

UNCLASSIFIED

**AGENCY FOR  
INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT**



# **ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION**

## **FY 82**

## **GUATEMALA**

**JUNE 1980**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1. TABLE I - Long Range Plan by Appropriate Account	1
2. TABLE I - Narrative	2
3. TABLE III - Project Obligations by Appropriation Account FY 1980 - FY 1982	4
4. TABLE IV - Project Budget Data	6
5. NEW PROJECT NARRATIVES	11
a. Small Farmer Diversification Systems (520-0255)	11
b. Area Development Pilot Model (520-0273)	14
c. Integrated Regional Development (520-0274)	16
d. Tax Improvement (520-0280)	20
e. Environmental Improvement (520-0283)	22
6. TABLE V - FY 1982 Proposed Program Ranking	24
7. DECISION PACKAGE NARRATIVES - AAPLs	26
8. TABLE VI - Project Summary	35
9. TABLE VII - Operating Expense Funded Personnel	36
10. TABLE VIII - Word Processing Equipment	38
11. TABLE VIII - Operating Expense Summary	39
12. TABLE IX - Supporting Data on Proposed Program Ranking	41
13. P.P.-480 Narrative	45
14. P.L. 480, TITLE II - Mission Review of Operational Plans	48
15. TABLE XIII - P.L.-480, TITLE II - Supporting Table	51

TABLE I LONG RANGE PLAN BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT

(\$ Thousands)

	FY 1980 Estim- ated	FY 1981 Estim- ated	FY 1982 Request		FY 1983	FY 1984	FY 1985	FY 1986
			Minimum	Enhanced AAPL				
<u>Development Assistance</u>								
<u>Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition</u>								
Grants	580	6,765	3,045	17,420	1,700	12,000	14,225	16,550
Loans	580	1,265	1,045	1,420	1,700	2,000	2,225	1,550
	-	5,500	2,000	16,000	-	10,000	12,000	15,000
<u>Population</u>								
Grants	874	695	558	663	675	675	675	675
Loans	874	695	558	663	675	675	675	675
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Health</u>								
Grants	4,140	300	350	350	160	15,060	60	60
Loans	140	300	350	350	160	60	60	60
	4,000	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-
<u>Education</u>								
Grants	939	812	807	1,097	5,865	365	8,290	100
Loans	939	812	807	1,097	865	365	290	100
	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	8,000	-
<u>Selected Development Activ.</u>								
Grants	230	200	240	470	16,600	1,900	1,750	1,350
Loans	230	200	240	470	1,600	1,900	1,750	1,350
	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	-	-
<u>Sub-Total Functional Accounts</u>								
Grants	6,763	8,772	5,000	20,000	25,000	30,000	25,000	18,735
Loans	2,763	3,272	3,000	4,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	3,735
	4,000	5,500	2,000	16,000	20,000	25,000	20,000	15,000
<u>P.L. 480, Title II (Non-Add)</u>	(3,941)	(6,618)	(7,976)	(7,976)	(8,901)	(9,870)	(10,865)	(11,885)
<u>Urban Upgrading (Non-Add) (HIG)</u>	-	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-
<u>Secondary Cities (HIG)</u>	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	-
<u>Total Personnel</u>	52	52	52	57	57	57	57	57
USDH	16	17	17	20	20	20	20	20
FNDH	36	36	37	38	38	38	38	38

TABLE I - NARRATIVE

Part I -- Relationship Between FY 1982 AAPL and Direct Hire Personnel Planning Level

In the discussion of proposed funding levels for FY 1982, following Table V, the Mission describes, in detail, the component projects and the personnel required to implement the program. In summary, at an AAPL of \$5 million, 17 USDH, including one IDI would be required to develop the new programs and monitor the \$40 to \$45 million pipeline which will remain at that point.

At a level of \$20 to \$30 million for FY 1982, 20 USDH would be required. The programmatic emphasis will be in integrated rural development, but the program will contain projects in the sectors of health, education and special development activities, as well. No change in skills mix would be required, but a U.S. secretary, an additional agricultural economist and an Assistant Program Officer would have to be added to the current staff level. The increase in personnel required to administer a program of two or three times the size of the present one would be three positions, due to the efficiency measures proposed below.

Part II - Relationship of Proposed Funding in "Out" Years to Direct Hire Personnel Planning Level

The program planned for the years FY 1983-FY 1986 would remain at approximately the \$20 to \$30 million level, or if the larger program is not approved, would remain constant at a level of about \$5 million annually.

In the case of a large program, the skills mix and manpower level would remain as described in Part I at 20 USDH. At a level of \$5 million, a continuation of the program with such token funding would imply a drastic reduction in both U.S. and Guatemalan positions as the pipeline is reduced.

The major efficiency measures selected by the Mission are the use of fewer projects of greater average size

and concentration of the program in a narrower geographical area. The FY 1982 program proposes a single loan for Integrated Rural Development at a level of from \$16 to \$26 million, depending upon the approval of ESF financing for a portion of assistance for Guatemala.

The project, both grant and loan components, would, therefore, be of much larger than average size and both Integrated Rural Development and all other projects would be focused on a reduced geographical area in a limited number of Highland Departments already targeted under the Guatemalan Social Action Plan.

We estimate that the same number of direct-hire personnel could implement a FY 1982-1986 program of \$20 to \$30 million annually as were required in FY 1978 and 1979 to implement a program of \$8 to \$12 million.

TABLE III

## PROJECT OBLIGATIONS BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT

FY 1980 - FY 1982

(\$ Thousands)

Appropriation Account	FY 1980	FY 1981	Minimum	Fiscal Year 1982	
				AAPL	Enhanced AAPL
<u>Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition</u>					
PD&S - FN	118	90	100	100	100
Small Farmer Marketing	-	139	-	-	-
Rural Enterprises Development	125	325	345	345	345
Integrated Area Development Studies	175	-	-	-	-
Small Farmer Diversification	-	300	450	450	450
Small Farmer Diversification Training School for Promoters	-	5,500	2,000*	-	-
Integrated Rural Development - San Marcos	71	61	-	-	-
Integrated Regional Development	91	150	150	150	150
Integrated Regional Development	-	-	-	375	375
Integrated Regional Development Area Development Pilot Model	-	200	-	16,000 a/	26,000 b/
<u>Population Planning</u>					
PD&S - PN	60	30	50	50	50
Integrated Family Planning	814	665	608	613	613
<u>Health</u>					
PD&S - HE	40	50	50	50	50
Community-Based Health	100	250	300	300	300
Community-Based Health	4,000	-	-	-	-





TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	OBLIGATION DATE	DATE OF NEXT PLANNED REPORTING PERIOD	LUM FUNDING AS OF 9/30/79	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)												FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS
					FY 1980			FY 1981			FY 1982 CAPL OBLIG.	FORWARD FUNDED TO (MO/YR)	FY 1982 CAPL OBLIG.				
					OBLIG.	EXPEND.	FY 1980	OBLIG.	EXPEND.	FY 1981				OBLIG.	EXPEND.	FY 1981	
0000.2	HEALTH PD&S	69	Cont.	104	40	130	14	50	50	14	50	50	01-83	50	01-83	Continuing	
0251	Community-Based Health	80	83	--	100	30	70	250	200	120	300	300	08-83	300	08-83	100	
0251	Community-Based Health	80	80	--	4,000	--	4,000	--	500	3,500	--	500	06-85	--	06-85	--	
	Appropriation Total			104	4,140	160	4,084	300	750	3,634	350	350		350			
	Grant Loan			104	140	160	84	300	250	134	350	350		350			
				--	4,000	--	4,000	--	500	3,500	--	500		--			

PROJECT NUMBER		ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)										DECISION UNIT					
		OBLIGATION DATE		DATE OF NEXT PLANNED ROUTINE EVAL.		FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982		FORWARD FUNDED TO (MO/YR)		FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS			
		ORL	INITIAL	FINAL	MO	YR	EXPEND.	TIME PIPELINE	OBLG.	EXPEND.	TIME PIPELINE	OBLG.	EXPEND.	TIME PIPELINE	OBLG.	EXPEND.	TIME PIPELINE
EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES																	
0000.3	PD&S	G	69	Cont.	--	51	50	86	15	50	15	50	50	15	75	05-83	Continuing
0258	Bilingual Education	G	79	83*	02-83	300	414	48	666	232	534	364	375	528	02-84		
0259	Education Administration	G	80	82	--	--	200	--	200	180	130	250	100	--	12-82		
0264	Non-Formal Education	G	82	85*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	290	725	05-83		
0269	Cubulco Community Education (OPC)	G	80	82	--	--	125	25	100	120	90	130	157	--	08-83		
0270	Development Administration Improvement	G	80	81*	07-81	--	150	20	130	130	60	200	--	--	03-82		
0280	Tax Improvement	G	81	82	--	--	--	--	--	100	30	70	100	--	09-82		
	Appropriation Total					351	939	179	1,111	812	859	1,064	1,097				
	Grant					351	939	179	1,111	812	859	1,064	1,097				
	Loan					--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				
* Final Obligation date is different from that shown in FY 1981 C.R.																	

