward funding to the minimum period of 12-18 months considered desirable, and to aim new obligations at only those project components for which expenditures are considered likely within that period.

TABLE III - PROJECT OBLIGATIONS BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT
FY 1981 to FY 1983
($ thousands)

Country/Office SENEGAL

	APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT	FY 1981	FY 1982	FISCAL YEAR 1983 MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
	SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM					
0202	Range and Livestock	1,000	600	-	-	-
0205	Casamance Regional Develop.	2,000	3,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
0208	Small Irrigated Perimeters	1,434	-	-	-	-
0210	Rural Health Services	-	-	-	-	-
0217	Family Health I	-	500	-	-	-
0218	SAED Training	730	1,100	-	-	-
0219	Fuelwood Production	730	300	-	-	-
0222	Youth Job Development	858	750	500	500	500
0223	Ag. Research & Planning	1,500	1,250	1,000	1,000	1,000
0224	SODESP Livestock	2,000	1,500	970	970	970
0233	National Plan of Land Use	1,000	1,000	-	-	-
0235	Cereals Production II	1,682	2,500	1,000	1,000	1,000
0242	Rural Health Services II	-	-	1,500	1,500	1,500
0246	Renewable Energy II	-	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
0248	Family Health II	-	-	1,000	1,000	1,000
0249	Agriculture Sector Grant	-	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
0250	Millet Processing	500	-	-	-	-
0253	Rural Satellite Communic.	550	-	-	-	-
0254	Marine Fisheries	150	-	-	-	-
0255	Info & Management of Research	100	-	-	-	-
0256	Rural Management (ENEA)	-	500	530	530	530
0257	Land Resource Regeneration	-	-	-	1,000	1,000
0258	Cooperative Operations	-	-	-	1,000	1,000
0259	Fuelwood Production II	-	-	-	-	1,000
0260	PVO Sector Grant	-	-	-	-	1,500
0261	Agriculture Sector Training	-	-	-	-	1,000
	Sub-total	14,234	18,000	16,500	18,500	22,000
	REGIONAL FUNDS					
0251	Land Resource (OPG)	500	-	-	-	-
0252	Support for Private Sector	-	500	-	-	-
625-0928	Food Crop Protection	(2,000)	(2,000)	(1,650)	(1,650)	(1,650)
0929	PM & R (includes OMVS)	1,200	1,200	1,000	1,000	1,000

TABLE III - PROJECT OBLIGATIONS BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT
FY 1981 to FY 1983
($ thousands)

Country/Office SENEGAL (cont'd)

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT		FY 1981	FY 1982	FISCAL YEAR 1983 MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
0936.7	SMDP	600	650	700	700	700
9901	Special Self Help	125	125	125	125	125
	Operational Program Grant (unspecified)	-	500	-	-	-
	Accelerated Impact Program (unspecified)	-	500	-	-	-
	Sub-Total	2,425	3,475	1,825	1,825	1,825
TOTAL ALL DA APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS		16,659	21,475	18,325	20,325	23,825
ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND		-	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000
TOTAL DA & ESF		16,659	31,475	28,325	30,325	33,825

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: SENEGAL

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL 1/	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL 1/	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH 2/	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN 2/	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80 3/	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	DROUGHT RELIEF																	
685-0201	Cereals Production I	G	1975	1979	3.8	3.8	77	-	77	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
685-0202	Range & Livestock Develop.	G	1975	1979	2.6	2.6	169	-	169	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Appropriat. Total (All Grant)				6.4	6.4	246	-	246	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOP., NUTRITION																	
685-0208	Small Irrigated Perimeters	G	1977	1981	4.2	4.2	2,048	-	1,000	-	1,048	-	-	-	-	-	-	582
685-0209	Grain Storage	G	1977	1977	4.9	4.9	1,972	-	1,385	-	587	-	-	-	-	-	-	618
	Appropriat. Total (All Grant)				9.1	9.1	4,020	-	2,385	-	1,635	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	HEALTH																	
685-0210	Rural Health Services I	G	1977	1978	1.0	1.0	146	-	146	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	482
	Appropriat. Total (All Grant)				1.0	1.0	146		146									
	SELECTED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES																	
685-0226	Patte d'Oie Improvement	G	1979	1979	1.3	1.3	1,300	-	1,000	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	718
	Appropriat. Total (All Grant)				1.3	1.3	1,300	-	1,000	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	

1/ Final Obligation dates are for particular funding mechanism. Initial obligation dates refer to activity as a whole, as required by FY 1983 ABS guidance.
2/ LOP given is for particular funding mechanism.
3/ Pipeline figures are for particular funding mechanism.

AID 1330 8 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: SENEGAL

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE 1/ INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE 1/ FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST ($million) 2/ AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST ($million) 2/ PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM 3/ PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM																	
685-0201	Cereals Production I	G	1975	1979	0.6	0.6	348	-	348	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	618
685-0202	Range & Livestock	G	1975	1982*	0.5	2.1	381	1,000	483	600	876	-	-	-	-	-	-	728
685-0205	Casamance Regional Development	G	1978	1985*	23.7	23.7	7,897	2,000	1,925	3,000	6,110	4,000	3,500	2,000	-	-	-	727
685-0208	Small Irrigated Perimeters	G	1977	1981	2.4	2.4	925	1,434	1,225	-	1,149	-	-	-	-	-	-	726
685-0210	Rural Health Services I	G	1977	1080*	1.8	1.8	1,656	-	1,139	-	517	-	-	-	-	-	-	725
685-0217	Family Health Services	G	1979	1982*	1.4	1.9	1,380	-	655	500	1,228	-	-	-	-	-	-	724
685-0218	SAED Training	G	1978	1982	4.5	4.5	2,536	730	1,191	1,100	1,460	-	-	-	-	-	-	723
685-0219	Fuelwood Production I	G	1979	1982	3.1	3.1	1,773	730	1,201	300	815	-	-	-	-	-	-	722
685-0222	Youth Job Development (OPG)	G	1979	1983*	1.8	3.0	850	858	1,608	750	750	500	-	-	-	-	-	721
685-0223	Agric. Research & Planning	G	1981	1985*	5.0	5.0	-	1,500	300	1,250	1,150	1,000	800	400	-	-	-	720
685-0224	SODESP Livestock Production	G	1979	1983	8.0	8.0	2,418	2,000	2,377	1,500	2,040	970	-	-	-	-	-	719
685-0233	National Plan for Land Use	G	1981	1982	2.0	2.0	-	1,000	550	1,000	620	-	-	-	-	-	-	481
685-0235	Cereals Production II	G	1980	1984	7.7	7.7	1,472	1,682	1,564	2,500	2,880	1,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	717
685-0239	CARITAS Village Develop. (PVO)	G	1979	1979	0.2	0.2	212	-	212	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	573
685-0240	Lowland Fisheries	G	1979	1979	0.2	0.2	100	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	572
685-0242	Rural Health Services II	G	1983	1987*	-	15.0	-	-	-	-	-	1,500	4,000	4,000	3,000	2,000	-	480
685-0243	AFRICARE Reforestation (OPG)	G	1980	1980	0.1	0.1	126	-	77	-	49	-	-	-	-	-	-	440
685-0246	Renewable Energy II	G	1982	1985*	-	4.6	-	-	-	1,000	500	1,000	1,500	1,100	-	-	-	369
685-0247	AFRICARE Village Woodlots (OPG)	G	1980	1980	0.2	0.2	212	-	100	-	112	-	-	-	-	-	-	430
685-0248	Family Health II	G	1983	1987*	-	7.0	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,000	1,750	1,750	1,000	-	368
685-0249	Agriculture Sector Grant	G	1982	1986	-	25.0	-	-	-	4,000	2,000	5,000	5,000	6,000	5,000	-	-	367

* indicates final obligation date differs from FY 1982 CP

AID 1330 8 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: SENEGAL

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	SAHEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (Cont'd)																	
685-0250	Millet Processing	G	1981	1981	0.5	0.5	-	500	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
685-0253	Rural Satellite Communications	G	1981	1981	0.6	0.6	-	550	-	-	350	-	-	-	-	-	-	360
685-0254	Fisheries Resource Assessment	G	1981	1981	0.2	0.2	-	150	50	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	327
685-0255	Management of Research	G	1981	1981	0.1	0.1	-	100	30	-	70	-	-	-	-	-	-	328
685-0256	Rural Management (ENEA)	G	1982	1985	-	2.0	-	-	-	500	250	530	500	470	-	-	-	-
685-0257	Land Resource Regeneration	G	1983	1986	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,200	1,250	800	-	-	-
685-0258	Cooperative Operations	G	1983	1986	-	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,500	1,250	1,000	-	-	-
685-0259	Fuelwood Production II	G	1983	1985	-	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	1,500	1,500	-	-	-	-
685-0260	PVO Sector Grant	G	1983	1985	-	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	1,500	1,500	1,500	-	-	-	-
685-0261	Agriculture Sector Training	G	1983	1985	-	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	1,000	2,000	1,750	-	-	-	-
	BILATERAL TOTAL (ALL GRANT)				54.6	143.9	22,286	14,234	15,635	18,000	23,326	22,000	25,000	22,970	11,550	3,000		

AID 1330 8 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: SENEGAL

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE 1/ INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE 1/ FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST ($million) 2/ AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST ($million) 2/ PLAN	CUM 3/ PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	FY OBLIGATIONS 1984	FY OBLIGATIONS 1985	FY OBLIGATIONS 1986	FY OBLIGATIONS 1987	FY OBLIGATIONS FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	REGIONAL SAHEL FUNDS																	
625-0251	Land Resource (OPG)	G	1981	1981	0.5	0.5	-	500	-	-	300	-	-	-	-	-	-	
625-0252	Support for Private Sector AIP	G	1982	1982	0.5	0.5	-	-	-	500	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	
625-0928	Food Crop Protection	G	1979	1984	8.3	8.3	800	(2,000)	(1,500)	(2,000)	(1,500)	(1,650)	(1,500)	-	-	-	-	
685-0937.7	Renewable Energy AIP	G	1980	1980	0.3	0.3	270	-	200	-	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	
625-0929	Hydro-Agriculture Study	G	1979	1979	0.8	0.8	272	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
625-0929.7	Project Management & Research (includes OMVS requirements)	G	- annual -		NA	NA	465	1,200	600	1,200	750	1,000	900	1,000	1,100	1,100	-	
625-0936.7	Sahel Manpower Development	G	- annual -		NA	NA	785	600	400	650	450	700	770	825	875	950	-	
685-9901	Special Self Help	G	- annual -		NA	NA	24	125	120	125	130	125	150	150	150	150	-	
	Operational Program Grant (unspecified)	G	- annual -		NA	NA	NA	-	-	500	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Accelerated Impact Program (unspecified)	G	- annual -		NA	NA	NA	-	-	500	250	-	500	500	500	500	-	
	Regional Total (All Grant)				10.4	10.4	2,616	2,425	1,320	3,475	2,320	1,825	2,320	2,475	2,625	2,700	-	
	Appropriat. Total (All Grant)				75.	54.3	24,902	16,659	16,955	21,475	25,646	23,825	27,320	25,445	14,175	5,700	-	

ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000)

AID 1350-8 (4-81)

A. Project Title: Family Health - Phase I (Amended)

Project No.: 685-0217

Proposed Obligation: FY 82 - $ 0.5 million, FY 83 - $ 0.0

LOP: $ 1.9 million.

