

UNCLASSIFIED

**AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT**



ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

FY 82

SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL

BEST AVAILABLE

JULY 1980

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

ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
FY 1982
SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Background	1
Table I Narrative	4
Table I, Long Range Plan by Appropriation Account	7
Table III, Project Obligations by Appropriation Account	8
Table IV, Project Budget Data	9
Table V, FY 1982 Proposed Program Ranking	11
Annex I, Bureau Program/Management Work Plan 1982-1982 Preliminary View	12
Annex II, Regional Development Strategy Statement Retrospect	17

APR/SA
July 2, 1980

ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
FOR FY 1982
SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL PROGRAM

Background

Recent events in southern Africa have enhanced the setting in which U.S. assistance will support regional economic and developmental cooperation. On April 1, 1980, nine southern Africa nations held, in Lusaka, Zambia, a Southern Africa Economic Coordination Summit. At this meeting, representatives from Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe signed a declaration for regional collaboration that had been initially drafted in July 1979, when the five "Front Line" states held the first Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference in Arusha, Tanzania. The declaration calls for consolidating the Front Line states association as an intermedium for regional cooperation in economic development. A program of action was developed at the Lusaka Summit for implementing, on a quasi-sectoral basis, the substance of the declaration.

Under the program, each of the nine countries is responsible for coordinating with the other member countries an approach for mobilizing individual resources within the region in order to address specified common development concerns. According to the program: Angola will coordinate action related to energy; Botswana will address foot and mouth disease eradication and semi-arid land use research; in Maputo, Mozambique, a Regional Transport and Communications Commission will be established; Tanzania will coordinate regional cooperation in industrialization; Swaziland is to organize

an approach in support of manpower development; Zambia is responsible for coordinating a study of regional financial arrangements; and Zimbabwe will direct a regional approach to establishing a food security plan.

From a practical standpoint, the southern African countries view regional cooperation in these areas as a means for advancing the pace of economic progress in the individual countries and lessening their dependency on the Republic of South Africa. Institutional means for implementing the program are to be discussed when cabinet ministers from the nine countries meet in Salisbury, Zimbabwe in September 1980. This meeting will also establish the format for soliciting support from the international donor community in another meeting scheduled in November.

USAIDs in the respective southern African countries have begun to assess (in their Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs) and individual ABSs) how the A.I.D. Southern Africa Regional Program can best respond to the recent overtures for regional economic cooperation. A.I.D.'s RPSS for FY 1982 to FY 1986 has outlined an assistance program that is consistent with the priorities established by the southern African countries themselves. The two meetings scheduled in September and November 1980 will result in specific proposals for proceeding with project assistance. A.I.D. assistance in response to southern African initiatives will be focused in four areas: transport and storage, agriculture and livestock, manpower, and small-scale enterprise. With the limited funding available in FY 81, preliminary project activities will be initiated - feasibility

studies, workshops, project design, and other preliminary activities. In the area of transport, rehabilitation and technical assistance activities may be undertaken.

TABLE I - NARRATIVE

Part 1 - Relationship Between FY 1982 Program Level and
Direct-Hire Personnel Planning Levels

In the FY 1982 RDSS and CDSSs for the individual countries, continued emphasis is placed on helping the southern Africa nations develop and implement investments in transport, agriculture, small-scale enterprises, and manpower. Additional project assistance will be used for program development in these four areas, and other support activities (e.g., PM R, Self-Help). A total of seven projects are proposed in support of A.I.D.'s RPSS for the region. These projects include three non-sectoral activities: support for Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) (0202); Planning, Management, and Research funds (PM&R) (0206); and Self-Help funds (0203). Project activity is to be initiated in FY 81 in the four areas: Agricultural and Livestock Development (0207); Technical, Vocational and Managerial Training (0208); Transportation and Storage (0209); and Small-Scale Enterprise Promotion (0210). Because funding in FY 81 for the regional activities is expected to be restricted project activity will perforce be limited to preliminary activities, e.g., workshops, feasibility studies, and initial pilot activities. In the area of transport, sufficient financing may be available for some rehabilitation and technical assistance activity. With substantial funding in FY 82, major programs may be expected based on the preliminary activity pursued in FY 81.