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	OBLIGATION DATE		DATE OF NEXT PLANNED MAJOR REPORTING EVAL.	SUM PERLINE AS OF 9/30/79	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)										FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS
		INITIAL	FINAL			FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982 CAPL OBLIG.	FORWARD FUNDED TO (MOVYR)	IPACBON UNIT				
						CHG.	INITIAL	FINAL	EXPEND.				CHG. PERLINE	CHG. PERLINE	EXPEND.	
0000.4	PD65	G	74	Cont.	18	75	80	13	50	53	10	90	12-82	Continuing		
0145	Special Development Fund	G	63	Cont.	--	50	50	--	50	50	--	50	09-82	Continuing		
0283	Environmental Improvement	G	82	84	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	200	05-85	350		
0284	Women in Development (OPG)	G	80	82	--	105	30	75	100	115	60	130	03-83	--		
	Appropriation Total				18	230	160	88	200	218	70	470				
	Grant				18	230	160	88	200	218	70	470				
	Loan				--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--				
	Functional Accounts Sub-Total				1,963	6,763	1,694	7,032	8,772	4,302	11,502	30,000				
	Grant				1,963	2,763	1,694	3,032	3,272	3,802	2,302	4,000				
	Loan				--	4,000	--	4,000	5,500	500	9,000	26,000				
	Pipeline Projects (No funding after FY 1979)				50,500											
	Total Grant				1,733											
	Loan				48,767											
	(Non-Add)															
	Urban Upgrading	HIC	81	81	--	--	--	--	(15,000)	--	(15,000)	--	07-86	--		
	P.L. 480, Title II	G	59	Cont.	--	(3,936)	(3,936)	--	(6,686)	(6,686)	--	(7,976)	--	Continuing		

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

PROJECT		ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST (\$000)											DECISION UNIT		
		OBLIGATION DATE		DATE OF NEXT PLANNED NORM. ROUTINE EVAL.	CUM. PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/79	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982 AVBL. OBLIG.	FY 1982 VAPL. OBLIG.	FY 1982 VAPL. TO (MO/YR)	FUTURE YEAR OBLIGATIONS		
		INITIAL	FINAL			OBLIG.	EXPEND.	OBLIG.	EXPEND.					CUM. PIPELINE	CUM. PIPELINE
0000.5	POPULATION PLANNING	G	79	Cont.	--	33	60	70	23	30	45	8	50	01-83	Continuing
0263	Integrated Family Planning Services	G	80	82	05-82	--	814	450	364	665	700	329	613	01-83	--
	Appropriation Total					33	874	520	387	695	745	337	663		
	Grant					33	874	520	387	695	745	337	663		
	Loan					--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--		

NEW PROJECT NARRATIVE

Project Title : Small Farmer Diversification  
Systems

Project Number : 520-0255

Proposed Funding: FY 1981 - Grant \$ 300,000  
Loan \$ 5,500,000

FY 1982 - At Minimum  
\$2 million add-on (Loan)

At AAPLI  
2 \$ million add-on (Loan)

L.O.P. : Grant - \$2,400,000

Loan - Minimum: \$ 7,500,000  
AAPL : \$11,500,000

Project Purpose

To stimulate diversification from basic grains to production of vegetable and fruit crops of higher value and greater labor intensity in the geographic areas where small scale farmers predominate.

Description of the Problem

This project addresses the problems of limited land resources, under-utilization of labor resources and lack of appropriate technology. The alleviation of these constraints to increasing the income of the rural poor is necessary to attain Guatemala's development priorities as stated in the current National Development Plan.

Proposed Means to Deal with the Problem

Although substantial progress is being made in determining requirements for increased yields of basic grains, evaluation of these efforts indicates

that continued reliance by small farmers on these crops for increased incomes to the exclusion of other crop alternatives will limit the potential for improving family incomes. A partial solution to the problem is to develop and apply technology, inputs, services and information which are directed toward the adoption of production alternatives that improve cash and non-cash output of the farm household system. The small farmer generally strives to produce enough basic grains to cover family subsistence needs and, if possible, extra cash crop production to increase family disposable income. Given the small size of land parcels, this requires the introduction of improved farm management and technology to allow the family to meet their subsistence requirements with reduced land and family labor inputs, and apply remaining land and labor factors to diversified crop and livestock production.

This project will provide loan funds and grant technical assistance support to the GOG's Agricultural Science and Technology Institute (ICTA), other GOG agencies, and the cooperative movement in an integrated effort directed to (1) develop an improved understanding of small farmer farm/household production/consumption systems; (2) develop appropriate technologies for diversified crop and livestock systems; (3) develop more responsive and cost-effective methods of disseminating small farmer-oriented technologies; (4) implementation of expanded technical assistance efforts to small farmers; and (5) assuring the expanded availability of credit and appropriate inputs necessary for the rapid adoption by small farmers of higher income-producing crop and livestock production alternatives.

#### Host Country Entities Involved

The principal Guatemalan entities to be involved in this project are : (1) the Agricultural Science and Technology Institute (ICTA); (2) the Agricultural Extension Unit of the Ministry of Agriculture (DIGESA); and (3) the Agricultural Development Bank

(BANDESA). These entities are presently engaged in grant and loan projects financed by AID, with generally favorable results. Effective agricultural technology has been developed for basic grains by ICTA. DIGESA has done effective technology transfer in soil conservation, small irrigation projects and youth projects, but needs to improve its capacity to transfer the more complicated agro-technologies involved in diversified crops and improved small farm management. BANDESA has a good record for management of agricultural credit.

#### Major Issues to be Addressed

To the extent that diversification into fruits is determined to be feasible, credit policies will have to be adjusted to allow for disbursement of funds to farmers over an extended time frame to establish orchards. The inter-institutional linkages involving research, extension and credit directed towards the small farmer, have generally been weak in developing countries, including Guatemala and will have to be strengthened in the process of project design and implementation.

#### Target Group Identification

Based on intensive project review and consultant studies, it has been estimated that between 10,000 to 12,000 small farm households will be effectively reached through the project. Cash incomes presently estimated at \$300 per family will be increased to an average of \$800 per family, an annual increase of \$500 per family. In addition, the project will directly benefit landless laborers by creating increased employment opportunities in the target area. Therefore, the total number of direct beneficiaries whose farm size is 7 hectares or less can be estimated at about 75,000. Moreover, the project will benefit, indirectly, some 100,000 rural families by creating a diversified crop research and extension capability in the public agricultural sector. This will significantly increase crop yields over time making possible steady improvements in rural productivity and incomes.

NEW PROJECT NARRATIVE

Project Title : Area Development Pilot Model  
Project Number : 520-0273  
Proposed Funding: FY 1981 \$200,000  
L.O.P. : \$200,000 Grant

Project Purpose

To assist the GOG to establish appropriate economic and social infrastructure and services in the poorest rural areas.

Description of the Problem

There are serious deficiencies in access roads, schools, health care facilities, banking and other commercial services in many rural Guatemalan communities. As a result, they do not share equitably in the economic and social growth which the nation as a whole enjoys. Further, if appropriate social and economic infrastructure were to be built, many of these communities have under-utilized natural resources which could be used to contribute to local and national economic growth.

Proposed Means to Deal with the Problem

Grant Project 520-0249, Integrated Area Development Studies, attempts to establish a methodology which defines the nature, extent and location of the constraints to development in a sample of 150-200 municipalities. It also attempts to identify opportunities to make effective economic use of natural resources. As a result, it is possible to determine priorities so that: (1) those communities most in need receive the greatest benefit; (2) each component of infrastructure and services added is appropriate and provides the maximum positive effect on economic growth and quality of life in the community; and,

(3) maximum complementarity is achieved in multi-sectoral investments.

The Area Development Pilot Model proposed to be financed by this project will, in a few carefully selected villages, make a practical demonstration of (1) the system of identification of needs; (2) the selection of appropriate infrastructure construction projects, and (3) utilization of resources available to the community to create employment. The experience to be gained with the pilot model will be used in the detailed planning for the Integrated Regional Development loan and grant proposed for FY 82.