Background: In spite of hopes expressed in last year's ABS that this project would begin to be implemented in FY 1981, continuing differences between the Ministry of Health (MOH) and the Secretary of State for Promotion Humaine (SEPH) have caused continued delays. In April, 1981, however, SEPH proposed a work plan to USAID which has the approval of the MOH. These two agencies appear to now share a common vision of how the project should be implemented. The present work plan will be revised so that it is acceptable to USAID. Implementation of the project should begin by the end of summer 1981.

A team of population/family planning experts who assessed the Senegal situation in February 1981 made a series of recommendations. They stressed that: 1) USAID/Senegal should have a full time population officer capable of coordinating not only the Family Health Project - Phase I but also the host of centrally funded, extra project assistance that USAID/Senegal intends to make available to the GOS. 2) USAID/Senegal should provide a significant amount of financial support to the private family planning organization in Senegal, the Association Sénégalaise pour le Bien Etre Familial (ASBEF).

The Amended Project: USAID intends to amend the Project Paper for the Family Health Project - Phase I so that the above two recommendations can be implemented immediately in the context of the revised project. The amendment will add $500,000 for these purposes, funds which were not obligated in FY 1981 owing to the delays cited. All activities during the life of Phase I of this project, except the assistance to ASBEF, will be financed using the $ 1.4 million already obligated.

ASBEF will be supported by an OPG grant, funded under the Project. By this means, ASBEF will greatly expand its current activities in the information, education and communication sphere and will begin a modest program of delivering family planning services in the Casamance Region of Senegal. ASBEF's model clinic in Dakar will continue to be a training and referral center. The Project Paper Amendment, which will include the OPG grant to ASBEF for FY 82, will be submitted in September 1981.

The $500,000 added to the project will support the following activities:

1.	Short-term technical assistance - (6 pm)	$ 100,000
2.	Commodities	50,000
3.	Renovation	50,000
4.	IEC	100,000
5.	In country training	20,000
6.	Other training	50,000
7.	Vehicles 3	30,000
8.	Operating costs - Staff salaries, Rent, Utilities, Equipment	100,000
		$ 500,000

Other Donors: The UNFPA will soon begin supporting the delivery of Family Planning Services in rural Senegal. Because UNFPA's regional interests within Senegal complement perfectly those of USAID, there will be no duplication of effort in Phase II of this project when USAID begins to support major service delivery programs in rural Senegal. That support, like all of AID assistance, will be concentrated in the Sine Saloum and the Casamance Regions.

The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) is currently providing a modest amount of support to ASBEF.

Beneficiaries: During the life of Phase I of this project the primary beneficiaries will be the 280,000 women of reproductive age in the Cap Vert Region. Other beneficiaries will include the women served by ASBEF's modest program in the Casamance Region - estimated not to exceed 100,000.

8. Project Title: Youth Job Development - OPG (Amendment)

Project No. : 685-0222

Proposed Obligation: FY 1982 - $750,000 FY 1983 - $500,000
LOP - $3,008,000

Purpose: The purpose of this two year extension is to provide further support for a program of vocational training for Senegalese youth as proposed by the International Division of the National Board of the Young Men's Christian Association of the U.S.A. (YMCA).

Background: The original OPG was designed in 1975 and signed in May 1979. The implementation encountered problems due to delays in the completion of construction of the Training Center, which in turn complicated implementation and led to poor management decisions. Construction of the Training Center was completed with the exception of the administrative building in December 1980 and classes begun at the new site on January 5, 1981. Due to delays between design (1975) and implementation (1979) cost estimates became outdated thus causing the project to run out of funds by the end of the third year of implementation.

The Amended Project

The purpose of the supplemental funding will be to continue activities along the following lines: the training of GOS instructors; teaching in the fields of masonry, metalwork, electricity and textiles, as well as the opening of a plumbing class; and post-training assistance. The latter assists graduates in finding suitable employment and in forming small independent trade enterprises.
An evaluation conducted in the Spring 1981 recommended that, given the strong and timely GOS support to the project, USAID should provide further support for the remaining two years of life of project in order to strengthen certain elements of the project. These were: (1) more effective management of project inputs; (2) changes in the administrative and technical structure to permit greater efficiency in project management; (3) implementation of counterpart instructors' training program and phasing out of the ORT technical team; and (4) setting up a fully operational center prior to handing over to the GOS.
In order to accomplish these recommendations, more financial resources will be required. To this end, $750,000.00 is programmed in FY 1982 and $500,000 in FY 1983, increasing the total life of project funding to $3,008,000.

Beneficiaries: The direct beneficiaries will be the unemployed youth who enroll in the Center with the aim of obtaining marketable skills. By the end of the Project some 850 youth will have enrolled in courses of instruction, and about 280 will have completed the full cycle of instruction. When the Center reaches planned full capacity, approximately 90 students will graduate each academic year.

C. Project Title: Rural Health Services - Phase II (FY 1983 - FY 1987)

Project No. : 685-0242

Proposed Obligation: FY 1983 - $1,500,000 LOP - $15,000,000

Purpose: To identify a methodology to deliver health services at the level of the Rural Community (CR) and the Village which fulfils the following criteria:

1. The services provided respond to the felt needs of the population ;
2. The recurrent costs of the services can be paid by a combination of direct financing by the state and local participation by the concerned population; and
3. The technologies required can be mastered by health post nurses and village health workers, and, if properly applied, will primarily reduce mortality and also morbidity among the target population.

Background and Project Description

This project is an extension of the Rural Health Services Development (RHSD) Project No. 685-0210 implemented in four of six departments in the Sine-Saloum Region. Based on the experience gained with the RHSD-I project, USAID Senegal intends to progressively achieve three goals during the second phase of this project. They are:

1) Provide additional financial and human support to the health post and more central levels of the health care system so that they, in turn, will better support health activities at the level of the Rural Communities and villages. This will be done first in the areas of the Sine-Saloum Region where village health teams are already functioning.

2) Extend Rural Health Services into the Kaffrine Department of the Sine-Saloum Region. These services will be defined after an evaluation of the ongoing Sine-Saloum Project in April, 1982. Although the exact nature of the services to be provided in Kaffrine will have to await the results of this evaluation, it is already certain that, as recommended by the Sahel Development Program Team, more assistance will be directed to the perfection of activities at the health post and health center levels.

3) During the final three years of this Project, Rural Health Services will be extended to the Casamance and Fleuve Regions. The primary objectives in this extension are to assist the GOS to:

   a) test the model developed in the Sine-Saloum Region in two ecosystems both markedly different from the Sine-Saloum and having very different ethnic groups;

b) minimize any possible adverse health impacts of the new irrigated farming techniques being introduced in these two regions - techniques introduced with USAID assistance;

c) assure that increases in crop production are translated into improvements in the nutritional status of pregnant women and children under five years of age.

Beneficiaries: The primary beneficiaries of Phase II of this project will be the people living in the rural areas of the Kaffrine Department of the Sine-Saloum - 95% of the 581,000 total population of the Department - and approximately one half of the 1,396,000 people living in the rural areas of the Casamance and Fleuve Region of Senegal. Groups who will benefit more than others from this program include the 20% of the population who are under age five and the 4-5% of the population who have a baby each year and must nurse that baby.

D. Project Title: Renewable Energy II

Project No.: 685-0246

Proposed Obligation: FY 82 - $ 1,000,000
FY 83 - $ 1,000,000
LOP - $ 4,600,000

Purpose: To develop a number of prototype renewable energy production and conversion processes for the rural communities of Senegal.

Background: The energy supply in Senegal is a limited and costly resource both in terms of the foreign exchange cost of imported fuels and of the land and water resource degradation resulting form present practices in harvesting trees and forest lands. The critical constraint of energy supply is expected to become more severe unless alternative energy sources and more efficient utilization can be developed.

USAID has entered the field of alternative energy resources development in a modest way through projects with tree plantations, improved stoves, solar fish dryers and improved charcoal production. These projects were selected for their apparent potential and early experience has confirmed that there is significant promise for positive contributions to the nation's energy profile from these particular technologies. However, the combined impact of these technologies will affect only a fraction of the energy demand under even the most optimistic of projections.

The literature on technology and development contains numerous references to technologies that have apparent potential for Senegal. Most, if not all, of these technologies, appear to require adaptation to the condition and applications in the rural sector of this country. There is, therefore, a need for a systemic process of the selection, adaptation, demonstration and commercialization of renewable energy production, and its utilization, in order to significantly impact on the energy picture in Senegal.

The Project: The preparation of the Project Paper will include a screening and initial selection of promising technologies; however, the project also will provide for continuing review of literature and identification of additional concepts for adaptation. Under the project, approximately three technologies will be introduced into a development cycle each year. The development cycle would consist of an initial performance trial of one or more prototypes to verify performance claims. If design changes and major adaptations are required, the technology may stay at this initial stage for a year or more. Once a local application has been verified by a prototype unit the technology will be advanced to a program of field use depending upon the cost of the technology and testing program. The results of the field trial program will be widely distributed in order to facilitate commercial development of successful technologies.

The GOS, acting through the SERST (Secretary for Scientific and Technical Research), will collaborate in the initial stage of technology screening and

prototype testing. The field trial programs will involve institutions such as CERER (energy), ISRA (agricultural research), the regional development agencies, and non-governmental organizations depending upon existing capability and interest. Provision will be made under the project for a system of subgrants from SERST to other agencies for the support of specific field trial programs.

Issues for Project Design: The criteria for selection of a technology as a candidate for this development program will be the major design task for this project. What sort of operational performance will be required? And what degree of redesign and adaptation will be provided for in the project? The process of search and the priorities for selecting technologies are interrelated with the possibilities in the state of the art, the needs of Senegal, and with the institutional capacities for the development of technologies.

The second issue is the feasibility of using sub-grants by SERST for the field trial stage of development. Another option would be to design the project with provision for numerous project components with various institutions for the diverse field trial program that appears to be required.

The project design process must also refine the trial steps and measurement criteria for advancement of a technology from the prototype to the field trial stage and ultimately to graduation from the project. These criteria may vary with technologies and applications. Basic policies and principles, however, must be developed to facilitate project management and the systematic investigation of the widest possible range of technologies.