Since the inception of the AID Southern Africa Regional Program, the Planning Office in the Africa Bureau's division of the Office of

Southern African Affairs (AFR/SA) has held primary responsibility for the program's development. Under the supervision of the Director of AFR/SA, the Planning Office has an authorized staff of two full-time and one part-time professional. With appropriate support from AFR/DR, the southern Africa USAID's, and occasional contract assistance, the present staffing level has thus far been adequate to meet program needs. What is not yet clear are the implications of regional program:field implementation requirements on the southern African USAIDs. These missions have comparatively small staffs. Thus, direct-hire field manpower availability for regional responsibilities is limited and will be constrained by bilateral requirements which will continue to have priority.

Both regional program development and implementation responsibilities would best be placed in the field. At present, the AID bilateral program staffs in southern Africa are core (skeletal) staffs which require heavy support primarily from the regional services mission in Nairobi (REDSO/EA). New AID programs in Zimbabwe (in FY 80) and quite likely Mozambique (in FY 81) will strain REDSO resources. This and the need to place the additional burden of regional program functions in the field, which will be required in earnest in FY 81, argue for the creation of a sister REDSO in southern Africa (i.e., separating REDSO/Nairobi into two separate servicing missions for east and southern Africa). The southern Africa REDSO would consolidate Mbabane regional staff as well. It would handle both the services and regional program development and implementation functions working closely with the bilateral core

staffs. While this alternative is being studied, a regional program development officer should be placed in southern Africa to pursue program development.*

*See Annex 1, Bureau Program/Management Work Plan.

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

PROJECT	PROGRAM	STATUS	REGISTRATION DATE	FINISH DATE	DATE OF NEXT PLANNED REVIEW (Y/M)	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)										FY 1982 U.S. DOLLAR VALUE (\$000)	FORWARD FUNDING TO (MONTH)	FUTURE YEAR ESTIMATIONS
						FY 1980					FY 1981							
						PRELIM AS OF 9/30/79	RECUR	CONTRIM	TRNG. PER/ANN	TRNG. PER/ANN	RECUR	CONTRIM	TRNG. PER/ANN	TRNG. PER/ANN	TRNG. PER/ANN			
690-0063	Development Training for Southern Africans	C	76	80		8043	3000	8000	3043	-	3043	-	-	-	-	-		
690-0076	Southern Perimeter Road	C	78	81		24800	-	4000	20800	8000	8000	20800	-	-	-	-		
690-0201	Refugee Support	C	78	80		9101	5000	12101	2000	-	2000	-	-	-	-	-		
690-0202	Private Voluntary Orgns	C	78	Cont		-	-	-	-	1250	800	450	1500	Cont	Cont	Cont		
690-0206	Planning, Management and Research	C	80	Cont		-	1750	1000	750	2000	1750	1000	2000	Cont	Cont	Cont		
690-0207	Agriculture and Live-stock Development	C	81	83		-	-	-	-	1000	250	750	10000	9/83	10000			
690-0208	Technical, Vocational and Managerial Training	C	81	83		-	-	-	-	1000	500	500	3000	9/83	3000			
690-0209	Transportation and Storage Improvement	C	81	83		-	-	-	-	6500	3000	3500	30000	9/83	30000			
690-0210	Small Scale Enterprises Promotion	C	81	83		-	-	-	-	1000	500	500	3000	9/83	3000			

Ann 15508 (4-80)

INTERNATIONAL
Southern Africa Regional

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	OBLIGATION DATE	DATE OF NEXT PLANNED SCOURING EVAL.	ESTIMATED U.S. UTILITIES COST (\$000)						FY 1982 VAPL OBLIG.	FORWARD FUNDED TO (AND/FRI)	FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS	
				FY 1980			FY 1981						
				1980 PRELIM AS OF 9/30/79	CHGR.	RETRN.	TOTL. PRELIM.	IMPLM.	EXTRN.				1981 PRELIM.
690-9801	Human Rights Fund	G 81		-	-	-	-	-	-	75	cont	cont	
690-9901	Special Self-Help Pipeline projects with no further obligations as of 9-30-79	G 78		3174	300	300	-	250	250	-	425	cont	cont
TOTALS				45118	10050	25401	26593	21000	20093	27500	50000		

AND 1328 B (4-80)