#### Host Country Entities Involved

Integrated area development implies the need for coordinated, complementary activities by several entities, which include the municipalities, the Ministries of Agriculture, Health, Education and Public Works, the banks, and private enterprise. The Municipal Development Institute and the Ministry of Agriculture are presently working together to obtain the data which are basic to project planning. At this stage, it has not been determined which entity of the GOG would be the lead executing agency.

#### Major Issues to be Addressed

The major issue for an integrated area development project is to establish the coordinating leadership which has sufficient political, economic and technical influence to elicit effective cooperation among various independent ministries and agencies of Government. Since this project requires cross-sectoral cooperation, the choice of the principal executing agency will be particularly important.

#### Target Group Identification

The Integrated Area Development Studies now in progress will inform the GOG where infrastructure and services are needed so that priority areas can be determined. Data on 157 municipalities will be available in early FY 1981. The pilot model project described here will involve two or three typical municipalities or communities whose population will total about 10,000 persons.

NEW PROJECT NARRATIVE

Project Title : Integrated Regional Development

Project Number : 520-0274

Proposed Funding: FY 1982 - \$26 million

<u>First Tranche</u>	<u>Total</u>
\$10 million ESF	
\$ 6 million DL	\$16 million
<u>Second Tranche</u>	
\$10 million DL	<u>\$10 million</u>
Total	<u>\$26 million</u>

Project Purpose

To increase the access of the rural poor to an integrated array of productive resources, services, infrastructure and appropriate technology.

Problem

Within the Mission's geographic target area, i.e., the Western and Central Highlands, small farmers and rural poor are faced with a series of critical constraints which limit productivity and incomes. These constraints include those which are internal to the productive enterprise (both farm and non-farm), as well as those external to the productive enterprise. In the Highland regions the most serious internal constraints are limited land resources, under-utilization of labor and lack of appropriate production technologies. External factors which constrain productivity and incomes are largely the result of inadequate public sector investments of the type that support productive activities, i.e., roads and transportation, productive credit programs, marketing facilities, extension programs, land resource development, etc.

### Means of Dealing with the Problem

The proposed project will finance an integrated series of public sector investments and development activities within the politically sensitive North-Central Altiplano Region. The nature and magnitude of each investment will be based on the productive potential of each sub-region, natural trade areas, and the hierarchy of population service centers to ensure optimal complementarity of such investments. As currently envisioned, these investments would include:

1. Market access roads.
2. Marketing and municipal infrastructure
3. Farm improvement credit and extension programs designed to improve the land resource base, i.e., irrigation and soil conservation.
4. Production credit and extension programs designed to exploit the identified agricultural potential of each sub-region.
5. Credit and technical assistance for small enterprise and agribusiness investments with forward or backward linkages to agricultural production.
6. A land purchase and redistribution program.

The prerequisite data base and methodology for developing the proposed integrated regional development investment program is currently being developed under the ongoing AID-financed "Integrated Area Development Study" project. This study is gathering disaggregated data, down to the municipal level, on agricultural potential and supporting infrastructure and services in both the productive and social sectors. Although the proposed project gives highest priority to the productive sectors, future AID and GOG complementary investments in the social sectors -- health and education -- will be programmed within the same regional development context.

At the \$20 million AAPL level, the project would be financed by an initial tranche of \$10 million of ESF

funds and \$6 million of DL funds. The ESF funds will be used to finance the construction of labor intensive access roads and marketing and municipal infrastructure. These investments will support recent high priority GOG development initiatives in the North-Central Altiplano Region by providing short-term employment and income opportunities, while at the same time contributing to self-sustained economic growth and integration of the Region. The initial tranche of DL funds will finance a series of inputs designed to promote diversification of small farmer agriculture and agribusiness development in the region. These inputs will include farm improvement credit and extension to improve the land resource base through irrigation and soil conservation; production credit and extension in support of diversified crop production, and, credit and technical assistance for small enterprises with linkages to agricultural production. Related training and technical assistance will also be provided to participating GOG institutions to develop their institutional capacity to plan and effectively implement proposed regional development activities in the target area.

At the \$30 million AAPL level, project financing would be increased by an additional \$10 million tranche of DL funds. These funds would be used to support the GOG in carrying out a land purchase and redistribution program in the Region. AID funds would specifically finance institutional development inputs -- technical assistance and training -- related to the creation and operation of a Land Purchase Fund; cadastral surveys and, farm access roads and other rural infrastructure required as a result of parcelization of larger farms.

#### Host Country Entities Involved

The National Economic Planning Council will play the major role in designing the integrated regional development investment programs for each sub-region included in the project. Implementation of the program will be the responsibility of the Ministries of Agriculture and Public Works and the Municipal Development Bank (INFOM).

### Major Issues to be Addressed

In order to determine the scope of the project and proceed with final project design, a decision must be made whether the project will be financed at the \$16 million combined ESF-DL level or the \$26 million ESF-DL level.

### Target Group

The target group will consist of those farm families with less than 10 hectares and families of landless poor living within the geographic scope of the project. In the North Central Altiplano this would include approximately 62,000 families. Because of its geographical isolation, the population of this sub-region is considerably worse off in terms of access to public resources, services and infrastructure than most of the rest of the Altiplano.

NEW PROJECT NARRATIVE

Project Title : Tax Improvement  
Project Number : 520-0280  
Proposed Funding: FY 1981 - \$150,000 (Grant)  
L.O.P. : \$250,000

Project Purpose

To improve collection procedures for income and property taxes thereby increasing revenue available for municipal services and infrastructure throughout the country.

Description of the Problem

Collection rates of central government taxes on income and property are extremely low. The property tax revenues collected outside of Guatemala City are, by law, returned to the Municipios (counties) from which they were collected -- usually in the form of municipal infrastructure. Since collection is poor, little progress is made in development of social or productive infrastructure at the local level and municipalities have little participation in the planning or execution of projects which directly influence their living conditions or environment.

Proposed Means to Deal with the Problem

The Guatemalan Government requested technical assistance to assess the causes of poor tax collection and to provide recommendations for its improvement. The project will also explore the possibility of collection of property taxes by municipal authorities, rather than central government, and the feasibility of planning and executing county level programs using these tax proceeds.

### Host Country Entities Involved

Ministry of Finance - Internal Revenue Unit and the Department of Cadaster and Property Assessment will be the principal recipients of technical assistance. Municipio-level offices will receive training in collection procedures and methods of planning, financing and implementing local-level projects.

### Major Issues to be Addressed in Design

Feasibility and acceptability of tax collection and use by municipal (county) governments, as well as analysis of problems in the current tax collection methodology, will be addressed during project design.

### Beneficiaries

The immediate beneficiaries of the project will be the federal and municipal offices involved in income and property tax collection. Indirect and ultimate beneficiaries will be those living in municipios where improved tax collection is used to improve municipal services and infrastructure.

NEW PROJECT NARRATIVE

Project Title : Environmental Improvement

Project Number : 520-0283

Proposed Funding: FY 1982 - \$200,000

L.O.P. : \$200,000

Project Purpose

To increase the effectiveness of the GOG in promoting resource conservation and environmental protection.

Description of the Problem

Guatemala faces a multitude of environmental problems common to developing -- and developed -- countries ranging from air and water pollution and contamination of meat by insecticides to deforestation and soil erosion. The health of the public, agricultural production, the lumber industry, among others, all suffer from the lack of knowledge and practice of positive environmental practices.

There are few laws aimed at curbing dangerous or damaging practices and little enforcement of the new statutes which do exist. Public awareness of environmental concepts and concerns is minimal and few people are trained to deal with the array of problems confronting the country.

Proposed Means to Deal with the Problem

The GOG has developed, and is currently reviewing, legislation for an Environmental Protection Law which will establish a mechanism for the elaboration of policy and regulations, coordination of environmental programs and enforcement of laws related to environmental problems. The Law calls for

the President to create a coordinating agency which will assume responsibility for these actions. The USAID grant project would provide technical assistance and training to officials and employees of this coordinating agency to better prepare them to perform the analysis and develop appropriate policies to meet the variety of environmental problems confronting the country.

#### Host Country Entities Involved

The principal GOG entity which will participate in the program will be the agency created under the new Environmental Protection Law to deal with environmental policy, laws and their enforcement.

Various line ministries of the GOG who are concerned with carrying out environmental policies such as reforestation, environmental sanitation, etc., may also receive technical assistance and training.

