PD-ABK-152
ISN 92365

USAID Africa Bureau Activities Pertinent to the International Convention to Combat Desertification

John J. Gaudet,
Michael McGahuey,
and
Walter I. Knausenberger

June 1994

Contents

Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations 2
Acknowledgments 2

USAID Africa Bureau Activities Pertinent to the International Convention to Combat Desertification

1. Introduction 3
2. The International Convention to Combat Desertification 3
3. Major Activities of the Africa Bureau Pertinent to the Convention 4
4. Total Estimated Funding Specifically Consistent with the Desertification Convention 4
5. USAID Support — The General Approach 4
6. Indicator-Led Development — An Approach to Increasing Efficiencies 5
7. How Can African Countries Access USAID Resources? — Future Strategy and Criteria 7
8. Multilateral Assistance in the Sector of Dryland Natural Resources Management 7
9. Summary 8

Annexes:
A. Major Current Activities of the Africa Bureau Consistent with the Convention 9
B. Select List of USAID Documents Addressing Dryland Natural Resources Management and Sustainable Agriculture in Africa, 1991–1994 15

Glossary of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABS	Annual Budget Submission (USAID document)
AGRHYMET	Agriculture, Hydrology, and Meteorology regional center (in the Sahel)
ATLAS	African Training for Leadership and Skills (USAID project)
CERPOD	Centre Regional pour la Population et le Développement (INSAH)
CILSS	Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel
DFA	Development Fund for Africa (DFA)
EIS	Environmental Information Secretariat (World Bank)
FY	fiscal year
GIS	geographic information systems
HRDA	Human Resources Development for Africa (USAID project)
INCD	International Convention to Combat Desertification
INSAH	Sahel Institute
LOP	Life of Project (funding life of USAID project)
MDS	Multi-Donor Secretariat
NAP	National Action Program to Combat Desertification
NEAP	National Environmental Action Plan
NESDA	Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NPA	nonproject assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
PADRES	Program for Applied Development Research in the Sahel (USAID project)
PPPD	Promoting Population Policy Development (USAID project)
TA	technical assistance
UNSO	United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
WRI	World Resources Institute

Acknowledgments

Responsible for this report are three staff members of the USAID Bureau for Africa's Division of Food, Agriculture, and Resources Analysis, in the Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support (AFR/ARTS/FARA): John Gaudet, the Africa Bureau Environmental Coordinator; Michael McGahuey, Sustainable Agriculture / Natural Resources Advisor; and Walter I. Knausenberger, Environmental Protection Advisor and Analyst. Any opinions expressed within this report are the personal views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the opinions or views of USAID. All material presented in this report is based on previous publications, and all funding levels cited are taken from the USAID annual budget submission, FY 1994 and FY 1995.

Particular thanks for his encouragement and stimulating input are due to John van Dusen Lewis, Club du Sahel Advisor at the USAID Africa Regional Office in Paris. Also, for their guidance, the authors thank Alan Getson and Curt Reintsma, USAID/AFR/ARTS, and Richard Day, USAID/AFR/DP. Bradley Rymph, USAID/AFR/ARTS/FARA, ably assisted in putting this report in final form.

Finally, members of the U.S. Desertification Delegation provided helpful suggestions.

USAID Africa Bureau Activities Pertinent to the International Convention to Combat Desertification

1. Introduction

What have been the activities of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Africa Bureau most pertinent to combating desertification and mitigation of drought's effects? This report provides a brief synopsis of such programming, primarily supported by the Development Fund for Africa (DFA). The overall goal of the DFA is to achieve broad-based sustainable economic growth, focussing on key priority areas that promote: (1) a public sector that is more equitable and efficient, (2) markets that are more competitive, (3) maintenance and restoration of renewable natural resources to increase agricultural productivity, and (4) greater food security. USAID has been in the forefront with respect to forging integrated approaches to development in which economic productivity and growth are seen as dependent on a properly nurtured and valued natural resources base.