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Southern Africa Regional

TABLE V . FY 1982 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY	PIPELINE/ONGOING/NEW	LOAN/GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	DECISION UNIT		WORK FORCE				
					Southern Africa Regional PROGRAM FUNDING (\$000)		USDH (Number of Positions)		PNDH		
					INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM	INCR	CUM	
	<u>DECISION PACKAGE MINIMUM</u>										
	<u>Pipeline Projects</u> 690-0076, Southern Perimeter Road	P	G	ESF	(20,800)	(20,800)					
	<u>New and Continuing Projects</u>										
1.	690-0209, Transportation & Storage Imp.	O	G	ESF	25,000	25,000					
2.	690-0207, Agriculture & Livestock Dev.	O	G	ESF	4,000	29,000					
3.	690-0208, Technical, Vocational and Managerial Training	O	G	ESF	1,000	30,000					
4.	690-0206, Planning, Management & Research	O	G	ESF	2,000	32,000					
5.	690-0202, Private Voluntary Organizations	O	G	ESF	1,500	33,500					
6.	690-0210, Small Scale Enterprise Promotion	O	G	ESF	1,000	34,500					
7.	690-9801, Human Rights Fund	N	G	ESF	75	34,575					
8.	690-9901, Special Self-Help	O	G	ESF	425	35,000					
	<u>DECISION PACKAGE AAPL</u>										
9.	690-0209, Transportation & Storage Imp.	O	G	ESF	5,000	40,000					
10.	690-0207, Agriculture & Livestock Dev.	O	G	ESF	6,000	46,000					
11.	690-0208, Technical, Vocational and Managerial Training	O	G	ESF	2,000	48,000					
12.	690-0210, Small Scale Enterprise Promotion	O	G	ESF	2,000	50,000					

a/ See Annex I, Bureau Program/Management Work Plan, 1982-1986.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : AFR/DP, Mr. Roy A. Stacy
AFR/EMS, Mr. David Main

DATE: June 3, 1980

FROM : AFR/SA, Martin V. Dagher *M. Dagher*

SUBJECT: Bureau Program/Management Work Plan 1982-86 - Preliminary View

REF: Stacy Memo of April 28, 1980

BACKGROUND

In approaching the program/management work plan for southern Africa, there are a few important points to register at the outset:

(1) None of the southern Africa D.A. countries is ranked below the six point category (IDCA Ranking) and the ESP programs in the region are being given a relatively high priority. Thus, phase-out by IDCA ranking criteria is not a consideration, although the Zimbabwe and Botswana programs might well be phase-out candidates at the end of the planning time-frame (1986).

(2) AID southern Africa assistance levels have only recently increased significantly; AID missions and offices have been in existence for less than two years. Having been caught in the midst of a bearish trend, staffing in southern Africa perforce already reflects the "more with less" philosophy. We are not faced, in southern Africa, with a legacy of relatively heavily-staffed missions from an earlier era.

(3) Thus, while our purpose here is to look at how we can best "husband our people resources" in southern Africa, we are in an overall expansion phase in terms both of assistance levels and staffing and already in a lean staffing pattern.

(4) From a broader perspective, I think it would be most useful if an inter-regional analysis and (within Africa) an inter-country or inter-area analysis were to be undertaken to determine existing program/staffing relationships with a view to establishing world-wide and intra-regional balance in the relationship between programs and staffing.

I. EXPECTED TRENDS IN THE A.I.D. PROGRAM IN SOUTHERN AFRICA - 1982-1986

A. Expansion of Numbers of Programs

There is a reasonable expectation that during the 1982-86 period, an AID program will be operative in Zimbabwe, Mozambique, and Namibia in



Buy U.S. Savings Bonds Regularly on the Payroll Savings Plan

addition to the five countries (Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Zambia and Malawi) where AID now has programs. We also expect to have a southern Africa regional program of some significance. Toward the end of the period, we can expect the AID program in Botswana, Zimbabwe, and, possibly, Swaziland to be phasing down but the others to be at roughly present or higher funding levels. The issue is how best to focus and manage these programs.

B. Program Concentration

There is a distinct trend toward program concentration in the region with particular emphasis on agricultural and human resources development. We note that the latter is not an IDCA area of concentration and assume that the Bureau will argue the case for Africa generally. Health, energy, employment (related particularly to development of small-scale enterprises), and low-cost housing are expected to (and should) receive some priority. Rapid population growth, part of the health problem but important enough to be singled out, is a problem area for the region which deserves more attention than it has been given to date. Transportation is another exceptionally important problem area for the region, which the AID program is expected to address.

C. Role of the Regional Program

The regional program will complement and reinforce the bilateral programs, i.e., will address problems or aspects of problems that are best developed in a regional context or handled by a regional mechanism (transportation activities, a region-wide agriculture information service, a dryland farming research institute, animal disease control, an entrepreneurial training institute, a graduate school of business, sharing region-wide national manpower training capacity - to name a few).

II. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT MODELS

There are presently two AID program management models in southern Africa, the AID Office (Zambia and Malawi) and the AID Mission (Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland). The latter is a minimal-personnel (ten-twelve U.S. direct-hire) mission. The AID Office has some five U.S. direct-hires. The existing AID offices draw very heavily on REDSO/EA services for program development and execution (implementation authorities are qualified by a need for REDSO/EA concurrence in important implementation actions). If we establish an AID office or small AID mission in Zimbabwe and (or an AAO) in Mozambique and Namibia, REDSO resources will be further strained. The southern Africa missions also depend on REDSO/EA for various services (e.g., project development and engineering).

A. AID Office Model

Typically, the AID office is composed of the AID Representative, two to three substantive officers (e.g., Agriculture, Human Resources, General Development) and a management/administrative officer. The latter is necessary to provide administrative back-up for the heavy flow of TDY personnel and resident contractors. The heavy TDY flow is occasioned not only by program development needs but also by execution requirements since the AID Representative must have REDSO concurrence on major implementation actions.

B. AID Mission Model

The missions in southern Africa are modest in their direct-hire staffing (Tab E). Typically, they include a Director and Assistant Director, program, project development, and management officers, a secretary, a controller, agriculture and human resources officers. Two of the three missions have an engineer. The missions in southern Africa have the full implementation authorities normally ascribed to AID missions but do not have (with the exception of Swaziland) project approval authority beyond \$500,000.

While the direct-hire staffs are small, numbers of AID-financed contractor personnel are quite large (some 40 on average). This can result in an administrative burden to the extent that contracting is done and support services are provided by the USAID. There is also, of course, a monitoring burden on mission management.

C. Sub-Regional Services

Regional services are provided most importantly by REDSO/EA in Nairobi whose staff has been essential in the development of the Zimbabwe program, whose services are none the less essential in program development operations in Zambia, and whose highly professional staff have provided important and effective services to most of the AID staffs in the southern Africa region. More limited (in scope) regional services are provided by USAID/Swaziland - legal, economic, and health/population. Some regional services are or will be provided by the Food for Peace Officer (in Zambia) and the engineer (in Lesotho), but 80 percent of their time will be devoted to work in their countries of assignment.

III. CONCLUSIONS

A. Program Concentration

AID bilateral programs in southern Africa are generally already concentrated within the IDCA concentration parameters. The major exception (IDCA non-concentration area) is human resources development which is perhaps the most important problem area for the region. Transportation and to some extent, small-scale enterprises, are expected to be regional program activities. Low-cost housing is essentially a HIG, target-of-opportunity activity which can be handled by regional services and resident contract personnel.

B. Staffing

(1) AID staffing in southern Africa is already minimal relative to program requirements.

(2) With the addition of programs with modest AID staffs in Zimbabwe, Mozambique and, possibly, Namibia during the five-year planning period, REDSO/EA will be increasingly called upon to provide services for southern Africa AID programs.

(3) The development and implementation of regional activities will place another burden on the field staffs.

IV. ALTERNATIVES

To provide support for continuing and for additional country and regional programs (Zimbabwe, Mozambique, regional, and, possibly, Namibia) in southern Africa, there are two basic program management alternatives: (a) establish the necessary additional country program staffs; upgrade them and existing staffs to virtual self-sufficiency and alternatively and (b) establish additional core country staffs and expand regional services to accommodate them. The former is not feasible for essentially two obvious reasons - mode considerations and probably inefficiency. How best to formulate the latter alternative is the essential problem of this exercise. In this respect, there are, perhaps, three basic alternatives with variations: (a) expand REDSO/EA, (b) expand Swaziland regional services and relocate them, and (c) expand regional services through assignment of additional personnel to country program staffs.

A. Expand REDSO/EA

- PROS: 1) Already established management and administrative framework and relations with USAID staff in southern Africa;
- 2) Possible economies of scale since REDSO's purview extends beyond southern Africa.
- 3) Good location to attract good people.
- CONS: 1) Increase in span of operations (numbers of countries and client staffs) dissipates awareness of individual country program circumstances.
- 2) Travel time and expense compared to more central location.
- 3) Not a good location for monitoring/developing southern Africa regional activities.