#### Target Group Identification

The target group will be, directly, the members of the agency charged with improved environmental protection. The Guatemalan citizenry, in general, from city dwellers to rural population, depending on the nature and effectiveness of the environmental policy and its enforcement, would benefit, indirectly, from the project. The creation of the environmental policy agency is, of course, the first step in a long process: the quality and timeliness of the training and technical assistance which this body receives may be the determining factor in the success of this very important GOG initiative.

TABLE V FY 1982 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

Decision Package Minimum	Pipeline/ On-Going/ New	Loan/ Grant	Appropriation Account	Program Funding (\$000s)		Workforce	
				Incr.	Cumulative	USDR	FYDR
				Incr.	Cum.	Incr.	Cum.
<u>Pipeline Projects</u>							
520-0233	P	L	FN	1,500	1,500		
520-0236	P	L	SD	2,000	3,500		
520-0238	P	L	FN	116	3,616		
520-0238	P	L	FN	1,200	4,816		
520-0242	P	L	EH	4,000	8,816		
520-0245	P	L	FN	3,500	12,316		
520-0248	P	L	FN	6,700	19,016		
520-0251	P	L	HE	3,500	22,516		
520-0261	P	L	HIG	15,000	37,516		
520-0267	P	G	FN	30	37,546		
520-0270	P	G	EH	90	37,636		
520-0273	P	G	FN	150	37,786		
Sub-Total (Non-Add)					37,786	10	30
<u>New and Continuing Projects</u>							
520-0245	O	G	FN	345	345		
520-0255	O	L	FN	2,000	2,345		
520-0255	O	G	FN	450	2,795		
520-0263	O	G	PN	508	3,303		
520-0251	O	G	HE	300	3,603		
520-0258	O	G	EH	375	3,978		
520-0259	O	G	EH	100	4,078		
520-0280	O	G	EH	100	4,178		
520-0272	O	G	FN	150	4,328		
520-0269	O	G	EH	157	4,485		
520-0284	O	C	SD	100	4,585		
520-0145	O	G	SD	50	4,635		
520-0000.1	O	G	FN	100	4,735		
520-0000.2	O	G	HE	50	4,785		
520-0000.3	O	G	EH	75	4,860		
520-0000.4	O	G	SD	90	4,950		
520-0000.5	O	G	PN	50	5,000		

P.L. 480, Title II

	( 7,976)	5,000	7	17	7	37
Basic Workforce		5,000				
Total Minimum Package and Related Workforce		5,000	17		37	

Decision Package AAPL

520-0264	Non-Formal Education	N	C	ER	290	5,290		
520-0274	Integrated Regional Development	N	L	FM	14,000 a/	19,290	1	1
520-0274	Integrated Regional Development	N	C	FM	375	19,665		
520-0263	Integrated Family Planning Services	O	C	FM	105	19,770		
520-0284	Women in Development (OWD)	O	C	SD	30	19,800		
520-0283	Environmental Improvement	N	C	SD	200	20,000		

Program  
Executive

1  
1

Workforce Increment AAPL

	15,000	3	20	1	38
--	--------	---	----	---	----

Decision Package AAPL Enhanced

520-0274	Integrated Regional Development	N	L	FM	10,000 b/	30,000	3	20	1	38
	Total Enhanced AAPL Package and Related Workforce				10,000	30,000	3	20	1	38

a/ ESF \$10.0  
DL \$ 6.0

At the AAPL Agricultural Diversification \$2.0 million add-on shown at the minimum level be dropped and \$2.0 million would be added to Integrated Regional Development making total \$16,000.

b/ DL \$10.0

DECISION PACKAGE NARRATIVEAAPL\$5 Million

The funding and work force proposed at the AAPL of \$5 million will, as indicated in the Guatemala Country Development Strategy Statement for FY 1982, mean a token U.S. program with severely reduced influence in questions of development policy. Such a level would only allow the Mission to meet its incremental funding commitments for eight on-going grant programs and four OPGs, and provide an add-on of \$2 million for a planned FY 1981 loan for diversified agricultural production.

At this proposed \$5 million level, the USAID could continue modest on-going programs in agricultural diversification, development of small rural enterprises, family planning, rural health delivery and a few education projects, including bilingual education and improved education administration. Funds would also be available to continue current assistance to PVOs under four on-going OPGs, one of them for Women in Development activities. However, no new grants could be started, no new loans initiated, and no additional proposals from private voluntary organizations would be entertained.

The long-term development goals of AID in Guatemala, i.e., increasing the productive base of the target group; increasing its efficiency in the use of productive resources; and increasing the access of the target group to relevant social services, would advance at only a minimal rate, and certainly no program toward alleviating shorter-term social or political problems could be expected. Assistance to the Guatemalan Government in carrying out rapid, high-impact, socio-economic reform programs to meet increasing rural unrest and discontent would be postponed indefinitely.

If such a level were to be sustained over a period of several years, we would be forced to eliminate one or more sectors from our assistance program and the integrated regional development program discussed in the FY 1982 CDSS would not be undertaken. In its place we would substitute a program of rather narrow geographic concentration which would provide limited assistance to the poorest municipios in the Highlands with two or three agricultural projects, along with some complementary, albeit reduced, health and population activities. These activities would absorb most of the financing at the level proposed as the AAPL.

A program of some \$5 to \$6 million in P.L. 480, Title II food would be sought as an adjunct to the planned FY 1980 Community-Based Health Systems loan. This supplementary feeding program would continue at least through 1985.

U.S. Direct Hire personnel required to manage the \$5 million proposed FY 1982 AAPL and the Mission's existing pipeline, which would be reduced to \$40 to \$45 million at that point, will total 17 persons. The Director and Deputy Director, three officers in Capital Development, two in the Program Office and one each in Engineering and the Executive Office will be required in staff positions. The pipeline and continuing activities in rural development, population/health and education will require two USDH officers in both the Health/Population and Education Divisions. Three USDH will be required in Rural Development due to the preponderance of rural development and agricultural projects in the program and the planned FY 1982 add-on to the Agricultural Diversification loan to be initiated in FY 1981. The staffing pattern at the \$5 million AAPL implies a reduction of four USDH from the present personnel level: the U.S. secretary to the Director, one person in the Administrative Office, one in the Program Office and one U.S. technician in the Rural Development Office. If the \$5 million level was sustained beyond 1982, additional reductions in both USDH and FNDH staff would be warranted.

FY 1982 AAPL - \$5 Million

Grants	\$3.0 Million	USDH	17
Loans	\$2.0 Million	FNDH	38
Total	\$5.0 Million	FNCONT	2

\$20 Million

The activities proposed at the \$20 million AAPL will permit the implementation of a program designed to address the Mission strategy, as described in the FY 1982 CDSS. Grant financing of \$4 million will provide for incremental funding of on-going grants as well as three new grant projects: one for environmental protection; one for non-formal education; and one for technical assistance complementary to a new loan for integrated regional development. The remaining \$16 million, composed of \$10 million ESF and \$6 million DL funds, will finance an integrated regional development program in the North-Central Highlands region in support of GOG high-impact, employment improvement initiatives, as well as longer term development objectives. The new initiatives are essentially a response to an increasingly violent and volatile political situation in the target region.

In large part, the current political environment reflects growing dissatisfaction and unrest among the rural populace resulting from high rural unemployment, poverty and inadequate access to basic resources and services. This, in turn, has created fertile ground for increasing guerrilla activities, especially in the more isolated and long-neglected departments of Huehuetenango, El Quiché and Alta Verapaz. In response to this worsening situation, the GOG has decided to undertake a concerted economic development effort in the rural areas as one means of reducing political tensions.

Although the underlying cause for any successful guerrilla proselytizing in the rural areas is principally economic, the problem has become a political one as a result of regular clashes between small guerrilla bands and government forces. The number of villages temporarily occupied by guerrilla propagandists who discuss local problems, solicit support for their goals, offer "solutions" as well as arms and training in their use, is increasing weekly. The number of campesinos and other rural poor who would actively support guerrilla activities is not known, but it is apparent that passive acceptance is high, since the number of incidents of temporary "occupation" of villages is growing rapidly and a guerrilla force cannot function for long in an area where the civilian population is opposed to its existence.

We feel, as do influential segments of the Guatemalan Government, that much of the social unrest which has contributed to increasing political violence can be significantly reduced by economic and social improvements for the poor in preference to military action. Economic and social programs, even if they do not resolve political polarization, can at least erode the recruitment base for extremist movements by providing basic necessities and a degree of hope that economic and social progress can be made without resort to violent conflict.