This report updates and complements a previous USAID report for an earlier round of the International Desertification Convention negotiations (Gaudet et al. 1993), which concentrated more upon USAID's extensive dryland management activities—i.e., in sustainable agriculture and natural resources management. The present report draws attention to the broader range of interventions to which USAID is committed—e.g., institutional capacity building initiatives (such as support to the Club du Sahel), training, policy dialogue, and other areas, to identify and address underlying systemic constraints and incentives. It is expected that this approach will lead to long-term sustainable capacity of Africans to deal with and prevent desertification in an adaptive and productive fashion.

A main thesis of this contribution is that readily verifiable indicators are needed for implementation and evaluation. USAID places emphasis on tracking *impacts*, not merely on tallying activities and resources invested. In this light, the lessons learned over the past 30 years need to be properly assimilated, and should be fully taken into account for the Convention's initiative for early priority action in Africa.

2. The International Convention to Combat Desertification

As a result of the Agenda 21 Action Plan that emerged from the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, more than 100 countries are presently engaged in negotiations to prepare an International Convention to Combat Desertification (INCD) with a special emphasis on Africa. Under the leadership of a Secretariat, several negotiation meetings have occurred, with the final meeting scheduled for June 6–17, 1994. The process so far has resulted in a very productive exchange of technical information and a forthright discussion of the experiences of combating desertification in developing countries to date.

At a recent meeting of delegation heads in Geneva at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), there was an indication that major bilateral donors are prepared to work toward better coordination of effort in support of the Convention when it is finally signed in 1994, but increased or new funding was not foreseen.

The Desertification Convention negotiations are now entering the stage where financial mechanisms are being discussed. Since the major emphasis of the Convention is on Africa,

it is appropriate that USAID set out what activities are underway in sub-Saharan Africa that support the intentions of the Convention.

3. Major Activities of the Africa Bureau Pertinent to the Convention

For many years, USAID's Africa Bureau has been very involved in development aid in the general area of dryland natural resources management. USAID support is also directed at country-specific levels (i.e., via Mission funding) and at regional levels (i.e., through central funding). This report's Annex A summarizes examples of both kinds of development assistance projects targeted toward addressing desertification. Such projects would therefore provide the basis for USAID's support of the Desertification Convention when it is signed. Several of these projects, in fact, already provide direct and indirect support for a number of individual Africans, as well as Sahelian institutions involved in the negotiations. Of particular interest is the USAID effort in providing support to the subregional efforts of the Club du Sahel and the Interstate Committee to Combat Drought in the Sahel (CILSS).

It should be noted that some of the activities described in Annex A are still in an advanced stage of planning, but the majority are in place and being implemented. Some of them have been in place for several years. A partial listing of 1991–94 USAID Africa Bureau publications pertinent to dryland management in Africa is presented in Annex B. Additional sources representative of these activities can be found in Gaudet et al. 1993.

4. Total Estimated Funding Specifically Consistent with the Desertification Convention (based on Annex A)

The scope and scale of present USAID investments in matters more or less directly relevant to antidesertification are presented below by broad categories of interventions; they are expanded upon in Annex A. As noted above, this list of activities represents ongoing or about-to-be-implemented programs and projects that are most pertinent to the focus of the INCD. Not included in this listing are activities addressing broader macroeconomic and policy dialogue, general institutional reform, or agribusiness support, in which USAID has been quite strongly engaged. Similarly, USAID's considerable support to Africans through food aid, drought relief and rehabilitation is not addressed herein.