B. Expand/restructure/relocate Swaziland Regional services to the most central and easily accessible location, i.e., Zimbabwe

- PROS: 1) Would build on already extant regional services - legal, economic, health/population.
- 2) Most central location and large, cosmopolitan city would keep profile down.
- 3) Good location to attract good people.
- 4) Appropriate for developing/monitoring regional activities.
- 5) More easily manageable span of control (than REDSO/EA).
- CONS: 1) If relocated, new services mission would have to be established.

C. Assign regional personnel to individual missions

- † PROS: 1) Most efficient in that country of assignment can be country program of greatest need (e.g., Food for Peace Officer - Zambia).
- 2) Profile effects could be spread.
- CONS: 1) No central supervision/coordination.
- 2) Regional activities development/monitoring is dissipated.

Attachments:

1. Southern Africa AID Staffing
2. Southern Africa DA and ESF Planning Levels

cc: DAA/AFR:WEMorth

RDSS Restrospect

The Southern Africa Regional Program (SARP) Regional Development Strategy Statement (RDSS) was written in January 1980. As the notion of regional action in development in southern Africa is a relatively new one, it is continually evolving. Since the RDSS, several significant analytical components have become available. The first of these was the AID southern Africa bilateral mission Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs). At the March RDSS review, there was expression of a need to relate the RDSS to the component country CDSSs. The second element was the realization of a Summit meeting among the majority-ruled southern African states which took place on April 1, 1980, in Lusaka, Zambia. Finally, the RDSS review also called for an analysis of how the proposed SARP will benefit the poor. The above elements will be discussed in the following pages.

Relationship of the RDSS to the CDSSs

The SARP will be designed to complement, not replace existing or planned bilateral programs. Indeed, the regional objective of the southern African countries as expressed at the Lusaka Conference is not necessarily to form regional bodies or common trade areas, but instead to work together on problems of regional concern which transcend national borders and do not lend themselves to one-country solutions. In this context, the SARP is supportive of, but not competitive with, the individual country goals as expressed

in the CDSSs. Such a strategy is now understood, accepted, and endorsed by all of the southern African USAIDs.

The SARP strategy presently envisages near-term program concentration in transport, agriculture, manpower development, and private enterprise promotion - in that order. Without exception, activities in each of these areas will contribute to the achievement of the individual AID country strategies. Brief examples for each country follow:

- Botswana: Improved regional transport linkages will significantly enhance Botswana's economic independence from the Republic of South Africa by providing optional routes for the shipment of vital imports and exports. Such reduced dependency and vulnerability will encourage increased domestic and foreign investment thus providing an important economic stimulus.
- Lesotho: Because it is entirely surrounded by the Republic of South Africa, Lesotho will probably benefit least from the SARP. Lesotho's best opportunities for participation will be in the manpower development and private enterprise programs. The manpower program can serve to enhance the institutional delivery capacity of the GOL in several key sectors (e.g., agriculture, livestock, planning). Private enterprise efforts can provide means of developing off-farm employment opportunities, while serving to encourage domestic investment.

- Malawi: The strengthening of regional transport linkages is especially vital for landlocked Malawi, a country which has suffered from increasing transport costs and the limited capacity of existing transport infrastructure. Malawi's strong agricultural sector will be able to take advantage of advances offered through regional agriculture and livestock programs. Regional manpower training programs will be supportive of meeting Malawi's institution building needs. It is possible that one or several existing Malawi training institutions (e.g., railroad, veterinary medicine) could be expanded to meet regional needs.

- Mozambique: As Mozambique's CDSS was a tentative document, direct attributions of SARP - country complementarity cannot be made. Nevertheless, it can be said that Mozambique would be a prime beneficiary of the SARP. Mozambique requires substantial contingency assistance in the rehabilitation of its port, rail and road facilities which serve as critical arteries for the shipment of the goods of five landlocked nations. Mozambique has also expressed an interest in regional agriculture and livestock programs. As its agricultural institutional and manpower bases are exceptionally weak, regional cooperation in this sector will be particularly attractive.

- Swaziland: Of relevance to Swaziland may be programs in agriculture and manpower development. Swazi ability to provide in-country employment for its citizens and to improve food self-sufficiency will require programs that are both national and regional in scope. Swaziland has been assigned particular responsibility for articulation of regional manpower development needs.
- Zambia: Zambia will benefit greatly from regional transport programs. Inadequate regional transport linkages have severely threatened Zambian food supplies and the flow of exchange-producing exports (particularly copper). Furthermore, regional agriculture programs, particularly in crop research, could provide significant additional support to Zambia's priority agriculture-based economic diversification program.
- Zimbabwe: While no country strategy for Zimbabwe yet exists, the improvement of regional transport linkages and support for private entrepreneurial activity will be key to the economic revitalization of this newly independent nation. GOZ interest and willingness to participate in the southern African regional development cooperation movement was made clear by Prime Minister Mugabe at the Lusaka Conference.