The CDSS deals at length with some of the Government's initiatives to meet the crisis, particularly the Social Action Plan (PASO), in which the Planning Office of the Presidency candidly acknowledges the Government's past shortcomings in meeting basic needs and providing services to a major portion of the Highlands' population. PASO proposes employment and income-generating activities for some 20,000 persons a year from 1980 through 1983, as well as the provision of improved social services to the neediest areas of the country. The Plan also seeks improvements in the efficiency and effectiveness of GOG agencies administering programs in housing, community development and social infrastructure, theorizing that institutional improvements will take

place in part as a result of the active involvement of these organizations in implementing the Plan. Some 118 projects, such as potable water systems, hospital and health center construction, housing and school construction will be carried out over the next two years. The Government estimates that these projects will benefit an average of 1.5 million persons annually. Total costs of the effort are projected at \$567 million -- \$278 million of which has already been financed by internal and external sources. The remaining \$289 million required is presently being sought, a major portion of which will undoubtedly be required from international donor agencies. The Social Action Plan has now been approved at the Presidential level and the next major step is the establishment of a unit which will coordinate the actions of the various Ministries and government dependencies charged with implementing the program and component sub-projects.

A parallel action being taken by the GOG is the acceleration of activity on the Development Plan for the North-Central Highlands. The Plan is one of several integrated regional development programs which, together, will cover almost the entire country. One currently exists for the Northern Transversal Strip for the land settlement effort currently underway, and another is being prepared for the Department of Baja Verapaz, an area which will be greatly affected by the back-up of the Chixoy dam as that hydroelectric project is completed.

The North-Central Highland Development Plan targets those rural areas which have historically received little in the way of central government programs or services. It is focused, specifically, on 17 municipios, or counties, with a population of some 375,000 people -- 85% of them Indian.

The Plan proposes an investment program in excess of \$150 million over the period 1980-1983, much of which will go to road construction, agricultural credit and a \$20 million land purchase fund to buy the largest properties and redistribute acreage to

small farmers and landless tenants. Additional financing is planned for schools, health posts, municipal infrastructure, potable water systems, reforestation, cooperatives and handicraft industries.

Other development initiatives being taken by the GOG include the legislation of a new Agrarian Reform Law (reported in GUAT 2481, April 17, 1980), the raising of the minimum wage in agriculture by over 100% early in 1980 and efforts to improve the implementation of projects and reduce "pipeline" build up (GUAT 3480, May 30, 1980).

The USAID, in support of these initiatives, proposes that \$10 million in Economic Support Funds be provided in FY 1982 to assist the Guatemalan Government fund the Social Action Plan and, more specifically, the Integrated Regional Development Plan for the North-Central Highlands. The area encompasses the neediest zone of the Highland department selected as the target for AID assistance in the CDSS. While a portion of our regular development program proposed for FY 1982 will be executed in the 17 municipios of the North-Central Highlands, in view of the approximately \$440 million remaining funding requirements for the two Plans and the extremely high potential for increasing violence if the affected areas do not receive both national and international assistance soon, ESF support to the GOG effort appears highly desirable. ESF financing would be used for immediate impact productive infrastructure, particularly for market access roads, construction of rural markets, produce processing centers, and other municipal facilities. Such investments would serve a two-fold purpose: generation of vastly increased short-term employment and income-earning opportunities, and creation of a basis for longer run self-sustaining improvements in productivity and income.

As this Mission suggested in GUAT 1354, such support would only be provided pari passu with a concrete demonstration of commitment by the GOG. We would suggest that the following be established as minimum pre-requisites to ESF support of the Social Action Plan and the North-Central Highlands Development Plan:

1. Inclusion of the GOG funding required to support the Plans for FY 1981 in the Guatemalan budget which will be submitted in December 1980.
2. Approval of the 1981 GOG funding requirements for the two Plans by the Executive and the legislature in January 1981.
3. Establishment of a Special Implementation Unit in the Planning Office of the Presidency which would be responsible for the timely execution of the National Social Action Plan.
4. Adoption by the Guatemalan Ministry of Finance of a project designed to improve operations in their External Finance Division which handles negotiations for and monitoring of all foreign assistance. Improvements in execution and speed of implementation of projects will be vital to the success of both Plans.

To complement the \$10 million ESF loan, the Mission proposes an additional \$6 million in Development Loan financing. These DL funds would be programmed in conjunction with the ESF funds in the context of the GOG's Integrated Regional Development Plan for the North-Central Highlands Region and would specifically support longer term GOG development objectives of diversification of small farmer agriculture and agribusiness. Inputs to be financed under the \$6 million tranche will include credit for farm improvement, such as small irrigation systems and soil conservation projects, production credit and extension in support of diversified crop production. Credit and technical assistance will also be provided for small agribusiness enterprises.

The proposed \$20 million FY 1982 AAPL (\$10 million Development Assistance; \$10 million ESF) would require a USDH workforce of 20 persons, including one IDI. For Executive Direction: a Director, Deputy Director and U.S. secretary. For Program Planning: a Program Officer, Deputy Program Officer and Assistant Program Officer; in Project Design and Implementation: a Rural Development Officer, two

Agricultural Economists and an IDI to monitor the thrust in integrated rural development proposed in the Integrated Regional Development Plan, Health and Population will require one USDH in each. Although the number of education projects will be reduced slightly, a Human Resources Development Officer and an Education Advisor will still be needed to monitor the Mission's existing portfolio in the sector. Three persons are planned for the Capital Development Office in planning, design and monitoring loan projects: a Capital Development Officer, Capital Project Development Officer and a Project Officer. One General Engineer and an Executive Officer complete the personnel roster.

This proposed personnel level, which is one position less than what the Mission has at present, will be required to carry out a program development effort twice the size of that of 1980.

FY 1982 AAPL - \$20 Million

Grants	\$ 4.0 Million	USDH	20
Loans	\$16.0 Million <u>1/</u>	FNDH	38
Total	\$20.0 Million	FNCONT	2

1/ \$10 Million ESF  
\$ 6 Million DL

AAPL - \$30 Million

At an AAPL of \$30 million, the USAID would mount a comprehensive integrated regional development program aimed at realizing the goals established in the CDSS, i.e.:

1. Increase the productive resource base of the target group.

2. Increasing the efficiency of the target group in the use of available productive resources.
3. Increasing the access of the target group to relevant basic social services.

This funding level would build upon the \$20 million base proposed above. The program would then consist of ten on-going grants, three new grant activities, the \$10 million ESF loan-funded Integrated Regional Development program of immediate impact, high employment generation sub-projects in the areas of most intense rural unrest and the \$6 million DL-financed loan which will be designed to complement the ESF-funded activities and promote diversification of crops and development of small rural enterprises based upon agricultural production. To this \$20 million base, the USAID would add another \$10 million in Development Loan funds in support of the planned GOG effort to carry out a major land purchase and redistribution program in the affected regions. AID funds would be utilized in support of the program, particularly for institution building inputs such as training and technical assistance and for cadastral surveys, access roads and other infrastructure required as a result of the division of large land holdings into small parcels.

USDH requirements would be the same as at the \$20 million level.

FY 1982 - \$30 Million AAPL

Grants	\$ 4 Million	USDH	20
Loans	\$26 Million	FNDH	38
Total	\$30 Million	FNCONT	2

1/ \$10 Million ESF  
\$16 Million DL

**TABLE VI  
PROJECT SUMMARY**

**NUMBER OF PROJECTS**

	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82 \$5	FY 82 \$20	FY 82 \$30
IMPLEMENTATION AT BEGINNING OF YEAR.....	14	14	20	21	21	21
MOVING FROM DESIGN TO IMPLEMENTATION DURING YEAR.....	5	7	4	0	3	3
DESIGN FOR FUTURE YEAR IMPLEMENTATION.....	8	5	3	2	4	4
<b>SUBTOTAL.....</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>28</b>
NUMBER OF NON-PROJECT ACTIVITIES.....	1	1	2	1	1	1
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>29</b>

IMPLEMENTATION AT BEGINNING OF YEAR.....  
 MOVING FROM DESIGN TO IMPLEMENTATION DURING YEAR.....  
 DESIGN FOR FUTURE YEAR IMPLEMENTATION.....  
**SUBTOTAL.....**  
 NUMBER OF NON-PROJECT ACTIVITIES.....  
**TOTAL.....**

**NUMBER OF PROJECTS MOVING FROM DESIGN TO IMPLEMENTATION BY PROJECT SIZE**

**AID'S CONTRIBUTION TO LIFE OF PROJECT COST**

	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82 MIN	FY 82 CURR	FY 82 AAPL
LESS THAN \$1 MILLION.....	2	4	2	--	1	1
\$1 TO \$5 MILLION.....	1	3	1	--	1	1
\$5 TO \$15 MILLION.....	2	--	1	--	1	--
\$15 TO \$25 MILLION.....	--	--	--	--	--	1
MORE THAN \$25 MILLION.....	--	--	--	--	--	--

LESS THAN \$1 MILLION.....  
 \$1 TO \$5 MILLION.....  
 \$5 TO \$15 MILLION.....  
 \$15 TO \$25 MILLION.....  
 MORE THAN \$25 MILLION.....