A. *Capacity Building* — $57.26 million
B. *Training* (approx. 5 percent of $250.0 million) — $12.50 million
C. *Remote sensing, famine early warning, and disaster prevention* — $58.00 million
D. *National Environmental Action Plans, Information and Policy Support Groups* — $2.25 million
E. *Bilateral and regional natural resource programs in affected countries* (see Annex A, Table 1) — $377.67 million

Total: $507.68 million

5. USAID Support — *The General Approach*

USAID's general approach in providing assistance in Africa is guided by the overall Agency objective of promoting broad-based sustainable economic growth. This objective is essential in reversing the overall decline in the quality of life in Africa, a decline that has come as a result of the economic, political, and social downturns that have adversely affected many of the poorest of the developing countries, which are often those most affected by desertification. One of the goals of USAID is to support a natural resources management strategy that designs, supports, and implements programs that will lead to sustainable increases in agricultural productivity and, hence, personal incomes, especially at the local level. Such pro-

grams are aimed at two inextricably linked outputs: (1) increases in productivity and personal welfare, and (2) decreases in the rate of environmental degradation.

This approach aims to achieve long-term impacts, but a potentially serious constraint is the time needed to begin to show such long-term impacts from improved resources management. Certain approaches (e.g., the adoption of new annual crops, or improved water harvesting techniques) may improve the welfare of farmers within a year or two, but other interventions—growing of trees on-farm, or the development of a natural forest management plan—often require up to 10 years to show meaningful results. Improved soil fertility through changes in crop mix require even longer periods, while the long-term benefits from the conservation of biodiversity, or ameliorating the adverse impact from climate change can only be fully assessed in terms of decades, not years.

What to do? In the past, faced with pressure to increase budgets in response to a crisis (such as desertification), donors have tended to throw money at the perceived problem, often achieving quantifiable results within a few years (numbers of trees planted, amount of land in protected areas, etc.). But this approach has proved itself to be flawed time and again; in most instances, such hurry-up strategies are not sustainable, having been essentially designed, implemented, and funded from the outside.

USAID has therefore resolved to focus on the underlying systemic constraints and incentives. In other words, USAID programs focus on those factors that make a difference in the way that farmers, herders, and other land users in pursuit of a better livelihood manage the natural resource endowment. It is far better to tackle these more difficult issues now, even though initial impact may be modest, if it can be demonstrated that such change has a good chance to lead to long-term, *sustainable* change.

6. Indicator-led Development — *An Approach to Increasing Efficiencies*

Over the past few years, USAID has continued to maintain a steady flow of aid in Africa to support interventions that are related to land management and desertification in arid and semiarid areas. This work has provided the Africa Bureau with much experience to draw on. Consequently, the Bureau has supported the effort of several delegations to the INCD to introduce draft text into the Convention, as well as into the Africa Annex, which calls for the establishment of "readily verifiable indicators for implementation and evaluation."

Under the USAID Development Fund for Africa (DFA), USAID has done a great deal of work on indicators. Based on this work, there are at least two good reasons for identifying and using indicators, whether it be part of the Convention or in any bilateral USAID program. These are to: (1) measure progress toward goals, and (2) test critical assumptions about achieving the goal. For both reasons, a vital step is to state assumptions about causal relationships in the process.

USAID uses indicators and a self-educating process to measure investment efficiencies and increase program effectiveness. Although the system is far from perfected, progress is being made. It is offered here as an approach to be discussed and as a way to better determine investment efficiencies. The approach is based on the following observations and activities:

- *Land-degradation cannot be considered independently of rural economic development.* In most countries where USAID works, land degradation is often an outcome of land-use management decisions made by farmers, herders, woodcutters, hunters, and other rural producers as they pursue more secure and prosperous livelihoods. The other outcome of these decisions is production of food, fuel, fiber, and other rural products. These decisions, made by millions of individuals,

link changes in production with changes in degradation rates.

- *A reduction in land-degradation rates can only be achieved if rural producers broadly perceive that it is in their interest to adopt less degrading land-use practices.* On one hand, mandating reduction in land-degradation rates has not been effective. On the other hand, initiatives that increase productivity and/or reduce risks from the adoption of less-degrading practices show promise.