Beneficiaries: The target group for which technologies will be selected are the small, commercial farm enterprises of the Casamance, the Peanut Basin and the Senegal River Basin. However, the beneficiaries of the project are expected to be a wider segment of the rural sector as successful prototypes are expected to be adopted throughout the country.

E. Project Title: Family Health - Phase II (FY 1983 - 1987)

Project No. : 685-0248

Proposed Obligation: FY 1983 - $ 1 million LOP - $ 7 million

Purpose: To provide medically sound and culturally acceptable child spacing services; to offer low cost contraceptive technology outside the normal health services; and to provide widespread education about reproduction and family health.

Background: This project is an extension to the Family Health Phase I project. The implementation of Phase I encountered delays due to the lack of clear implementation responsibilities between the Ministry of Health and the Secretariat of Promotion Humaine. This now has been resolved and the implementation of Phase I will be completed in FY 1982.

The Project: In this expanded phase of the program, located primarily in the Sine-Saloum, Casamance, and Fleuve Region, family health services will be provided by MCH and rural women's centers. The program will be managed by a PVO. In order to provide a wider use of contraceptives, private organizations will take responsibility for their distribution and sale. Ministry of Health (MOH) employees will receive a modest training program in clinical training techniques. Promotion Humaine (PH) personnel will follow education and communication training program to assist them in reaching the intended audience.

At the same time that the MOH and the SEPH are expanding services through the official government structures, the Association Sénégalaise pour le Bien Etre Familial (ASBEF) will continue to play an important role in promoting family planning through the private sector. USAID support to ASBEF will remain at approximately FY 1982 levels ($500,000) throughout the project, after adjusting for inflation. Increased levels of ASBEF activities should be financed by other donors - particularly non-governmental institutions.

During Phase II of this project USAID will provide very significant direct funding to support research by national, parastatal, private, and/or regional organizations based in Senegal. This will provide information which will lead to a better understanding of demographic problems among private citizens, as well as official policy makers.

Other Donors: The UNFPA will continue to be an important donor. Although neither UNFPA's nor USAID's assistance will be limited to specific regions during this planning period, the geographic concentration in different regions will continue. UNFPA is already funding a number of research projects in the field of demography and family planning. USAID will be careful to assure that its funded research activities will be complementary to those of UNFPA. USAID would particularly like to accentuate research to better define the relationship between family planning and maternal and child health, an area of research not currently supported by the UNFPA.

Beneficiaries: The primary beneficiaries of this program will be women of reproductive age, particularly those living in the regions of Cap-Vert, Casamance, Sine-Saloum and the Fleuve. In 1981, those four regions contained 55% of Senegal's population.

F. Project Title: Rural Management (ENEA)

Project No. : 685-0256

Proposed Obligation: FY 1982: $500,000; FY 1983: $530,000; LOP: $2,000,000

Purpose: This project will support the revision and upgrading of the educational program at the National School of Applied Economics (Ecole Nationale d'Economie Appliquée, ENEA) thereby enabling ENEA to more effectively support the new GOS strategy in rural development.

Background: In late 1979 the Prime Minister announced a major revision of policy for economic development in Senegal - the "Plan de Redressement". Under this plan major changes were set in motion for the rural development agencies, the cooperatives and most other rural service and infrastructure institutions. In 1980 many actions were taken under the plan, including the institution of new budgets and work plans for the regional development agencies and the reorganization of the cooperative structure. Also during 1980 the Sixth Plan for National Development was drafted, which further elaborates economic goals and institutional responsibilities.

The institutional changes that are taking place under the Plan de Redressement imply that major revisions are required in the academic program of ENEA as it seeks to serve this set of institutional clients. ENEA is the training institution primarily responsible for the preparation of lower-middle level rural managers, specifically including cooperative personnel. For example, the redefinitions of the structure of the cooperatives indirectly redefines the roles of managers of the various levels of the cooperative organization. Furthermore, the establishment of new roles and performance targets for the cooperatives implies that new skills must be provided cooperative managers if they are to achieve these targets. Similarly, these have implications for program revision in the other departments of ENEA.

The Government is impatient to move fully into a more operations-oriented training system ENEA desires outside assistance in order to more rapidly revise and establish a relevant training curriculum in the major program areas. The USAID is already financing under Title III the physical refurbishment and reequipping of ENEA, located on the outskirts of Dakar.

The Project: Under the proposed project a number of specialists will assist ENEA staff in curriculum revision and in the development of new materials through pilot teaching programs. The focus of these revisions will be the introduction of training in project design, management, and evaluation techniques. Technical assistance assignments of 3-9 months are envisaged. Assistance in modernization of teaching materials and equipment is also proposed.

ENEA staff would be provided participant training in the U.S. for both degree and non-degree programs to improve their credentials and experience with appropriate technology and methods.

ENEA is supervised by the Ministry of Higher Education and has a close working relationship with the Ministry of Rural Development. The ENEA graduates have established a good reputation in all of the major governmental and development institutions. These relationships are to be strengthened under the project.

Project design issues: A crucial design issue is the time that will be required for the technical assistance specialists to acquire an adequate understanding of the local needs before proceeding to the curriculum revision and pilot instruction. Related to this is the utility of return assignments for refinement of materials after two or three cycles of use.

A second design issue is the number of curriculum changes which may be required. The details of the institutional revisions for some organizations are still under discussion and may not be resolved for some time. The USAID believes, however, that there is adequate basis to start the project. This issue is important only in relation to the size and duration of the project.

The adequacy of French language competency within U.S. institutions of comparable academic levels is also an uncertainty which must be resolved in the project design process.

Beneficiaries: The target group for this project is the small farming enterprises of Senegal which have the potential to contribute much more significantly to economic growth if they can be better served by rural institutions and infrastructures. The graduates of ENEA are expected to impact directly on this situation within the policy framework of the GOS as defined by the Plan de Redressement.

6. Project Title: Land Resource Regeneration

Project No. : 685-0257

Proposed Obligation: FY 83: $1,000,000; LOP: $4,250,000

Purpose: To establish an extensive impact program with modified farm and soil management practices which provide resource protection and improvement.

Background: Land deterioration is affecting the most important rainfed farming region of Senegal - the Peanut Basin. This agro-ecosystem has evolved over the past two hundred years on the semi-arid, sandy soils of central Senegal. A network of closely spaced villages and cultivated fields and plots is quite evenly distributed over the generally flat landscape. There is some growth of trees near villages, on field boundaries, and also a broad dispersion of the *Acacia albida* in some localities.

Farming is generally pursued with low-levels of input use, resulting in low yields. In recent years the productivity appears to have shown a marked downtrend. While some observers have attributed the progressively lower yields to the pattern of rainfall, others argue quite persuasively that serious land resource degradation is taking place.

There is evidence of both water and wind erosion. Individual farmers report marked changes in field conditions and productivity, and cite changing ground water levels and other factors. To counteract these trends, some villages have undertaken tree plantings, mixed farming, use of animal manure and other conservation practices. These efforts are very tentative and impacts are quite limited, but the results appear to indicate that the technology of soil and water conservation can be adapted to the agro-ecosystem of Senegal.

The Project: In March, 1981, USAID/Senegal initiated work in arid land water resource protection and improvement through support to a local PVO in a survey of the problems and approaches as perceived at the village level in the Sine Saloum. Concurrently, a staff specialist was added at the Mission level to research the world technology and means to facilitate technology transfer in this area. These two lines of work are expected to produce a set of technologies developed adequately for extensive application in cooperating villages.

Certain practices have already been identified for study and planning. Contour plowing, minimum tillage, and incorporation of organic matter are practices that have farmer interest as well as a solid basis in the research work. Tree crops such as *Acacia albida*, fruit trees, and other species offer possibilities for wind protection and stabilization plus the production of organic matter, possibly animal feed and food products, and ultimately firewood. Alternate crops such as the legumes and short cycle vegetables offer possibilities of improving the soil, increasing incomes and maintaining soil cover. The literature contains numerous references to other crops and practices that merit local trials.

A number of these practices will be introduced at the village level by a local PVO in FY 82 under an OPG arrangement. This experience will begin to develop a working understanding of the process of resource regeneration in selected areas of Sine Saloum and will provide the basis for project design of an expanded impact program for initiation in FY 83. The project design process will identify a group of five to ten practices for extensive introduction and the procedures of the initial project will be adapted for the dissemination of these technologies in the expanded project.

Project Design Issues: The major design task will be to evaluate the supporting evidence for each proposed practice to ensure that an adequate basis exists for extensive application of that technology in Senegal. The similarity and adaptations of technical and cultural parameters require thorough investigation and planning.

Farmers will require economic insurance in cooperating in the introduction of new technologies. It may be especially difficult to make some changes in farming practices that may reduce yields in the initial phases although the prospects for long-term benefits are high. The procedures for obtaining farmer cooperation for the various practices will require thorough planning.

The institutional support required by new technologies may be supplied by several GOS agencies, e.g. agricultural research (ISRA and CNRF), agricultural extension (SODEVA), and Water and Forest Services, Hydraulics, and Promotion Humaine. The project design will ensure close complementarity with a parallel project being proposed for initiation in FY 1983: the PVO Sector Grant (0260). While searching for direct links with PVO Sector Grant activities, such as ties between tree nursery development and seedling dissemination and planting, the USAID does not rule out utilization of PVO's and international volunteers in various phases of the present program, as well. These PVO's could include Lutheran World Service, AFRICARE, ORT, and CARITAS.

Beneficiaries: Indirectly the rural poor in the Sine Saloum, a population totalling 1.0 million. The project visualizes a direct impact on approximately 1/4 of the farm communities in this Region.

H. Project Title: Cooperative Operations

Project No. : 685-0258

Proposed Obligation: FY 82 - None FY 83 - $1,000,000
LOP: $4,750,000

Purpose: To assist in management improvement and structural reorganization of the cooperatives and service centers of the "groupement villageois."

Background: The Plan de Redressement calls for major structural reorganization of the rural institutions including the cooperatives and "groupements villageois." The groupements are to be the grass roots unit in channelling farm inputs to farmer and movement of market surplus away from the farms. The groupements will be the essential building blocks of a reformed cooperative structure. The cooperatives will be organized to serve 10-15 groupements, and there will be a network of regional facilities for warehouse and administrative services. Policy and organizational structures are in transition with certain features of the new structure not clearly defined at this stage.

The installation of an effective farm service operation as outlined will require significant improvement in the management and service operations at all levels of this structure. The rapid establishment of an extensive, efficient cooperative organization will require the introduction of new operational procedures and corresponding staff training, as new administrative roles are defined and additional services introduced. It will be a difficult task to transform the present cooperative organization. However, there is no current alternative service infrastructure to the cooperatives available in the rural country side. The USAID anticipates that the project design and planning process will be especially difficult; but we believe that a program of assistance which can help establish an authentic cooperative network is of vital importance to improved agricultural production in Senegal.