**TABLE VII  
OPERATING EXPENSE FUNDED PERSONNEL  
YEAR END POSITIONS**

FUNCTIONS	FY 79			FY 80			FY 81					
	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT
Executive Direction 1/	3	2			2	2			2	2		
Program Planning	3	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	2	3	0	1
Project Design	4	7			4	7			4	7		
Project Implementation	8	8		2	7	10			8	10	1	1
Financial Management												
Mission Support	2	17			1	15			1	15		
Non Mission Specific												
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>36</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
PLUS: PASAs (OE & Program)	3				2				2			
LESS: JAO Details	0				0				0			
MODE Required	23				18				19			

1/ Excludes one Part-Time Resident Hire Secretary

**TABLE VII**

FUNCTIONS	FY 82 MINIMUM			FY 82 CURRENT			FY 82 AAPL					
	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT	USDH	FNDH	US CONT	FN CONT
Executive Direction 1/	3	2							3	2		
Program Planning	3	3		1					3	3		1
Project Design	4	7							5	7		
Project Implementation	6	10	1	1					8	11	1	1
Financial Management	0	0							0	0		
Mission Support	1	15							1	15		
Non Mission Specific	0	0							0	0		
<b>TOTAL.....</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>					<b>20</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
PLUS: PASAs (OE & Program)	2								2			
LESS: JAO Details	0	IDIs							0	IDIs		
<b>MODE Required</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>1</b>							<b>22</b>	<b>1</b>		

1/ Excludes one Part-Time Resident Hire Secretary.

TABLE VIIIWORD PROCESSING EQUIPMENT

At present, USAID/ROCAP have no word processing capability. We propose to develop this capability during FY 1982. The equipment will be used for recurring program, administrative and financial reports and for the preparation of program documents that are reviewed and retyped several times. It will be operated by existing secretarial staff.

The following WANG Corporation equipment will be procured:

1 Model 5520	Text Processor CPU	\$7,300.00
2 Model 5536-1	Work Stations	9,200.00
1 Model 5581WC	Printer	8,050.00
1 Model MT-1	Table for CPU	550.00
1 Model WST-1	Table for Printer	<u>300.00</u>
	TOTAL	<u>\$25,400.00</u>

- A. Procurement of equipment and initiation of the system is proposed for FY 1982.
- B. Funding priority of the acquisition is minimum.
- C. Funding will be \$15,000.00 for USAID and \$10,400 for ROCAP.

**TABLE VII**  
**OPERATING EXPENSE SUMMARY**

	FY 1979			FY 1980			FY 1981		
	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
<b>COST SUMMARIES</b>									
US Direct Hire	741.8	18.6	39.88	784.4	18.0	43.58	767.4	17.5	43.85
PN Direct Hire	397.6	36.0	11.04	439.2	35.6	12.34	503.8	37.0	13.61
US Contract Pers.	0	0	0	0	0	0	61.3	1.0	61.30
PN Contract Pers.	30.3	3.0	10.10	16.1	1.6	10.06	27.1	2.0	13.55
Housing Expense	175.1	22	7.96	212.5	17.7	12.00	217.8	18	12.10
Office Operations	290.4	XX	XX	400.6	XX	XX	405.0	XX	XX
Total Budget	1,635.2	XXX	XXX	1,852.8	XX	XX	1,982.4	XX	XX
Mission Allotment *	1,587.0	XXX	XXX	1,807.6	XX	XX	1,966.7	XX	XX
PAAS	48.2	XXX	XXX	45.2	XX	XX	15.7	XX	XX
Trust Fund	0	XXX	XXX	0	XX	XX	0	XX	XX

\* Includes Costs USDH Salaries and Benefits paid AID/W.

**TABLE VIII**

	FY 1982 MINIMUM		FY 1982 CURRENT		FY 1982 AAPL		
	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	(000's)	Related Workyear	(\$000's)	Related Workyear	Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	773.9	17.5	44.22		894.4	20.5	43.63
FN Direct Hire	562.5	37.0	15.20		568.6	38.0	14.96
US Contract Pers.	61.3	1.0	61.30		61.3	1.0	61.30
FN Contract Pers.	27.1	2.0	13.55		27.1	2.0	13.55
Housing Expense	218.6	18	12.14		247.6	21	11.79
Office Operations	408.4	XX	XX	XX	408.4	XX	XX
Total Budget	2,051.8	XX	XX	XX	2,207.4	XX	XX
Mission Allotment *	2,033.3	XX	XX	XX	2,188.9	XX	XX
FAAS	18.5	XX	XX	XX	18.5	XX	XX
Trust Fund	0	XX	XX	XX	0	XX	XX

**COST SUMMARIES**

US Direct Hire

FN Direct Hire

US Contract Pers.

FN Contract Pers.

Housing Expense

Office Operations

Total Budget

Mission Allotment \*

FAAS

Trust Fund

\* Includes Cost USDH Salaries and Benefits paid AID/W.

TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING  
 POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 19 80 - 1982  
 (By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	DECISION UNIT USAID/Guatemala																	
	FY 1980						FY 1981						FY 1982					
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982		FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982		FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982	
	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR	URDH	FNDR
<b>EXECUTIVE DIRECTION</b>																		
Director's Office																		
Director	1																	
Deputy Director	1																	
Secretary																		
Part-Time Resident Hire Secretary Non-Add		1																1
Administrative Assistant		1																1
All Other																		
Sub Total Executive Direction	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
<b>PROGRAM PLANNING</b>																		
Program Officer	1																	
Deputy Program Officer	1																	
Assistant Program Officer																		
All Other																		
Sub Total Program Planning	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	FY 1980		FY 1981		NUMBER OF POSITIONS						
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982			FY 1982			
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982			FY 1982			
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	AAPL
<u>PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION</u>											
<u>Food and Nutrition Office</u>											
Rural Development Officer	1		1								
Assistant Agric. Development Officer	1		1								
Agriculture Economist	1		1								
Agriculture Economist											
IDI - Agriculture			1								
Agriculture Economist											
All Other			3								
<u>Health and Population Office</u>											
FML Dev. Officer	1		1								
Population Officer	1		1								
Health Program Assistance											
All Other			1								

TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING  
 POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 1980-1982  
 (By Function, Organisational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

DECISION UNIT  
 USAID/Guatemala

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS												
	FY 1980		FY 1981		FY 1982		FY 1982		FY 1982		FY 1982		
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	
<u>Education/Human Resources Office</u>													
Human Resources Dev. Officer	1		1										1
Education Advisor	1		1										1
Education Advisor		1		1									1
All Other		2		2									2
<u>Capital Development Office</u>													
Capital Development Officer	1		1										1
Capital Project Development Officer	1		1										1
Project Officer	1		1										1
Assistant Capital Dev. Officer		1		1									1
All Other		2		2									2
<u>Engineering Office</u>													
General Engineer	1		1										1
Engineer		1		1									2
All Other		1		1									1
<u>Program Office</u>													
Project Assistant		1		1									1

**TABLE IX - SUPPORTING DATA ON PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING**  
**POSITION REQUIREMENTS - FY 1980-1982**  
 (By Function, Organizational Unit, Position Title and Professional Speciality)

FUNCTION/ORGANIZATIONAL UNIT/ POSITION TITLE/PROFESSIONAL SPECIALITY	NUMBER OF POSITIONS												AAPI			
	FY 1980			FY 1981			FY 1982 - Current			USDH		FNDH		USDH	FNDH	
	Minimum		AAPI	Minimum		AAPI	Minimum		AAPI	Minimum		AAPI	Minimum		AAPI	
	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH	USDH	FNDH		
Food for Peace Assistant		1		1												1
Project Manager - SDA		1		1												1
Training Officer		1		1												1
All Other		1		1												1
Sub Total Project Design & Implementation	11	19	12	19	12	19							13			20
<b>FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT *</b>																
<b>MISSION SUPPORT *</b>																
Executive Officer Assit. Director for Management	1		1										1			
Personnel Officer		1		1												1
Supply and Contract Officer		1		1												1
All Other		12		12												12
Sub Total Administrative Support	1	14	1	14	1	14							1			14
Total Increment	16	36	17	37	17	37							20			38
Cumulative Total	16	36	17	37	17	37							20			38

\* All Mission support personnel working for both USAID/Guatemala and ROCAP are allocated to USAID/Guatemala and all Financial Management personnel are allocated to ROCAP.