- *A primary challenge to African countries and donor partners is to identify and establish those conditions that increase the incentive to adopt less-degrading practices.* Not only must the "enabling conditions" be identified and validated, they must also be established on a broad base so that they can systemically build up the incentives for hundreds of thousands if not millions of land-use decision makers.

- *What are these "enabling conditions"?* To identify these enabling conditions, USAID Missions and the Africa Bureau have conducted surveys of cases where producers have adopted practices that both improve productivity (or reduce risks) and decrease degradation rates. Analyses of the characteristics associated with the adoption of these practices show that the enabling conditions vary over time and space but that there are characteristics that are common to many. These include the following: perception of tenure security, access to capital and markets, ability to manage community-based enterprises, perception of having authority over management of resources, first-hand knowledge about land-use options, and access to competent technical assistance and inputs.

- *How are these conditions established?* Many of the above are established by policy and institutional changes. Others are changed by training people at all levels. Still others are initiated by projects that "kick-start" the process by underwriting some of initial costs or by sharing the costs with rural communities. The primary inputs into establishing conditions include surveys and analyses to assess the factors that distinguish the adopters of more productive/less degrading practices from the nonadopters; the establishment and testing of policy and institutional changes; and the training of people at all levels (community to policy maker).

- *How do we know if we are on the right track?* USAID has used the field-survey approach to identify intermediate and impact indicators. The impact indicators reflect changes in productivity and land-degradation rates. The intermediate indicators are measures of progress that are plausibly linked to impacts. Because the process is multiple step (i.e., land-use management decisions affect both sets of impact and are, in turn, affected by the "enabling conditions," etc.), the Africa Bureau established a hierarchical framework to organize the various indicators according to causal relationships. By selecting indicators at each level of the organizing framework that are plausibly linked to increased productivity and reduced degradation rates, USAID Missions and host governments could tell where they are in making progress. Depending on how reliable the indicators are, host governments and donors could use these as the measure of impact in the efficiency equation (Efficiency = impact / investment).

- *How are indicators used to improve programming effectiveness?* Analyses conducted by host governments and USAID confirm that the development process is an ever-evolving dynamic. As a result, the reliability of intermediate indicators changes over time and space. For example, land tenure may not be

an important factor in land-use management decisions if demographic pressure is low or markets are not important. But, as demographics and market opportunities change, tenure often becomes a very important factor. One way to detect changes in the causal relationships between program inputs and impacts is to compare expected versus actual outcomes. If the full set of enabling conditions is established but the impact is less than expected, then host governments should consider changing the assumptions that guide their investments. Host governments that are most sensitive to changes in these causal relationships are in the best position to establish the new set of conditions that will increase impacts and efficiency.

In summary, USAID feels that the emphasis on indicators within the Convention will be helpful to all donors, as it will provide a common mechanism for judging progress of the signatory countries during the implementation of the Convention.

It should also be pointed out that the Africa Bureau has established a system for ranking all countries on the basis of past general performance especially in policy reform. This ranking includes an assessment of past performance, in the general environment and natural resources sectors, and this in itself acts as an indicator of progress towards a favorable climate in which sustainable development can flourish.

7. How Can African Countries Access USAID Resources? — *Future Strategy and Criteria*

Over the years, USAID has developed some basic ground rules relative to development funds. Of obvious importance, for example, is whether or not the Agency maintains a presence within the host country. Assistance provided to any host-country activity in support of the Convention would depend on that activity meeting such criteria as the following:

1. Is the country a signatory to the Convention?

2. Has the country demonstrated a positive response to the recommendations, plans, and activities called for in the Convention?

3. Is the subject country a priority USAID country, and does the local USAID Mission support or approve the activity? Is it related to current ongoing Mission activities?

4. Assuming the activity is defined within the National Action Program to Combat Desertification (NAP), how does it relate to the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP), and is it clearly coordinated with the work of other donors?