The Project: This project will be one element in a coordinated USAID program for cooperative development. The project will take as its geographic focus the Region of the Sine Saloum. Direct assistance to the organization and operation of the "groupements villageois" will be provided through a separate AID-funded PVO/Peace Corps development project in functional literacy and technical assistance (PVO Sector Grant). A Title III project is being developed to assist groupements in construction of local seed storage. Another Title III project already provides assistance in the construction of 100 cooperative warehouse and service centers. And a new project (685-0256) in the AID portfolio will provide basic training through ENEA (the Ecole Nationale d'Economie Appliquée) for management and service personnel belonging to cooperative organizations.

The present project will provide technical assistance and in-service training to build the management and administrative operations of the revised cooperative structure, principally in the Sine Saloum. A second element will be an experimental credit program, operated through the groupements, with records and audits designated to improve the viability of the credit program. The third component will be directed towards the improvement of management and administrative support facilities

required to expedite the flow of services and commodities for the 100 new AID-financed warehouses in the Peanut Basin. These three elements of the project are to be further defined in the course of project planning.

The chief GOS institution with which AID will collaborate in this project will be the National Cooperative Directorate, a branch of the Ministry of Rural Development. Project operations will also be coordinated with the Regional Development Agencies and with the Ecole Nationale d'Economie Appliquée.

Project Design Issues: The most important issue will be the adequacy of the revised GOS policy and of the administrative organigram of the cooperative structure. The USAID believes that the policy reforms outlined in the Plan de Redressement provide an adequate basis for this project. Nonetheless, we also anticipate that this new structure will be difficult to establish in practice and that the policy could be consequently revised as the details are worked out.

The policy environment is crucial to the viability of cooperatives, particularly the existence of a rational set of prices and allowances for services rendered. The project design must, therefore, provide for a thorough analysis of prices and service costs. If, under the government policy, the viability of cooperatives depends upon subsidies, then the procedures for calculations of subsidies and payment procedures must be considered in the Project Paper.

The USAID has intentionally limited this proposal to the agricultural production support activities of the cooperative structure. We have done so to conserve resources and thereby to achieve greater impact with the limited resources available. Complementary service activities provided by cooperatives can improve their viability if they can be managed well. An important issue will be the establishment of the time-phasing for expansion to conserve human energy and ensure sound growth.

Beneficiaries: The target group of this project is the small farm enterprises which are now poorly served by market infrastructure. The geographic locality will be primarily in the Peanut Basin, however some project benefits will also be realized in the Casamance and the Senegal River Basin.

I. Project Title: Fuelwood Production II

Project No: 685-0259

Proposed Obligation: FY 1983 - $1,000,000 LOP - $4,000,000

Purpose: This project is an expansion of Senegal Fuelwood I. This project will contribute to two major goals to: stabilize/increase national fuelwood (charcoal/firewood) production potential; and halt/reverse environmental deterioration due to inadequacy of national forest cover in up-country areas.

Background: Increased productivity of wood production is required in Senegal to supply domestic needs for energy - mainly for cooking. Rapid deforestation is resulting from wide-scale tree cutting for fuel purposes. After extensive research and planning, the Fuelwood I project was initiated in 1979 as the first phase in developing a new production system that would both raise land and labor productivity. The first phase was deliberately limited in scope to provide an opportunity to verify the design before undertaking the completion of a pilot unit.

The project evaluation is scheduled for FY 82 and a favorable outcome is anticipated in proposing this project for FY 83 funding. The experience thus far in land clearing and establishment of fast growing trees confirms the initial design parameters. Early tree growth is very good and all signs point to a go-ahead decision in the evaluation.

The Project: Under the second phase of this project, an additional 3000 hectares of intensely managed forest plantations in the Thies area, east of Dakar, will be planted with fast growing species. Also, harvesting and replanting will begin on a rotational basis, thus establishing a renewable energy unit. This project provides the support for completion of the system.

The basic approach will be to complete the unit designed in Fuelwood I. The experience of the project thus far has not identified a basis for a major alteration of approach. However, the thorough evaluation of the first Phase, prior to final design of the second, will provide the grounds for fine-tuning.

Nursery and plantation development will be undertaken by the Bandia Forest Administration (PARFOB), a small, financially autonomous entity under the technical and financial supervision of the Service of Water and Forests. PARFOB was established especially for Phase I of this project.

Project Design Issues: The major issue for consideration in the design and development process for this project is the conclusion of the evaluation of Fuelwood I. Present indications point to an evaluation recommendation to proceed with the completion of the project. However, firm decisions cannot be made in advance of the project evaluation.

Beneficiaries: There will be numerous beneficiaries of the project, including local village timber cutters, consumers in the Dakar/Thies area, and up-country rural populations threatened by the loss of local forest cover. Villagers in the immediate project area will benefit from the employment opportunities generated in the context of project implementation and marketing of harvested output.

Women, especially in the rural areas, will be particularly affected by the project, given that firewood and charcoal acquisition and use are a part of daily life. By reducing pressure on fuelwood stocks now supplying the Dakar-Thies region, more fuelwood will be available for local use in these regions, thereby easing the job of fuelwood collection.

J. Project Title: PVO Sector Grant

Project No. : 685-0260

Proposed Obligation: FY 1983/ $1,500,000 - LOP: $4,500,000

Purpose: To provide a funding and evaluation mechanism through which U.S. and indigenous Private Voluntary Organizations (PVO's) can undertake activities designed to promote the well being of the rural poor, while minimizing the demands on scarce AID Direct Hire manpower.

Background: The recently promulgated GOS Plan de Redressement (discussed in detail in the Senegal 1983 CDSS) places particular emphasis on developing rural institutions at the local level for the implementation of both economically productive and socially beneficial development programs. In so doing, the Reform Plan provides a golden opportunity for proceeding with the type of grass roots, hands-on development project that can most directly and immediately reach AID's key target group, the rural poor. However, at the same time, the unrelenting pressure on AID to "do more with less" precludes the use of direct hire personnel to carry out the extremely labor intensive task of working directly at the village level on the type of small scale activity necessary to impact directly upon the immediate and attainable needs of the small farmer, village artisan and landless laborer. This is particularly true in the domain of land resource regeneration, soil protection and avoidance of desertification programs with their specific requirements for widespread utilization of technically qualified personnel. An additional constraint limiting the impact of conventional bilateral programs is the general necessity in a government-to-government program of working in tandem with GOS agencies, such as the Regional Development Agencies. Such agencies are not always as dedicated and efficient as either the project beneficiaries or the donor agency employees/contractors.

The Project: The answer chosen by USAID/Senegal to this dilemma is to increase substantially the use of Private Voluntary Organizations (PVO's), both American and Senegalese, often in coordination with Peace Corps, to develop and implement particular programs, within the capabilities and interests of the PVO's themselves, under the overall guidance of the AID development strategy for Senegal. By providing their own qualified personnel and by working, in large part, directly with the intended beneficiaries of the project rather than wholly through GOS agencies, the PVO's are able to overcome both of the development constraints cited above. The proposed project seeks to mobilize the PVO resources, U.S. and Senegalese, available for Senegal's development in the most efficient and expeditious manner possible, as determined by the recent evaluation of the highly successful Ghana FAAD project.

The project will particularly focus upon organizing a range of possible PVO activities, to operate in overall conjunction with Peace Corps programs, AID bilateral projects and GOS activities, in the Sine Saloum Region. The project will place particular emphasis upon strengthening local "groupement villageois" (the basic unit of the newly proclaimed cooperative structure) and local councils. This activity will also contribute substantially to land resource regeneration, broadly defined as covering a broad spectrum of activities aiming to arrest the continuing and severe degradation of Senegal's fragile cropland. In addition to

strengthening local institutions with training and functional literacy, the project will assist them in meeting their development objectives along the lines of specific criteria which will be set forth in the project document. These criteria will assure an integrated program in support of resource regeneration, to include assistance with village wells, linked to tree and shrub planting and vegetable gardening, and to the institution of ecologically-sound farming practices and other such conservation measures.

FY 1983 Program: The first year of the project will see the active interaction of the PVO's and USAID/Senegal in the programming, designing, approval and commencement of activities for the initial land resource regeneration projects in the Sine Saloum. With authorization of the Grant programmed for the third quarter of FY 82 and a great deal of preliminary investigations on the part of appropriate PVO's scheduled to have been completed by that time, it is expected that actual on the ground activities could be under way by mid-1983.

Host Country and Other Donors: The program will be undertaken in collaboration, as necessary, with the GOS agencies of Eaux et Forêts, Promotion Humaine, and SODEVA, the Regional Development Agency operating in Sine Saloum. The project, however, will seek to develop particularly direct and close contacts between the PVO's whose activities will be funded under the program, and the beneficiaries of their activities, as organized in village groupements and local councils. In a complementary action, the USAID supported Rural Health Services Project (Phase II) will be helping villages establish primary health units throughout the Region. The USAID is also proposing in this ABS two new activities for funding in FY 83, Rural Management (ENEA) and Cooperative Operations, which will support local institutions in this region through other means, and one parallel project, Land Resource Regeneration. Other donors active in the Sine Saloum include the French, the Dutch, and the World Bank. The USAID project will actively coordinate with all donors engaged in similar undertakings.

Beneficiaries: The direct and immediate beneficiaries would be the U.S. and indigenous Private Voluntary Organizations which would be enabled to obtain funding for appropriate projects under this grant, plus the USAID which would be enabled to engage in more developmental activities with less use of scarce U.S. Direct Hire human resources. The longer term and more fundamental beneficiaries would be the poor farmers, artisans and landless laborers of the region who would receive assistance from the PVO's in the preservation of their fragile ecological resources.

K. Project Title: Agriculture Sector Training (INDR)

Project No. : 685-0261

Proposed Obligation: FY 1983: $1,000,000 - LOP: $4,750,000

Purpose: To train the middle-level administrative and management personnel required for government, the development agencies and private business in the agricultural sector.

Background: The rural economy of Senegal has faltered badly during the last several years. While inadequate rainfall is a major contributing factor to this record, many observers believe that the ineffectiveness of public and private sector institutions is also an important factor. Indeed, there are a number of weaknesses at the upper middle-level positions in the ministries, cooperatives, rural development agencies, and private sector enterprises. A number of these weaknesses will be corrected in the implementation of the Plan de Redressement and the consequent reorganization of these institutions.

Nonetheless, many senior administrators are concerned that the supply of trained individuals for middle-level positions is a critical limitation on their ability to achieve the targets of the plan. At this time there is no institution in Senegal which trains agricultural specialists for the middle and upper level, so that all must be educated abroad. Administrators report some success in attracting a few well qualified individuals to return to Senegal but generally this is only successful for the senior positions.

With World Bank and French assistance, the GOS has begun construction of a university-level agriculture training institution, the Institut National de Développement Rural (INDR), to be located at Thies. The resources available do not appear to be adequate for the task. The USAID believes that the impact of the institution would be significantly enhanced if resources can be found to carry out a modestly enlarged project.