P.L. 480 NARRATIVE

A. Relation of P.L. 480 Inputs to CDSS Basic Human Needs Strategy

The FY 1982 Guatemala CDSS cites nutritional studies which have pointed out the widespread nature of malnutrition in Guatemala, especially among children. Eighty-one percent of the "most at risk" population (children under 5 years of age) can be considered malnourished according to the Gómez classification, 30% severely so. The poorest half of the population suffers from a deficit of 40% of the minimum daily caloric requirement and a protein deficit of almost 50% of the minimum daily requirement. Ways in which the Mission will address this cross-sectoral problem through initiatives in the areas of income generation, family education, preventive health services, environmental sanitation and population planning are treated throughout the CDSS Strategy Section, with pages 51 and 52 focusing especially on nutrition. Over the short-term, however, P.L. 480, Title II commodities will continue to constitute important inputs to supplemental feeding programs directed primarily toward the maternal and child health care target population.

B. Magnitude of Food Deficit and Guatemala's Strategy for Moving Toward More Equitable Consumption

Interestingly, Guatemala is essentially self-sufficient in corn and beans, the grain staples of the poor. Guatemala has until this year enjoyed self-sufficiency in edible oil, almost entirely cotton seed oil. 1979 production of 33,000 metric tons approximately equalled demand. The 1980 production estimate is only 27,000 MT, however. Cotton production over the next five years is not expected to keep pace with demand for the by-product cotton seed oil; an annual 15% edible oil deficit can be expected over the next five years, or from

6,000 to 7,000 MT annually. There have been some attempts at diversification into palm oil in the Caribbean coastal region and the Petén, but low government-controlled edible oil prices have inhibited expansion of such endeavors.

The 1978 Guatemala Health Sector Assessment, citing an INCAP report, states that despite self-sufficiency in corn, the real consumption of corn has decreased in the last few years at an annual rate of more than 6%. Guatemalan and externally-financed income generation programs including programs to provide the land-hungry with access to agricultural land, are being brought to bear on this problem. At the same time, GOG supplemental feeding activities are attempting directly to address this distributive inequity. The Food and Nutrition component of the 1979-1982 National Development Plan makes explicit GOG recognition of the need for supplemental feeding. In an attempt to bridge the nutritional gap, the GOG has assumed full responsibility for a school feeding program in which children are provided Incaparina, a fortified corn product. The GOG also envisages a continuing role of P.L. 480, Title II assistance through the planning period, primarily to address protein deficiency in the MCH population. The GOG envisages a special supplementary feeding thrust using P.L. 480 foods to improve the nutritional status of the population in the target area of a proposed FY 1980 AID health loan.

#### C. Storage and Distribution

Extant storage facilities and distribution channels are adequate for the commodity levels proposed for the planning period.

#### D. P.L. 480, Title II Commodity Levels

We are proposing an FY 1981 level of \$6,618,000, which is higher than the level indicated in guidance the Mission has received. We are proposing, as well, an increase in program size spread over the planning period. The increasing dimensions of

the malnutrition problem and GOG interest in utilizing P.L. 480 resources in addressing the problem dictate a higher program level. Reflective of this GOG interest and awareness of the problem is a Ministry of Health decision to undertake an intensive supplemental feeding MCH program in the selected departments which comprise the target area of the new AID health loan. The MOH has requested that the additional commodities needed to serve additional beneficiaries generated through the efforts of especially trained village-level outreach agents be provided by CARE under its MCH program with the Ministry. The higher P.L. 480, Title II level proposed by the Mission is required, in part, to support this increased coverage.

P.L. 480, TITLE IIMISSION REVIEW OF OPERATIONAL PLANSCARE

The magnitude of the malnutrition problem in Guatemala is such that an increase in supplemental feeding assistance is warranted. Part of the burden is being borne by the GOG, which has assumed full responsibility for school feeding, implemented in prior years by CARE with P.L. 480 food. A substantial nutritional gap -- principally protein deficiency -- in the MCH population, the country's "most at risk" group, remains to be addressed. P.L. 480, Title II assistance can both help motivate and support the GOG in the meeting of its objectives to improve the nutritional status of this group.

While a decrease in the CRS program is necessary because of administrative constraints, an increase in the CARE program is warranted by existing and increasing need, the capacity to manage a larger program and by the extent to which the program is integrated into the GOG's nutritional strategy.

The Ministry of Health has requested an expansion of the CARE MCH program in the target area covered by the new FY 1980 AID health loan, which has been selected for an intensive effort to improve the nutritional status of the population. The extent of the need and the special intensification of coverage in the loan project area are reflected in the CARE Operational Plan, attached as an annex, which shows a steady increase in MCH beneficiary levels over the planning period. The MCH program accounts for over 90% of the CARE beneficiaries each year. A modest, but effective, Food for Work reforestation activity with the National Forestry Institute (INAFOR) will also double its beneficiary level from 3,500 in FY 1981 to 7,000 in 1986. Deforestation is an acute problem in Guatemala and last year alone one million seedlings were planted under this program.

The Mission requests that FY 81 beneficiary levels higher than those presented in the guidance cable, STATE 127836, be considered. The Mission believes that the levels requested by CARE constitute a justifiable response to GOG initiatives in the MCH and Food for Work categories. Proposed FY 1981 beneficiary levels are:

MCH	-	200,000
OCF	-	15,000
FFW	-	<u>3,500</u>
TOTAL		218,500

The CARE certification that storage facilities are adequate and that the program will not result in a substantial disincentive to domestic agricultural production is attached.

### CRS

The CRS FY 1982 Operational Plan is attached as an annex. The Plan projects a 12% reduction in beneficiary level from 1980 to 1981, an 8% reduction from 1981 to 1982, and a reduction of approximately 20% p.a. from 1983 to 1986. The FY 1981 level is in accordance with guidance from AID/W received by the Mission.

Over 80% of the beneficiaries are in the MCH category, which is consonant with GOG priorities. Approximately 12% of the beneficiaries each year will be in the Food for Work category; the remainder will be served by Other Child Feeding and Institutional Feeding programs.

The Mission is in agreement with the CRS operational strategy. Problems experienced by CRS in managing the program, including difficulties in clearly defining responsibilities of the entities involved in implementing the program -- CRS, Guatemalan National Caritas and the Diocesan Caritas organizations -- would argue for a diminution of the program to bring it within more manageable limits.

The scaling down is spread over time to minimize trauma to recipients. The gradual decrease will minimize duplication of coverage by both CRS and CARE as the CARE program picks up additional beneficiaries under a Ministry of Health MCH program. The CRS program, unlike CARE's, does not channel food through a GOG agency; rather, food assistance is provided to a large number of private local committees as well as churches, which poses further administrative problems.

The CRS certification that storage facilities are adequate and that the program will not result in a substantial disincentive to agricultural production is attached.