5. Has the responsible agency in-country designed and implemented a system of benchmark indicators (as established within the Convention), along with monitoring, evaluation, and mitigation plans? Has policy reform gone forward to the extent that demonstrable progress can be demonstrated toward a policy environment?

8. Multilateral Assistance in the Sector of Dryland Natural Resources Management

USAID is very involved with other donors in a common development effort going forward in Africa. It is particularly important to ensure that donors are not led into duplicative efforts. USAID therefore applauds the Convention drafters for the particular attention paid to the area of national planning.

The World Bank has now produced an analysis of the NEAP process and has concluded that the process has great potential as a vehicle in preparing the NAPs. This could play an important role in mounting a "Early Action" effort to speed along the implementation of national efforts under the Convention.

Since USAID already provides considerable support to the NEAP process in Africa, the Agency is interested in ensuring that the most efficient use is made of this very versatile planning process.

Regarding NEAPs, it should also be pointed out that USAID's interest in NEAPs stems from the fact that the Africa Bureau has been a leader in backing participatory processes in environmental planning and natural resources management. It was determined long ago that it is no longer sufficient to review development activities for potential environmental impacts. Rather, support must go to programs that primarily focus on sustainability and linkages between environment and development. The multiple linkages among the environment, population growth, poverty, public health, market, public and nongovernmental institutions, and social culture require coordinated, geographically specific approaches to build on the positive and to break the negative linkages between development and the environment.

For this reason, USAID has been fully supportive of the various delegations working to emphasize multiple linkages and also those negotiations that have stressed the design and implementation of effective monitoring and evaluation systems that will allow programs to be adapted with time.

Such an approach is being taken in those 38 countries, in Africa that have initiated NEAPs, many with the direct or indirect support of USAID. NEAPs are intended to provide a framework for integrating environmental considerations into the nations' economic and social development at the local and national levels. The NEAPs aim to define a time-bound plan of actions, including environmental policy, institutional and legal reforms, corrective measures for continuing development programs, and investment programs. In principle, and largely in practice, the process is demand-driven and participatory.

In addition, the Africa Bureau supports the newly formed, Africa-based Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa (NESDA), located in Abidjan, which has been formed to help facilitate the process and improve NEAPs' development impact by assisting Africans to optimally structure environmental training and analytical capacity-building initiatives so as to improve implementation.

9. Summary

In addition to a general development effort in natural resources in dryland regions of Africa, the Africa Bureau has already initiated several regional support projects and activities that are targeted toward desertification and will provide the basis for our support of the Desertification Convention when it is signed. USAID will be very interested in strategies and any planning process that shows how countries can *increase the efficiency of the investment in this sector.* Up to this point, the measure of progress has been the amount spent against the problem and not the impact of that money. The amount of money spent is only the denominator in the equation: Efficiency = impact / investment.

It could be argued that, even if money were not the object, a focus on efficiency must still be the priority. Based on field experience and results, increased productivity and reduced degradation rates are not always directly correlated to the amount spent. Consequently, the convention should decide on a way to measure efficiency of investments.

USAID has a large interest in the national planning process and would support any effort to ensure that the existing National Environmental Action Plans process is used, as far as possible, in preparing and implementing National Action Programs to Combat Desertification.

Annex A

Major Current Activities of the Africa Bureau Consistent with the Convention

This Annex provides brief synopses of the scope and scale of present USAID investments in matters more or less directly relevant to antidesertification, according to the broad categories of interventions listed above in Section 4. As has been noted, this list of activities represents ongoing or about-to-be-implemented programs and projects that are most pertinent to the focus of, but not explicitly in response to, the INCD. Not included in this listing are activities addressing broader macroeconomic and policy dialogue, general institutional reform, or agribusiness support, all of which USAID has been quite strongly engaged in. Similarly, USAID's considerable support to Africans through food aid, drought relief, and rehabilitation is not covered here.