The Project: Recently USAID commissioned a preliminary but comprehensive review of the agricultural education facilities in Senegal. This study confirmed the need for the Institut National de Développement Rural. Concurrently, the USAID discussed with the GOS and the Institute Director the possibilities and needs for U.S. assistance in the establishment of the Institute. These needs included a laboratory-demonstration farm attached to the INDR. It is apparent from these discussions that the GOS has a strong interest in the potential benefits which U.S. support could bring to the Institute.

The USAID frankly recognizes several open questions associated with this project. The U.S. approach in college level agricultural education has not heretofore been successfully adapted to the college level of what would otherwise be a predominantly French institution. Secondly, the institutional infrastructure of Senegal does not provide for a direct linkage of teaching-research-extension in the style of the U.S. land grant university. In any case, U.S. universities have not shown a strong interest in francophone Africa. And finally, the recurrent cost associated with an institution of this sort may be difficult for the GOS to assume, even in the medium term, given the government's severe economic difficulties.

The known problems do not appear to be insoluable. The potential contributions of the Institute appear to justify a serious investigation of what AID's contribution might be to the development of the Institute. The project design will be undertaken in such a way as to provide periodic confirmation of the potential success of the project and to permit a decision to abort the effort.

Project Design Issues: The major issue is to define ways in which a selected U.S. agricultural educational institution may effectively contribute to the INDR, which will grow up in an essentially French educational environment. A number of persons involved in this project, including French technical advisors to GOS for this undertaking, have strongly endorsed U.S. participation in the project. However, the uneven track record of U.S. agricultural education development in francophone Africa suggests that AID must approach this activity with caution and thoroughness.

The design of this project also will require negotiation with the World Bank and FAC in order to optimize the mix of assistance resources. The history of our collaboration with both organizations in Senegal has been very good.

The transition in development objectives, organization structures and programs which result form the Plan de Redressement and the Sixth Development Plan will produce some changes in requirements for personnel and consequently in training needs. Planners for the INDR in May 1981 initiated a fresh analysis of requirements for trained agriculturalists. This work will provide the basis for a reevaluation of the need for the project and the relevance of U.S. assistance in the present context.

Host Government Institutions Involved: This project will directly support the Institut National de Développement Rural which falls under the Ministry of Higher Education. Through the Board of Directors of the Institute, the project will have working linkages with the Ministry of Rural Development, with the rural development agencies, and with other potential employees of Institute graduates.

Beneficiaries: By better preparation for effective employment, the direct beneficiaries, the graduates of the Institute, are expected to impact directly on the agricultural sector. In fact, the employment of these graduates at the middle levels of management will place them in the regional and district offices of the various organizations in direct contact with the farming operations of Senegal.

TABLE V FY 1983 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING — Country/Office: SENEGAL

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION	Ongoing/ New	Loan/ Grant	Approp. Acct.	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) INCR	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) CUM	WORKFORCE (Number of Workmonths) USDH INCR	USDH CUM	FNDH INCR	FNDH CUM
	DECISION PACKAGE MINIMUM									
	Pipeline Projects					(5,801)	216	216	264	264
	New and Continuing Projects									
1.	685-0205 Casamance Regional Development	O	G	SH	4,000	4,000	12	228		
2.	685-0235 Cereals Production II	O	G	SH	1,000	5,000	12	240		
3.	685-0224 SODESP Livestock	O	G	SH	970	5,970	12	252		
4.	685-0223 Agriculture Research & Planning	O	G	SH	1,000	6,970	12	264		
5.	685-0249 Agriculture Sector Grant	O	G	SH	5,000	11,970	12	276		
6.	685-0246 Renewable Energy II	O	G	SH	1,000	12,970				
7.	PL-480 Title II - CRS, MCH, FFW				(9,000)	12,970	12	288		
8.	PL-480 Title III - Rice, 30,000 MT				(15,000)	12,970				
9.	685-0222 Youth Job Development	O	G	SH	500	13,470				
10.	685-0256 Rural Management (ENEA)	O	G	SH	530	14,000				
11.	685-0242 Rural Health Services II	N	G	SH	1,500	15,500	12	300		
12.	685-0248 Family Health II	N	G	SH	1,000	16,500				
13.	625-0928 Food Crop Protection	O	G	SH	(1,700)	16,500				
14.	(L/C Projects, excluding PL-480 funded: No. of Projects - 1; $ value - 5,000)									
15.	Basic Workforce					16,500	84	300	264	264
	Total Minimum Package and related Workforce				16,500		300		264	
	DECISION PACKAGE CURRENT									
16.	685 0257 Land Resource Regeneration	N	G	SH	1,000	17,500				
17.	685-0258 Cooperative Operations	N	G	SH	1,000	18,500				
18.	Workforce Increment Current Package				--	18,500	--	300	--	264
	Total Current Package and Related Workforce					2,000	--		--	
	DECISION PACKAGE AAPL									
19.	685-0259 Fuelwood Production II	N	G	SH	1,000	19,500				
20.	685-0260 PVO Sector Grant	N	G	SH	1,500	21,000				
21.	685-0261 Agriculture Sector Training	N	G	SH	1,000	22,000				
22.	Workforce Increment AAPL Package				--	22,000	--	300	--	264
	Total AAPL Package and Related Workforce				3,500		--		--	

A Guide to Project Ranking

Between February and June, 1980, the USAID with the Government of Senegal conducted a Joint Assessment both of the A.I.D. programs and of Senegal's general economic environment. The joint conclusions of this study were published in July, 1980. There then followed a series of special analyses prepared for the USAID on specific aspects of the current situation with potential for U.S. assistance. These twelve reports included papers on Senegal's private sector, local rural institutions, nutrition, demography, and the education-training system. The USAID then convened the principal contributors, together with key members of the Mission and the Country Team, to draw up over a three-day period in December, 1980, the outlines of the most effective conceivable U.S. assistance strategy for Senegal in the 1983-1987 period. This work became the basis for the Mission's FY 1983 CDSS submission.

While concurring generally with the USAID's former emphasis on agricultural production and human resources (an area subject to further review), including health, nutrition, and family planning, the CDSS recommended that the USAID program should make several departures from past practices.

First, given Senegal's urgent economic difficulties, the CDSS recommended much greater emphasis upon non-project assistance. Second, given the serious difficulties in which Senegal's major rural institutions - the Rural Development Agencies (RDA's) and the state-run cooperatives - found themselves, the CDSS urged that the USAID program pay much closer attention to the encouragement of local farmers' groups (the "groupements villageois"), local councils, and local entrepreneurs. These two recommendations were complementary, since greater quantities of local currencies, generated by non-project assistance, would be required to adequately stimulate indigenous local institutions. Insofar as the RDA's continued to maintain chief responsibility for agriculture production, the CDSS concluded, the U.S. should continue to support them, but in such a way as to enable the RDA's to disengage from commercial functions and to dedicate themselves to carrying out their essential responsibilities as agriculture extension agencies.

The encouragement of local institutions, both directly and indirectly (through the RDA's), is a long-term undertaking in Senegal, but one recognized by the government's Reform Plan, as well as by the CDSS, as absolutely essential to the stimulation of maximum rural production. The CDSS, however, also recommended that the USAID at the same time undertake a leadership role with other donors in another vital and arduous domain, the regeneration of soils resources in the principal agriculture area of the country, the Peanut Basin.

In both spheres, that of local institutions and production and that of agro-ecosystems regeneration, the CDSS proposed that the USAID should concentrate upon three geographic areas: the Sine-Saloum Region of the Peanut Basin, where AID's village health program is underway, the Casamance Basin, and the Senegal River Basin (Fleuve Region). This marks a reduction from the five regions in which AID is currently engaged. Finally, in support of better program management, the CDSS recommended the reduction of active projects from 30 at present to about 15 by the middle of the planning period.

Following Washington's approval of the CDSS on March 6, 1981, the USAID presented the country strategy to the government of Senegal for GOS concurrence and joint implementation, using the same mechanism established the year previous to direct the Joint Evaluation. The GOS/USAID Working Group then set to work in April and May to derive specific projects from the country strategy. Relying primarily on the USAID Agriculture Office together with the appropriate GOS technical ministries, the GOS/USAID Working Group drafted the narratives for the new activities which appear on the preceeding pages of this submission. The stage is thus set to move rapidly into the design phase of the several new projects presented.

Decision Package: Minimum

This package contains all USAID ongoing projects, and provides for the start of the second phase of the two health/family planning projects. Set at $16,500,000, we estimate this can be accomplished for an amount well within the total allocation which USAID/Senegal may expect in FY 83. This envelope will permit the Mission to fund to completion two activities - SODESP Livestock in the Ferlo zone and Youth Job Development in Dakar - which do not figure among the CDSS priorities. At the same time, it will permit the continuation of an important non-project activity, the Agriculture Sector Grant, started in FY 1982, which together with an augmentation of Title III in FY 1983 will account for $20 million in local currencies to complement on-going activities in the agriculture sector and to prepare the way for new programs.

Decision Package Current

The two programs initiated within this package are at the heart of the new departures recommended in the CDSS, one in the area of Land Resource Regeneration, the other in the building of sound rural institutions, Cooperative Operations. Both programs will rely on the use of local currencies generated by Title III and the Agriculture Sector Grant. Although both activities represent major undertakings, the USAID considers it advisable to begin with increments ($1 million each) which are modest in comparison with the overall requirement until such time as procedures are well established and the desired effects of these methods have been determined.

Decision Package AAPL

In this package, we rank the second phase of Fuelwood Production, an approach which is proving successful in the Bandia Forest area south of Thies and which should be ready for extension in FY 1983. The PVO Sector Grant represents a means of working closely and intensely with local institutions for predetermined ends, but with a minimum expenditure of A.I.D. personnel resources. The USAID believes that the kind of personnel American and Senegalese PVO's, together with Peace Corps and other volunteers, can deliver will be essential in helping local groupements, cooperatives, and councils in the Sine Saloum area organize and equip themselves for food production and rural works. We rank Agriculture Sector Training in final position because, while its importance is undeniable, there are significant issues which must be resolved before we will recommend final design and implementation of the activity (see narrative).

COMMENTARY ON OPERATING EXPENSES AND WORKFORCE

The operating expense budget presentation contains amounts budgeted for USAID/Senegal and OMVS.

The Table I narrative included with this budget submission details personnel planning levels used to develop the operating expense portion of the budget. Discussions between the Director USAID/ Senegal, and the Director AFR/SWA approved using these figures for budget purposes.