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CARE

FY 1982

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 245,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
245,000	Rice	3,998	1,503.2
245,000	CSM	5,351	2,183.2
245,000	Milk	2,675	1,120.8
245,000	Oil	1,323	1,316.4
<b>TOTAL MCH</b>		<b>13,347</b>	<b>6,123.6</b>

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<b>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 15,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
15,000	Rice	164	61.7
15,000	CSM	164	66.9
15,000	Flour	245	66.4
15,000	Oil	81	80.6
<b>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</b>		<b>654</b>	<b>275.6</b>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 4,500

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
4,500	Rice	197	74.0
4,500	CSM	98	40.0
4,500	Flour	197	53.4
4,500	Oil	24	23.9
<b>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</b>		<b>516</b>	<b>191.3</b>

## E. OTHER.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<b>TOTAL OTHER</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CARE

FY 1983

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 291,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
291,000	Rice	4,749	1,785.6
291,000	CSM	6,355	2,592.8
291,000	Milk	3,177	1,331.2
291,000	Oil	1,571	1,563.2
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		<u>15,852</u>	<u>7,272.8</u>

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 15,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
15,000	Rice	164	61.7
15,000	CSM	164	66.9
15,000	Flour	245	66.4
15,000	Oil	81	80.6
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		<u>654</u>	<u>275.6</u>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 5,500

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
5,500	Rice	240	90.2
5,500	CSM	120	49.0
5,500	Flour	240	65.0
5,500	Oil	30	29.8
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		<u>630</u>	<u>234.0</u>

## E. OTHER.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

## TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPICOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CARE

FY 1984

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 337,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
337,000	Rice	5,500	2,068.0
337,000	CSM	7,360	3,002.9
337,000	Milk	3,680	1,541.9
337,000	Oil	1,820	1,810.9
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		18,360	8,423.7

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		N/A	N/A

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 15,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
15,000	Rice	164	61.7
15,000	CSM	164	66.9
15,000	Flour	245	66.4
15,000	Oil	81	80.6
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		654	275.6

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 6,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
6,000	Rice	262	98.5
6,000	CSM	131	53.5
6,000	Flour	262	71.0
6,000	Oil	32	31.8
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		687	254.8

## E. OTHER.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		N/A	N/A

TABLE XII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CARE

FY 1985

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 383,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
383,000	Rice	6,250	2,350.0
383,000	CSM	8,364	3,412.5
383,000	Milk	4,182	1,752.3
383,000	Oil	2,068	2,057.6
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		20,864	9,572.4

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		N/A	N/A

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 15,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
15,000	Rice	164	61.7
15,000	CSM	164	66.9
15,000	Flour	245	66.4
15,000	Oil	81	80.6
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		654	275.6

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 6,500

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
6,500	Rice	284	106.8
6,500	CSM	142	57.9
6,500	Flour	284	77.0
6,500	Oil	35	34.8
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		745	276.5

## E. OTHER.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		N/A	N/A

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAFLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CARE

FY 1986

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 428,500

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
428,500	Rice	6,993	2,629.4
428,500	CSM	9,358	3,818.1
428,500	Milk	4,679	1,960.5
428,500	Oil	2,314	2,302.4
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		<u>23,344</u>	<u>10,710.4</u>

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 15,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
15,000	Rice	164	61.7
15,000	CSM	164	66.9
15,000	Flour	245	66.4
15,000	Oil	81	80.6
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		<u>654</u>	<u>275.6</u>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 7,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
7,000	Rice	306	115.0
7,000	CSM	153	62.5
7,000	Flour	306	82.9
7,000	Oil	38	37.8
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		<u>803</u>	<u>298.2</u>

## E. OTHER.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPL

COUNTRY: Guatemala

SPONSOR'S NAME: CRS

FY 1982

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 56,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
56,000	Rice	305	114.7
56,000	Oil	305	303.5
56,000	CSM	610	248.9
56,000	WSB	610	236.0
56,000	Milk	610	255.6
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		<u>2,440</u>	<u>1,158.7</u>

B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 2,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
2,000	Rice	22	8.3
2,000	Oil	11	11.0
2,000	CSM	44	17.9
2,000	WSB	22	8.5
2,000	Flour	22	7.3
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		<u>121</u>	<u>53.0</u>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 8,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
8,000	Rice	87	32.7
8,000	Oil	22	21.9
8,000	CSM	87	35.5
8,000	WSB	87	33.7
8,000	Flour	87	28.7
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		<u>370</u>	<u>152.5</u>

E. OTHER: INSTITUTIONS.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 800

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
800	Rice	9	3.4
800	Oil	4	4.0
800	CSM	17	6.9
800	WSB	9	3.5
800	Flour	9	3.0
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		<u>48</u>	<u>20.8</u>

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAFL

COUNTRY: Guatemala

SPONSOR'S NAME: CRS

FY 1983

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 45,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
45,000	Rice	245	92.1
45,000	Oil	245	243.8
45,000	CSM	490	199.9
45,000	WSB	490	189.6
45,000	Milk	490	205.3
<b>TOTAL MCH</b>		<b>1,960</b>	<b>930.7</b>

B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<b>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 2,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
2,000	Rice	22	8.3
2,000	Oil	11	10.9
2,000	CSM	44	17.9
2,000	WSB	22	8.5
2,000	Flour	22	7.3
<b>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</b>		<b>121</b>	<b>52.9</b>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 6,400

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
6,400	Rice	70	26.3
6,400	Oil	17	13.9
6,400	CSM	70	28.5
6,400	WSB	70	27.1
6,400	Flour	70	23.1
<b>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</b>		<b>297</b>	<b>118.9</b>

E. OTHER: INSTITUTIONS.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 640

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
640	Rice	7	2.6
640	Oil	4	3.0
640	CSM	14	5.7
640	WSB	7	2.7
640	Flour	7	2.3
<b>TOTAL OTHER</b>		<b>39</b>	<b>16.3</b>

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CRS

FY 1984

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 36,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
36,000	Rice	196	73.7
36,000	Oil	196	195.0
36,000	CSM	392	159.9
36,000	WSB	392	157.7
36,000	Milk	392	164.3
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		<u>1,568</u>	<u>750.6</u>

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 2,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
2,000	Rice	22	8.3
2,000	Oil	11	11.0
2,000	CSM	14	17.9
2,000	WSB	22	8.5
2,000	Flour	22	7.3
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		<u>91</u>	<u>53.0</u>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 5,100

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
5,100	Rice	56	21.0
5,100	Oil	14	13.9
5,100	CSM	56	22.8
5,100	WSB	56	21.7
5,100	Flour	56	18.5
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		<u>238</u>	<u>97.9</u>

E. OTHER; INSTITUTIONS.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 510

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
510	Rice	6	2.2
510	Oil	3	3.0
510	CSM	11	4.5
510	WSB	6	2.3
510	Flour	6	2.0
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		<u>32</u>	<u>14.0</u>

TABLE XIII - P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CRS

FY 1985

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 29,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
29,000	Rice	158	59.4
29,000	Oil	158	157.2
29,000	CSM	315	128.5
29,000	WSB	315	121.9
29,000	Milk	315	132.0
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		<u>1,261</u>	<u>599.0</u>

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 2,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
2,000	Rice	22	8.3
2,000	Oil	11	11.0
2,000	CSM	44	17.9
2,000	WSB	22	8.5
2,000	Flour	22	7.3
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		<u>121</u>	<u>53.0</u>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 4,100

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
4,100	Rice	45	16.9
4,100	Oil	11	10.9
4,100	CSM	45	18.4
4,100	WSB	45	17.4
4,100	Flour	45	14.9
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		<u>191</u>	<u>78.5</u>

E. OTHER: INSTITUTIONS.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 410

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
410	Rice	4	1.5
410	Oil	2	2.0
410	CSM	9	3.7
410	WSB	4	1.5
410	Flour	4	1.3
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		<u>23</u>	<u>10.0</u>

TABLE XIII- P.L. 480, TITLE II

Decision Package: AAPLCOUNTRY: GuatemalaSPONSOR'S NAME: CRS

FY 1986

A. MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 23,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
23,000	Rice	125	47.0
23,000	Oil	125	124.4
23,000	CSM	251	102.4
23,000	WSB	251	97.1
23,000	Milk	251	105.2
<u>TOTAL MCH</u>		<u>1,003</u>	<u>476.1</u>

## B. SCHOOL FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
---	---	---	---
<u>TOTAL SCHOOL FEEDING</u>		<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

C. OTHER CHILD FEEDING.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 2,000

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
2,000	Rice	22	8.3
2,000	Oil	11	11.0
2,000	CSM	44	17.9
2,000	WSB	22	8.5
2,000	Flour	22	7.3
<u>TOTAL OTHER CHILD FEEDING</u>		<u>121</u>	<u>53.0</u>

D. FOOD FOR WORK.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 3,300

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
3,300	Rice	36	13.5
3,300	Oil	4	8.9
3,300	CSM	36	14.7
3,300	WSB	36	13.9
3,300	Flour	36	11.9
<u>TOTAL FOOD FOR WORK</u>		<u>148</u>	<u>62.9</u>

E. OTHER: INSTITUTIONS.....TOTAL RECIPIENTS 330

No. of Recipients by Commodity	Name of Commodity	(Thousands)	
		KGS	Dollars
330	Rice	4	1.5
330	Oil	2	2.0
330	CSM	7	2.8
330	WSB	4	1.6
330	Flour	4	1.3
<u>TOTAL OTHER</u>		<u>21</u>	<u>9.2</u>