A. Capacity Building

1. **Sahel Regional Institutions (625-0975):** $25.03 million.* Completion date, 1997. Provides support to the Club du Sahel and the Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), and assists the Club and CILSS with donor coordination and implementation of their joint work plan in food security and natural resources management.

2. **Program for Applied Development Research in the Sahel (PADRES) (698-0980):** $8.51 million. Completion date, 1998. Project will improve Sahelian analysis, formulation, and coordination of research efforts in agricultural production, food security and natural resources management. The project will be implemented by the Sahel Institute (INSAH) a regional organization dedicated to collecting, analyzing, and disseminating scientific and technical information in the Sahel.

3. **Sahel Water and Data Management IV (698-0981.83):** $12.82 million. Completion date, 1997. Project supports the timely collection, transmission, and utilization of accurate and relevant weather, climatic, and hydrological data in the Sahel region, and its application to famine early warning and the monitoring and planning of agricultural development and natural resources management. This project provides technical assistance, training, equipment, and operational support to the AGRHYMET Regional Center. Areas of concentration are: (1) institutional capacity leading to Sahelianization; (2) new products and applications in famine early warning, agricultural production, and natural resources management; and (3) pilot activities, especially using geographic information systems (GIS) applications relative to the above objectives.

4. **Promoting Population Policy Development (PPPD) (625-0978):** $10.90 million. PPPD supports Centre Regional pour la Population et le Développement (CERPOD), the Sahelian population center located in Bamako, in its undertaking demographic surveys, studies, and analyses to inform national population policies and program development. As an institution-building activity, PPPD supports CERPOD by providing high-quality services in the areas of

* All funding reported here = Planned Life of Project (LOP) / Source: FY94 ABS.

applied research, training, and technical assistance on a broad range of population (including migration) and health issues.

B. Training

1. **Human Resources Development for Africa (HRDA) (698-0463):** $110.00 million. Completion date, 1997. A general training program that uses bilateral Mission funds for training in many sectors, including in-country training.

2. **African Training for Leadership and Skills (ATLAS) (698-0475):** $140.00 million. Completion date, 1999. Formerly "AFGRAD," with almost 3,000 alumni from 45 African countries south of the Sahara, it aims to improve the ability of African institutions to plan and promote sustainable development by strengthening the research and management skills of highly qualified Africans.

C. Remote Sensing and Disaster Prevention / Mitigation

1. **Famine Early Warning System III (698-0491):** $40.00 million. Completion date, 1999. This project will reinforce and further institutionalize existing national African programs for early warning of impending food production problems, potential famines, and nutritional stress through capacity building. It will also develop or expand warning systems in semiarid and drought-prone countries in regions outside the Sahel such as Southern Africa, and will explore ways and means for linking and applying early warning technology and experience to food security and other agricultural development issues.

2. **Disaster Preparation and Mitigation in Niger (683-0271/9):** $18.00 million. Completion date, 1996. This project has two main components: (1) involving policy and legal reform, institutional development; and (2) an Emergency Fund, as well as a companion project assistance component. These last components have a common purpose of strengthening Nigerien capabilities to assess, mitigate, and successfully respond to disasters. The program goal is to minimize the negative impact of disasters on economic development. Through a cash transfer, the Emergency Fund will allow for disaster early warning, preparedness, mitigation, and effective relief.

D. National Environmental Action Plans, Information, and Policy Support Groups

These three initiatives include support to dryland resources management:

1. **USAID, the Multi-Donor Secretariat (MDS), and National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs):** $0.85 million, 1993–1995. The Africa Bureau, since 1987, has pursued a program of support to assist Missions in the design and preparation of NEAPs. At present, the Africa Bureau is supporting, through USAID Mission interventions in seven countries, over $300 million in assistance related to African NEAPs. The MDS, housed at the World Bank and cofunded by the Africa Bureau, has been directly involved with the design or implementation of almost all of these programs, many of which include dryland resources management.

   The MDS helps host-country personnel to understand the nature of the NEAP process, to learn from the experience of others, and to informally ensure that USAID's interests regarding NEAPs is represented within the donor community.