USAID/Senegal serves as a regional office. The USAID/Senegal Mission Director is responsible for Senegal and OMVS. The AID/OMVS office is responsible for programs in Senegal, Mauritania, Mali and The Gambia. The Crop Protection project manager has projects in seven countries. The Food for Peace officer serves three countries and the Dakar Controller office serves four countries. As a result of the regional nature of USAID/Senegal certain expenditures such as international travel, domestic travel and expenditures related to vehicles (purchase of vehicles, repairs and gasoline) are abnormally high.

This Budget request includes dollars for Staff Training Programs that were initiated in the present fiscal year and programmed for future years. These costs are in addition to those of prior years' budgets and are expected to be continued well into the future.

The Mission minimized the PSC restrictions by utilizing an institutional contract with the Employees, Commissary, Welfare and Recreation Assoc.(ECWRA). Cleaning personnel, chauffeurs, some secretaries, and other personnel were employed by the ECWRA. It is the Mission opinion that the long range solution to its needs is a substantial increase in FNDH positions.

USAID/Senegal's FNDH allotted level was established at 22 workyears. If the FNDH ceiling is increased and the PSC limitations remain at the current levels the Mission will be able to meet the need for services to design, and manage the AID projects in the area for which the USAID/Senegal Mission Director is responsible. Without an increase in FNDH ceiling or access to an institutional contract the design, support and management function could not be accomplished.

In converting local currency costs to dollars, a rate of 250 CFA to $1.00 was used. This was the prevailing rate at the end of April, 1981. For budgetary purposes it was assumed that there would be no variance in the rate of exchange between the CFA and U.S. dollar between the current date, and FY-81 and FY-82.

USDH Unit Costs were high in FY-80 due to Post Assignment Costs to fill up to a stable staff level. Unexpected assignment costs due to deaths and unanticipated transfers kept these costs high in FY-81. The small decreases expected in FY-82 and again in FY-83 are due to an expected stable USDH staff level offset by anticipated inflationary cost increases. FNDH unit cost changes anticipated are due to inflationary and exchange rate changes. FNDH Unit Costs were slightly less in FY-81 due to an increased strength in the U.S. dollar in the fiscal year. Contract Personnel Unit Costs are decreasing due to expected PSC additions recruited locally to save on housing costs. Small increase thereafter due to inflationary factors. Unit housing cost increases are all inflationary. The smaller increase between FY-82 and FY-83 accounts for a large number of leases currently negotiated through FY-83. Office Operational Costs are climbing due to inflationary pressures, staff increases and institutional contract support costs as well as the expanded staff training as discussed above.

Country/Office SENEGAL, OMVS

TABLE VIII

OPERATING EXPENSE SUMMARY

COST SUMMARIES	FY 1980			FY 1981			FY 1982		
	($000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	($000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	($000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	1,568.7	24.0	65.3	1,431.0	21.5	66.6	1,871.9	29.0	64.5
FN Direct Hire	162.4	15.0	10.8	195.5	19.0	10.3	228.3	22.0	10.4
US Contract Pers.	48.2	2.0	24.1	34.4	1.0	34.4	83.6	4.0	20.9
FN Contract Pers.	24.8	1.0	24.8	34.0	1.0	34.0	52.3	2.0	26.2
Housing Expense	513.3	24.0	21.4	567.4	24.0	23.6	718.2	29.0	24.8
Office Operations	1,558.3	xx	xx	1,671.0	xx	xx	1,835.8	xx	xx
Total Budget	3,875.7	xxx	xxx	3,933.3	xx	xx	4,790.1	xx	xx
Mission Allotment	2,305.0	xxx	xxx	2,626.4	xx	xx	3,104.2	xx	xx
FAAS	308.4	xxx	xxx	300.1	xx	xx	354.1	xx	xx
Trust Fund	-0-	xxx	xxx	-0-	xx	xx	-0-	xx	xx

Country/Office SENEGAL, OMVS

TABLE VIII

COST SUMMARIES	FY 1983 ($000's)	FY 1983 Related Workyear	FY 1983 Unit Cost	FY 1983 (000's)	FY 1983 Related Workyear	FY 1983 Unit Cost	FY 1983 ($000's)	FY 1983 Related Workyear	FY 1983 Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	1,844.5	29.0	63.6						
FN Direct Hire	254.4	22.0	11.6						
US Contract Pers.	89.9	4.0	22.5						
FN Contract Pers.	54.1	2.0	27.1						
Housing Expense	730.0	29.0	25.2						
Office Operations	2,015.9	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
Total Budget	4,988.8	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
Mission Allotment	3,207.7	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
FAAS	424.9	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
Trust Fund	-0-	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SHC	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 ABOVE PLAN LEVEL	FY 84	FY 85
387	U	10	011	51005 DIRECTOR	S	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
397	U	10	012	51010 DEPUTY DIRECTOR	S	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
404	U	10	050	51051 SECRETARY	F	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1865	F	10	990	CHAUFFEUR (SENIOR)	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
415	U	20	023	53005 PROGRAM OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
421	U	20	023	53009 DEPUTY PROGRAM OFFICER	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	20	023	REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~427~~	~~U~~	~~20~~	~~023~~	~~54010 ASSISTANT PROGRAM OFFICER~~	~~M~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	20	023	ASSISTANT REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~436~~	~~U~~	~~20~~	~~050~~	~~51065 SECRETARY~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	20	021	PROGRAM ECONOMIST	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~482~~	~~U~~	~~20~~	~~940~~	~~51036 CAPITAL PROJECTS DEV OFFICER~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
1866	F	20	024	PROGRAM ASSISTANT	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	20	910	TRAINING SPECIALIST	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1868~~	~~F~~	~~20~~	~~03~~	~~ASSISTANT WID OFFICER~~	~~P~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	F	20	910	DOCUMENTATION SPECIALIST	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1867	F	20	07	TRANSLATOR/INTERPRETER	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~447~~	~~U~~	~~30~~	~~103~~	~~55020 PROJECT MANAGER AGRICULTURE~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
~~470~~	~~U~~	~~30~~	~~103~~	~~55005 PROJECT MANAGER AGRICULTURE~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
~~484~~	~~U~~	~~30~~	~~103~~	~~55016 PROJECT MGR AGRICULTURE~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
~~477~~	~~U~~	~~30~~	~~802~~	~~54004 REGIONAL DEV OFFICER~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	30	940	PROJECT DESIGN DIVISION OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
481	U	30	804	51055 HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
508	U	30	940	51038 ASST CAP PROJECT DEV OFFICER	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1869~~	~~F~~	~~30~~	~~050~~	~~SECRETARY~~	~~E~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	30	251	ENGINEER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	30	251	ENGINEER ASSISTANT	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	30	940	PROJECT DESIGN ASSISTANT	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

BUREAU: BUREAU FOR AFRICA

04/15/81

DECISION UNIT: SENEGAL

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SHC	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 ABOVE PLAN LEVEL	FY 84	FY 85
~~1072~~	~~U~~	~~40~~	~~101~~	~~55025 AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIST ACRONOMIST~~	~~M~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	40	103	PROJECT MANAGER AGRICULTURE	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
512	U	40	103	55015 ~~PROJECT MANAGER AGRICULTURE~~ AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
517	U	40	103	54015 ~~PROJECT MANAGER AGRICULTURE~~ ASSISTANT AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	103	PROJECT MANAGER AGRICULTURE	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	X	12	12
536	U	40	150	51020 REGIONAL FOOD FOR PEACE OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	103	PROJECT MANAGER-LIVESTOCK	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1071~~	~~U~~	~~40~~	~~251~~	~~51031 GEN ENGINEERING ADVISOR~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	40		PROJECT MANAGER-OMVS	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~526~~	~~U~~	~~40~~	~~257~~	~~54020 HYDRAULIC ENGINEER ADVISOR - OMVS~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	40		PROJECT MANAGER-OMVS	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	X	12	12
1070	U	40	502	51025 REGIONAL HEALTH OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U		103	PROEJCT MANAGER AGRICULTURE	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1870~~	~~F~~	~~40~~	~~07~~	~~ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT~~		~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
	U	40	502	FOOD FOR PEACE IDI	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	502	HEALTH IDI	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	X	12	12
	U	40	502	AGRICULTURE IDI	M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~558~~	~~U~~	~~50~~	~~041~~	~~52015 FINANCIAL ANALYST~~	~~H~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
562	U	50	042	52011 BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING OFFICER	~~H~~M	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
549	U	50	043	52005 REGIONAL CONTROLLER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1871	F	50	041	CHIEF ACCOUNTANT	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1873	F	50	041	ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1876	F	50	041	~~ACCOUNTING CLERK~~ VOUCHER EXAMINER	~~E~~P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1877	F	50	041	ACCOUNTANT	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1872	F	50	07	VOUCHER EXAMINER	P	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1875	F	50	071	ADMINISTRATIVE TECHNICIAN	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1874~~	~~F~~	~~50~~	~~990~~	~~SCHEDULING CLERK~~	~~E~~	~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
1073	U	60	032	51015 MANAGEMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

BUREAU: BUREAU FOR AFRICA

DECISION UNIT: SENEGAL

04/15/81

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SHC	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 ABOVE PLAN LEVEL	FY 84	FY 85
500	U	60	932	51060 SUPPLY MGT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1878	F	60	050	SECRETARY	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60	032	ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1881~~	~~F~~	~~60~~	~~07~~	~~RECEPTIONIST~~		~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
1879	F	60	072	MAIL AND REPRODUCTION SUPERVISOR	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1880	F	60	072	COMMUNICATION AND RECORDS SUPERVISOR CLERK	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1882	F	60	990	~~CHAUFFEUR~~ DRIVER	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1883	F	60	990	DRIVER	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60	990	DRIVER	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1884	F	60	990	DISPATCHER	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60	932	FREIGHT SUPERVISOR	N	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
~~1885~~	~~F~~	~~60~~	~~990~~	~~MECHANIC~~		~~-~~	~~40~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~12~~	~~-~~	~~12~~	~~12~~
				TOTAL FOR DECUNIT				~~564~~ 612	~~564~~ 612	~~564~~ 612	~~564~~ 612	~~564~~ 612		~~564~~ 612	~~564~~ 612

FY 83

SENEGAL - PL-480 NARRATIVE

I. INTRODUCTION

"The long range goal (2000 AD) of U.S. assistance to Senegal is food self-sufficiency, defined in the broadest sense as: Senegal's achievement of the capacity to feed its people, by domestic production and storage and by trade, even in drought years". (FY 1983 CDSS, page 20).

The pursuit of food self-sufficiency in its broadest sense requires USAID/Senegal to follow two complementary program paths, as set forth in the CDSS:

(a) Increase and diversify agricultural production and trade;

(b) Improve nutrition and access to family health facilities to maximize the benefits of increased agricultural production.

The objective of the $ 15 million Title I/III Program proposed for FY 1983 is exclusively increased production and trade; the objective of the ongoing Title II Program is principally improved nutrition, and with it the increased confidence required if birth rates are to be reduced. The specific relationship of each program to the CDSS is delineated in the following pages.