How the Poor Will Benefit

Because of the macro-economic nature of a regional development program, the poor, almost by definition, will largely be benefitted indirectly. Nevertheless, such benefit will be substantial. Concentration of regional efforts on particular groupings of the poor in southern Africa would not be practical from a development standpoint, nor would such an approach be acceptable to the cooperating nations. The SARP will, at all times, endeavor to ensure that AID regional program benefits fall on the poor - but, given the special requirements of a regional approach, the SARP will remain open to a wide variety of programming options, while also maintaining a high level of responsiveness to the participating nations.

Because the FY 81 regional program has not yet been fully designed, specific examples of how the poor will benefit are not available. Although the discussion below is somewhat hypothetical in nature, it is reflective of what will constitute the SARP.

- Transport: Improved regional links transport will provide for imports of food and other vital goods to the poor of the landlocked nations. When food shortages occur in a country, it is invariably the poor who suffer most. Thus, improving transport will clearly help feed the poor. Improved transport will also make investment in landlocked countries more attractive. Investment provides new sources of employment for the poor as well as revenues to the governments which can use them in financing the heavy recurrent cost burden of BHN programs.

- Agriculture: Regional agricultural programs will seek to increase food production, improve the incomes of the poor, and increase the profitability of animal raising. Programs will be directed at enhancing government ability to deliver services to the poor as well as qualitatively influencing the services themselves.
- Manpower Development: Manpower development weaknesses is an important component factor of virtually every significant development problem in southern Africa. Trained manpower shortages are significant obstacles between government program objectives for improving the lives of the poor and the realization of these objectives.
- Private Enterprise Promotion: Private enterprise represents both a potential source of government revenues to finance BHN projects for the poor as well as the creation of new off-farm employment opportunities for the unemployed. Private enterprise formation can significantly strengthen national economies which, given the established high levels of commitment for development, should have a beneficial multiple effect on the poor.

REVIEW OF USAID CDSB OBJECTIVES

Botswana

- Support CDSB goals of achieving rapid economic growth, social justice, economic independence and sustained development.
- Improved rural income and employment opportunities
- Increase crop production on land of low and medium arability
- Protect the national resource base
- Broaden the rural human resource base

Laos

- Contribute to the accelerated development of Laos
- Enable the GOI to serve more effectively the economic and social interests of its citizens
- Support suggested institutional capabilities of the GOI and strengthen development policies and supporting strategies
- Improve agricultural planning
- Support land conservation efforts
- Support planning in the education sector
- Support rural based income employment, and service activities

Mali

- Long-term Goal: Improve institution building in Mali and produce appropriately skilled manpower for the institutions.
- Intermediate Targets:
 - o Raise smallholder agricultural activity
 - o Provide alternative employment opportunities for estate workers
 - o Provide educational opportunities for females and the undereducated and uneducated
 - o Provide access to agricultural credit to all who qualify

Mali (continued)

- o Provide access to agricultural credit to all who qualify
- o Encourage a more positive land/people ratio
- o Contribute to the provision of rural services
- o Maintain the integrity of the environment
- o Aid in developing alternative energy resources
- o Assist in resolving transport and distribution problems
- o Accelerate the growth of labor intensive agriculture industry

Niger

- Support the needs of small farm agriculture
- Support needs for trained manpower development
- Support rural health needs
- Support transport needs through the SAAR

Senegal

- Long Range Goal: Achieve self-sustaining and equitable growth
- Sub Goal Objectives:
 - o Reduction of population growth rates
 - o Increased agricultural productivity on Soudan Basin Land
 - o Increased employment and productivity of the non-agricultural labor force
 - o Reduction in under-two infant mortality

Zambia

- Increase the incomes of traditional farmers
- Increase total food production

Zimbabwe

- No CDSB submitted.

National

- Principal Purpose: To support regional cooperation in socio-economic development
- Sub Goals:
 - o Promote more balanced economic interdependence throughout the region
 - o Support the socio-economic reintegration of the region's vast population of refugees and other displaced or unemployed persons.
 - o Strengthen the capacity of the majority-ruled governments to offer the conditions and services necessary for meeting basic human needs throughout the region.