2. **Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa (NESDA):**

$0.50 million. NESDA was founded in 1990 as the "Club of Dublin," It has grown since then to encompass an Africa-wide network of environmental practitioners with a small operational secretariat based in Abidjan, hosted by the African Development Bank. Its financial support comes from the World Bank, the United Nations Sudano-Sahelian Office (UNSO), and USAID. NESDA's main objective is to assist in reversing the trend of natural resource base degradation in Africa at national, subregional, and regional levels; in building environmental concerns into general planning; in raising the general public awareness; and in creating new opportunities for economic growth through the environment. Operationally, NESDA's program seeks to (a) strengthen the capacity of countries to launch the process of formulating and implementing strategic frameworks for sustainable development through support for a forum for exchange of experience in the field, and (b) facilitate the establishment of a network of African experts and institutions to foster technical cooperation among African countries.

3. **WRI Natural Resource Information Consultative Group:** $0.40 million, 1993–1995. This Consultative Group consists of experts from U.S. universities, U.S. Government agencies, the World Bank, World Resources Institute (WRI) staff, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector. The wide range of expertise of the Consultative Group includes geographic information systems, survey design and sampling, and remote sensing. The members of the core group have extensive African experience and have a close liaison with the World Bank Environmental Information Secretariat (EIS) which is constituted of 18 or more representatives from African countries.

   The purposes of this Consultative Group are: to facilitate the effective utilization of relevant approaches and tools, including geographic and environmental information systems, and to better understand and assess environmental conditions and degradation and increase the impact of environmental programs on sustainable development in Africa, including the management of natural resources in dryland areas.

4. **WRI Consultative Group on Natural Resource Policy:** $0.50 million, 1993–1995. This Consultative Group has been developed to provide a level of quality control and advisory services not otherwise available to USAID Missions. Natural resources / environmental policy requires a mix of specialties and approaches, as well as the ability to learn gradually from field experiences. At the present time, the academic community involved with such policies tends to be removed from the body of practical experience and knowledge being generated at the country level. USAID Missions, on the other hand, often do not have the technical competence to evaluate approaches to natural resources / environmental reform, adding to the difficulties in designing and implementing such policy programs. This Consultative Group fills that need, and although it deals with many problems in many countries, it provides a major resource wherever dryland natural resources management issues are at stake.

E. USAID Bilateral and Regional Natural Resources Program in Affected Countries in Africa

As is evident from the synopsis provided by Table 1, USAID in sub-Saharan Africa has an extensive and diverse portfolio of development assistance focusing on sustainable development, much of which is directly pertinent to combating desertification. The mandate of the Development Fund for Africa is to promote broad-based sustainable economic growth, focusing on key priority areas that encourage: (1) a pub-

lic sector that is more equitable and efficient, (2) markets that are more competitive, (3) maintenance and restoration of renewable natural resources to increase agricultural productivity, and (4) greater food security. USAID emphasizes strategic objective–driven programming so as to forge integrated approaches to development in which economic productivity and growth are seen as being dependent on a properly nurtured and valued natural resources base.

Table 1 draws attention to the broader range of interventions to which USAID is committed that are antidesertification and drought mitigation in nature. This includes, for example, many activities undertaken by private voluntary and nongovernmental organizations, as well as agricultural research in affected countries. Not directly encompassed by the rationale in assembling the table are the institutional and policy reform initiatives that USAID strongly supports as well (e.g., support to the Club du Sahel and the PADRES project listed earlier).

One of the hallmarks of USAID portfolios is their programmatic flexibility, in that key areas of assistance are not projectized but are adaptive programs responding to targets and indicators. USAID places emphasis on tracking *impacts*, not merely on tallying activities and resources invested. In any dialogue as to new initiatives, readily verifiable indicators are needed for implementation and evaluation.