The Title III program has yet to complete its first year. We are confident that Title III is proceeding on a sound basis but with implementation less rapid than planned. Continued efforts to improve the impact of Title II with the total country development thrust are reported hereafter. An evaluation of the Title II program, now approaching $ 10 million annually, should be undertaken in FY 83.

TITLE I/III

II. PROGRAM COST

Senegal's first Title III Program was initiated in May 1980 and provided for the annual sale of $ 7 million worth of rice over FY 80, 81 and 82 for a total of $21 million. We proposed to extend this program for another three years at the rate of $15 million per year commencing in FY 83. Rice is a staple foodgrain of Senegal's population, and the amount to be imported under Title III is negligible compared to total rice imports.

An important measure of the USAID development effort, including Title II resources, are directed to reducing Senegal's dependency on food imports. The justification for this goal is outlined hereafter.

III. HOW TITLE III RESOURCES ARE INTEGRATED WITH CDSS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Food self-sufficiency, the long range goal of U.S. assistance to Senegal, to be pursued by complementary programs of agricultural and human development, was a strategy hammered out on the basis of the following three sets of data which provide the approach, and give character and emphasis to the Title III program. These three data bases are described at length in the CDSS and only referenced here to provide the thread of logic to Title III projects:

1. SENEGAL'S FINANCIAL CRISIS

Senegal is caught in its worst financial and economic crisis since Independence with a spiraling balance of payments deficit, a high rate of population increase, negligible economic growth: high imports of petroleum and food, and drought in six of the last ten years. There are few economic linkages between the rural and urban populations. About 60% of the GDP is produced by 10% of the (urban) population; a majority of farmers operate at subsistence level, while the urban population lives almost exclusively on food (rice and wheat) imports. Dakar's population increases by 6.1% per year; the overall population increases between 2.7% - 3.3% per year. Soil fertility is very poor, and is declining in the central growing area, the Peanut Basin. This crisis has serious implications for the Government food policy (CDSS p.1 - 12).

2. REFORM PLAN (PLAN DE REDRESSEMENT)

The Government of Senegal has organized in response to this crisis, a comprehensive program of macro-economic and agricultural reform, named the Plan de Redressement (Reform Plan). The agricultural reform objectives include:

(1) The development of food crops;
(2) The diversification of agricultural production and promotion of agricultural processing for export;
(3) Increased farm income and improved quality of life;
(4) The encouragement of farmers to accept more responsibility by providing them with extension services and training in cooperative organization, so as to enhance their capability to manage their own affairs.

In 1980, the GOS demonstrated its commitment to the Reform Plan through various measures which included:

(1) Abolishing subsidies on consumer food items;
(2) Increasing farmgate prices of peanuts and cotton;

(3) Increasing import duties and increasing export subsidies; and
(4) Placing a five year moratorium on farm debt.
(CDSS p. 12 - 18)

3. USAID/GOS JOINT ASSESSMENT 1980

In the first half of calendar 1980, the GOS and USAID conducted a six month review of the 1975-1979 USAID program. This assessment has led to the joint planning of economic assistance for 1983-1987. The major findings of the joint assessment were:

1. USAID programming will need to consider and respond to the balance of payments and liquidity crisis.

2. Although Senegalese institutions charged with rural development (RDA's and cooperatives) are to be reformed, the USAID should not reply on them exclusively to reach the target population.

3. To achieve maximum impact, USAID projects must be more closely monitored and the ground level beneficiaries must be more involved in project design and implementation.

4. Greater attention must be given to how USAID resources can stimulate local production forces and build cost effective institutions (CDSS p.18 - 20).

4. THE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS TITLE III WILL ADDRESS

The GOS financial crisis, the Plan de Redressement, and the joint USAID/GOS Program Evaluation contributed to the following selection of Title III supported projects in FY 83 and thereafter. (see also Table A).

a. RURAL TECHNICAL SCHOOLS

These are new components to this activity initiated under the first Title III Agreement:

(1) National Institute of Rural Development (INDR - Thies)

To commence training agriculture sector specialists for middle level administrative and management positions within the GOS development agencies and private business, Development Assistance and Title III funds, along with support from France and the World Bank, will help to establish the first university level agricultural training facility in Senegal.

(2) National School of Applied Economics (ENEA - Dakar)

Title III funds will be used to change and upgrade the ENEA academic program in response to the reforms in the role and organization of cooperatives required by the Plan de Redressement.

b. DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR RURAL/AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES (RDF)

The GOS/USAID Joint Assessment criticized AID projects for their failure to directly engage villagers in project planning

and implementation, and warned of USAID's inability to reply exclusively on RDA's to reach the target population. In response to these observations, Title III funds will be used to extend and expand the RDF established under the first Title III Agreement as follows:

(1) Peace Corps/USAID Joint Programs.

To promote self sufficiency in food production, Title III funds will be programmed with Peace Corps to: (a) construct ponds and produce fresh water fish, (b) construct village level seed storage; (c) identify the causes and magnitude of post harvest grain losses; (d) improve the use of river water transport for farm to market trade.

(2) PVO Sector Grant

To promote village level participation in food production and soil conservation in the Sine Saloum Region, Title III funds will be allocated to a working body of Senegalese and American PVO's, together with Peace Corps, to stimulate participation in development efforts such as reforestation, coop training, operation of health huts, assistance at Title II food distribution centers, and stockpiling of waste materials for extrusion as fuel bricketts.

c. RENEWABLE ENERGY II

Title III funds will provide the local currency costs for the production and field trials of prototype renewable energy production and conversion processes for rural communities.

d. FUELWOOD II

Title III funds will help to meet the local currency costs of clearing and planting an additional 3000 hectares of intensely managed forest plantations. These funds will also help to harvest and replant on a rotational basis the forests developed by Fuelwood I.

e. COOPERATIVE OPERATIONS SUPPORT

Title III funds will support the local currency components of a dollar funded project to assist the National Cooperative Organization to improve its supervision of local and regional cooperatives.

This project was preceded in FY 82 by a project to train coop managers and trainers for village organization. A follow-on Title III project will provide working capital to the reorganized village cooperatives.

f. ECOSYSTEM REGENERATION

Title III funds will help to meet the local currency costs of a dollar funded major soil conservation effort to propagate the growth of Acacia Albida trees in the Millet Peanut Basin. This will be done, first, by establishing nurseries and thereafter by planting and tending the trees in the fields. The project will generalize and intensify this proven means of maintaining soil fertility.

g. RIVER BASIN DEVELOPMENT

To help provide the supporting infrastructure associated with this tri-part river development scheme, Title III funds will be used exclusively within Senegal to construct the ISRA research station at Fanaye for the OMVS Agriculture Research project, to build housing for researchers at Richard Toll, and to establish similar essential facilities.

h. FOODGRAIN RESERVE

As a logical and necessary follow on to the USAID funded 30,000 MT flat cereals storage project (685-0209) now completed, Title III funds will be used to purchase indigenous millet through the village coop network for storage as a reserve against drought and as a guaranteed source of supply for the production of millet-based foods, including weaning foods, under the Millet Transformation Project (685-0250).

i. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Administrative cost of the Secretariate supporting the Title III Management Committee.

IV. FOOD AVAILABILITY PROSPECTS

Senegal's dual cereal economy, where the rural majority produces only subsistence quantities of cereal while the urban population lives almost exclusively on cereal imports, renders the traditional food balance sheet impractical. Instead, Table B describes net production, commercial and donated cereal imports and requirements, assuming an annual per capita consumption of 180 Kg per year.

Table C examines rice consumption and imports in the urban context in which they occur; it reflects the following:

- Growth rates. Dakar's population increases 6.1% annually, other urban areas increase 4.3%, and the rural population increases 1.8%.

- Rice consumption. Unless price (import duty) constraints are placed on imported rice, thus forcing some consumers to millet, or unless the Millet Transformation Project initiated in 1981 is effective over the long term in converting urban populations to millet, rice demand will grow in direct proportion with the urban population.

- Domestic rice production may increase 8.2% per year from 1981/82 onward, but since 95% has been consumed by the producers themselves in the past, increased domestic production will have little immediate effect in reducing the rice import requirement.

- Commercial imports will rise 92,000 MT, from 285,000 MT in 1980 to 377,000 MT in 1985.

These projections have serious implications for Senegal's balance of payment crisis. They underline the importance of the Title III supported development projects.

V. STORAGE, DISTRIBUTION, AND MARKETING CONSTRAINTS

Title III imports in FY 1980, 1981, and 1982 constituted about 5% of Senegal's total rice imports; in FY 83, 84, and 85 Title III transactions will account for about 8% of total rice imports. In neither case will these quantities encounter storage, marketing and/or distribution problems, nor will they constitute a discentive to production.

(a) Storage and Handling

Total rice imports average 22,000 MT per month; purchase and delivery schedules, including those of Title III, are arranged to provide an even flow of imports over the entire year and to avoid overtaxing storage facilities.

(b) Marketing

The principal rice production areas of Senegal are found in the more remote regions of the country. Not more than 5% of Senegal's rice production is consumed outside of the area in which it is grown. In 1980, commercial rice imports and Title III, were distributed 80% in the greater Dakar area (including Thies and Kaolack) and 20% in other urban areas. Table C illustrates the balance of payments implications arising from a failure to increase production and reduce cereals imports. Local currencies generated from the sale of Title III are used to support projects in the agricultural sector, designed to reduce dependency on food imports and to increase domestic production.

TABLE A

Summary Budget, PL-480 Title III

SENEGAL FOOD FOR DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ($000)

	FY81 Year 2	FY82 Year 3	FY83 Year 4
I. Approximate Generations:	$7,000	$7,000	$15,000
II. Use by Projects:			
1. Agricultural Policy Studies	300	300	
2. Local Cooperatives Storage	1,000	1,000	
3. Decentralization of Research	1,520	1,710	
4. Rural Technical Schools	900	240	2,000
5. Reforestation and Dune Fixation	2,180	2,650	
6. Development Fund for Rural/ Agricultural Activities	1,000	1,000	3,900
7. Renewable Energy II			1,000
8. Fuelwood II			2,000
9. Cooperative Operations Support			1,000
10. Ecosystem Regeneration			2,000
11. River Basin Development (Senegal)			2,000
12. Foodgrain Reserve			1,000
Sub-total			14,900
Program Management	100	100	100
GRAND TOTAL	7,000	7,000	15,000

TABLE B

ANNUAL CEREAL SUPPLY AND REQUIREMENT

(000's MT)

Year	Net Production	Imports Rice, Wheat	Donated Cereals	Total Supply	Requirement at 180 Kg/yr.	Difference
72/73	298	297	126	721	841	- 121
73/74	467	294	132	893	864	+ 29
74/75	731	204	42	977	887	+ 90
75/76	606	355	59	1,020	910	+ 110
76/77	544	324	50	918	933	- 15
77/78	335	370	140	845	958	- 113
78/79	866	368	-	1,234	982	+ 252
79/80	496	376	61	933	1,008	- 75
80/81	517	379	130	1,026	1,035	- 9

(1) 79/80/81 wheat imports estimated on the basis of prior 5-year average

TABLE C

Urban Supply and Demand for Rice

	76/77	77/78	78/79	79/80	80/81	81/82	82/83	83/84	84/85
1. Urban Demand: a. Dakar	186	184	210	231	245	260	276	293	311
b. Other Ruban	46	46	53	58	60	63	66	69	72
c. Total (6+7)	232	230	263	289	305	323	342	362	383
2. Domestic Production - Milled at 65% - Paddy	73 (112)	41 (63)	91 (140)	79 (122)	44 (68)	93 (143)	100 (155)	109 (168)	118 (182)
3. Seed and Waste 10%	7	4	9	8	4	9	10	11	12
4. Domestic Production Availability for Consumption	66	37	82	71	40	84	90	98	106
5. - Rural Demand 95% available	63	35	78	67	38	80	86	93	100
6. - Urban (residual) 5% available	3	2	4	4	2	4	4	5	6
7. Import Requirements (1c-6)	229	228	259	285	303	319	338	357	377
8. Of Which Title III contribures	-	-	-	(18.5)	(13)	(15.5)	(30)	(30)	(30)

1 - Urban Demand: - Dakar:-increases at estimated 6.1% annually
-actual for 79/80; otherwise projected
- Other:-increases at 4.3% annually
-actual for 79/80; otherwise projected
- Total:-actual for 79/80 and before
-projected by sum of Dakar + Other
-prorated between Dakar and Other at 79/80 actual

2 - Domestic Production : -actual through 1980/81
-increases at 8.2% from 1978/79 actual of 140

3 - Rural Demand: -80% is auto-consumed; - 15% goes to local market; - 5% only reaches urban market (urban residual)

4 - Import Requirements: This amount from total urban demand equals import requirements

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE XI
Country: SENEGAL
P.L. 480 TITLE I/III REQUIREMENTS
(Dollars in Millions, Tonnage in Thousands)

COMMODITIES	FY 1981 Agreement $	FY 1981 Agreement MT	FY 1981 Shipments $	FY 1981 Shipments MT	FY 1981 Carry into FY 1982 $	FY 1981 Carry into FY 1982 MT	Estimated FY 1982 Agreement $	Estimated FY 1982 Agreement MT	Estimated FY 1982 Shipments $	Estimated FY 1982 Shipments MT	Estimated FY 1982 Carry into FY 1983 $	Estimated FY 1982 Carry into FY 1983 MT	Projected FY 1983 Agreement $	Projected FY 1983 Agreement MT	Projected FY 1983 Shipments $	Projected FY 1983 Shipments MT	Projected FY 1983 Carry into FY 1984 $	Projected FY 1983 Carry into FY 1984 MT
Title I																		
RICE	7	13	7	13	-	-	7	15.5	7	15.5	-	-	15	30	15	30	-	-
Total																		
Of which Title III																		
RICE	7	13	7	13	-	-	7	15.5	7	15.5	-	-	15	30	15	30	-	-
Total																		

COMMENT: Agreement signed 5/16/80 amended 12/23/80 provides dols 7 million annually in FY 80,81, and 82 for L.C. utilization in FY 81, 82 and 83

Title II

I. PROGRAM COMPONENTS AND OBJECTIVES

The FY 83 $9.2 million Title II program will be administered by The Catholic Relief Service (CRS). The program will continue to operate exclusively in rural Senegal, and almost exclusively through GOS health and development facilities. The great majority of these centers (82%) are located within the Peanut Basin, the Casamance, and the Fleuve-USAID/Senegal's three geographic areas of concentration.

A. MATERNAL CHILD HEALTH (MCH)

MCH is the first priority recipient category in Title II. In FY 83 MCH comprises 216,000 mothers and infants or 87% of total program recipients at a cost of $ 7,883,000.

The MCH program objectives are: (1) to provide critical nutrients to the age group under six years and to mothers of child-bearing age; (2) to provide mothers with education to combat malnutrition and infection; and (3) to reduce infant morbidity and mortality, lessen the rural family's expectation of infant death, and thus support USAID/GOS family planning efforts.

B. FOOD FOR WORK (FFW)

FFW is the second priority recipient category in Title II policy. The CRS FFW program operates exclusively in the Wassadou (OFADEC) Agricultural Development and Production Project, located South of Tambacounda in the Gambia River Basin. In FY 83, this program will help to support 25,000 workers and dependents, or 10% of total program recipients, at a cost of $ 869,000. The Wassadou program objective is to increase food production and gross income of the Wassadou Cooperative members, and thus slow the rate of rural exodus. The PL-480 Title III Rural Development Fund is providing $ 250,000 local currency annually for three years to support this project.

C. ADULT HEALTH

Adult Health constitutes 3% of the Title II recipients; its objective is to provide food relief to the aged and infirm who otherwise are unable to secure sufficient food. The cost of the program in FY 83 is $ 427,000.

II. RELATION TO CDSS

A. MCH - The CDSS (page 21) describes and justifies the pursuit of two parallel program paths - increased food production and improved health and nutrition - to achieve food self-sufficiency, broadly conceived. The effectiveness of the Title II MCH program in support of that goal will be enhanced by the following actions:

(1) The development of a millet based weaning food, which ultimately will replace Title II imports, is another step closer to reality by approval of the Millet Transformation Project (685-250) for obligation in FY 1981, and implementation in FY 82 and FY 83. Through its stimulation of millet production, diversification of sales outlets, creation of rural employment, involvement of cooperatives in the supply of millet and possible manufacture of weaning food for consumption in rural health centers, this one project responds to many strategy components of the CDSS (CDSS p 13, 16, 27).

(2) Coordination of Title II food imports with the installation of a nutrition component into the Sine-Saloum Rural Health Project will provide a resource realignment long overdue and fully in accord with improving the population's access to Primary Health Care (CDSS page 50).

(3) The synergistic relationship between a mother's health, her nutrition, and the spacing of her children will inevitably link currently imported Title II foods, and thereafter those manufactured in Senegal, to the improved nutrition of mothers and infants. These are essential concomitant actions with the introduction of family planning programs (CDSS page 53).

(4) GOS salaried Regional Supervisors to the CRS Title II MCH program have just completed publication of a 15-subject lecture outline packet. These minimally detailed, family oriented outlines, together with a new administration manual, promise to enhance the effectiveness of the educational message given at the 454 GOS health stations where Title II foods are distributed.

B. FFW - The Title II Food For Work component (as well as PL-480 Title III Local Currency) is directed exclusively to the Wassadou Agricultural Development and Production Project. The objectives of that Project fully support the CDSS because it promotes resettlement in rural areas; increases the land area under cultivation; promotes new technologies to increase food production, diversifies agriculture by producing rice, millet, corn, manioc, bananas, citrus and other fruits and vegetables; raises per capita income; strengthens public participation in crops; and exports food to urban Senegal and enhances the quality of life.

III. PRODUCTION DISINCENTIVES AND STORAGE

The blended and fortified foods provided under Title II are not produced locally. The rural majority, to which the MCH program is directed, generally are not accustomed to purchasing imported baby foods. Consequently, the especially developed Title II supplemental foods are not displacing market sales of indigenous foods and do not, therefore, constitute a disincentive to local production. The Food-For-Work program supports the Wassadou Agricultural Development Production Project which is designed to increase indigenous food production.

Warehousing at the Port of Dakar and in the interior is adequate.

IV. RECIPIENTS

The development of the CRS Title II program in Senegal over recent years reflects controlled growth, improved program quality, and conformity to Title II priorities. The following table compares the number of recipients by category for the three years.

CATEGORY	FY 81 Authorized Recipients	%	FY 82 AER Request Recipients	%	FY 83 ABS Recipients	%	$ Million
MCH	200,500	82	200,500	87	216,000	87	7.9
FFW	39,500	16	25,000	11	25,000	10	0.9
Adult Health	6,000	2	6,000	2	7,000	3	0.4
Total	246,000	100	231,500	100	248,000	100	9.2

V. COMMODITIES AND RATIONS

No changes in commodities or rations are proposed for FY 83; these are as follows:

CATEGORY	COMMODITY	RATION/MONTH (kgs)	
MCH	CSM	3.75	
	SFSG	3.75 x	
	SFC	3.75 x	
			7.50
FFW	SFC	11.0	
			11.0
Adult Health	CSM	2.0	
	SFC	9.0	
			11.0

x Alternates

VI. MULTI-YEAR PROGRAMMING

We expect this program to continue, generally as presently structured, and with modest (6 - 8%) annual increases in recipients through FY 85. Commencing in FY 86 we expect the production of indigenous weaning food to reduce Title II imports by roughly 20% per year.

VII. CRS OPERATIONAL PLAN

An amendment to the CRS Operational Plan stating the correct recipient numbers and commodity costs is attached as Statistical Supplement (B).

CRS/Senegal
Food Requirement
FY 83

STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT (B)

COMMODITY REQUIREMENTS AND CCC VALUE

By Category	Recipients	Commodities	Kgs (000)	US $ (000)
MCH	216,000	CSM	9,720	4,520
MCH	108,000	SFS Grits	4,860	1,657
MCH	108,000	SF Cornmeal	4,860	1,706
FFW	25,000	SF Cornmeal	2,475	869
Adult Health Cases	7,000	CSM	168	162
Adult Health Cases	7,000	SF Cornmeal	756	265
Total	248,000		22,839	9,179

By Commodity				
CSM			9,888	4,682
SF Sorghum Grits			4,860	1,657
SF Cornmeal			8,091	2,840
Total	248,000		22,839 MT	$ 9,179

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE XIII

FL 480 TITLE II

I. Country SENEGAL

Sponsor's Name CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES

A. Maternal and Child Health.....Total Recipients 216

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands) KGS	Dollars
216	CSM	9,720	4,520
108	SFGRITS	4,860	1,657
108	SF CORNMEAL	4,860	1,706
Total MCH		19,440	7,883

B. School Feeding.....Total Recipients

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands) KGS	Dollars
Total School Feeding			

C. Other Child Feeding.....Total Recipients

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands) KGS	Dollars
Total Other Child Feeding			

D. Food for Work.....Total Recipients 25

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands) KGS	Dollars
25	SF CORNMEAL	2,475	869
Total Food for Work		2,475	

E. Other (Specify)...ADULT HEALTH.....Total Recipients 7

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands) KGS	Dollars
7	CSM	168	162
7	SF CORNMEAL	756	265
Total Other		924	427
GRAND TOTAL :	CSM	9,888	4,682
	SFGRITS	4,860	1,657
	SF CORNMEAL	8,091	2,840
		22,839	9,179

248