A main point of this paper is to draw attention to the programming already in place. In this light, the lessons learned over the past 30 years need to be properly assimilated and should be fully taken into account for the Convention's "Early Action" initiative.

Table 1. Ongoing USAID Africa Bureau Bilateral Country-Specific Programs Directly Relevant to Desertification, Including Support to Dryland Resource Management, and Applicable to the Convention. (Funding levels indicated encompass approximately the period 1992 to 1997, covering the planned Lives of the Projects [LOP] involved.)

Country	Program	US$(millions)
Botswana ($17.5 million)	*Natural Resources Management	17.50
Cape Verde ($3.8 million)	Watersheds and Applied Research Development	3.80
Chad ($11.4 million)	PVO/NGO Support (NRM 30% of $38 mill.)	11.40
Ethiopia ($10 million)	Support for Ethiopian Recovery (ca. 5% NRM/E)	10.00
	Eritrean Recovery Program (ca. 5% NRM/E)	
The Gambia ($22 million)	Agriculture and Natural Resources Management	22.00
Guinea ($13.80 million)	Fouta Environmental Protection	2.00
	Natural Resources Management	11.80
Guinea-Bissau ($6 million)	Tenure Rights for Broad-Based Agricultural Growth	6.00
Kenya ($11.25 million)	Conservation of Biodiverse Resources	7.00
	PVO Cofinancing (NRM 40% of 7.0 mill.)	3.00
	Park Rehabilitation and Management	1.25
Lesotho ($14.1 million)	Community Natural Resources Management	14.10
Malawi ($8.05 million)	Agricultural Sector Assistance (ca. 20% of $40 million directly pertinent to desertification matters)	8.00
	*Natural Resources Management	0.05
Mali ($48.32 million)	Development of Haute Vallée	25.23
	PVO Co-financing (NRM 40% of 3.22 mill.)	1.29
	Mali Environmental Support / Forestry Sector Reform	15.00
	Strengthening Research Planning and Research on Commodities (ca. 25% of $19.47 million attributable to desertification mitigation)	4.92
	Animal Productivity and Export (ca. 10% of $18.82 million attributable to dryland management)	1.88
Mozambique ($18 million)	PVO Support (20% of $90 million)	18.00
Namibia ($10.5 million)	*Living in a Finite Environment	10.50
Niger ($18.63 million)	Agricultural Sector Development (40% of $20 million NPA and $7.97 mill. TA)	11.19
	Disaster Mitigation and Preparedness ($10 million NPA; $8 million TA, of which ca. $ 5 million is NRM-related mitigation) (see Annex A, Section C)	--
	Gouré Natural Resources Management	5.00

Country	Program	US$(millions)
	Maradi Microenterprise (20% of $7.20 million)	1.44
	Peace Corps Naturai Resources Management Interventions	1.00
Senegal ($69.5 million)	Natural Resources-Based Agricultural Research (25% of $19.75 million)	4.94
	Southern Zone Water Management	17.50
	Senegal Reforestation	14.00
	Kaolack Agricultural Enterprise Development	8.00
	Community Based Natural Resources Management	25.00
Swaziland ($12 million)	PVO Soil and Water Conservation	12.00
Uganda ($10 million)	Action Program for the Environment (ca. 33% of $30 $30 million applied to drylands issues)	10.00
Zambia ($5.25 million)	*Natural Resources Management	4.00
	Agricultural Sector Adjustment Program (25% judged directly pertinent to drylands issues)	1.25
Zimbabwe ($34 million)	*Community-based Natural Resources Management	18.00
	Natural Resources Management (bilateral)	16.00
Regional Natural Resources and Agricultural Research Activities ($33.63 million)	Policy, Analysis, Research, and Technical Support (ca. 40% of $73.80 million)	29.52
	Southern Africa Natural Resources Management (regionally coordinated, bilaterally implemented in Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Zambia, Zimbabwe; $38.46 million, listed under individual countries, above)	--
	Southern Africa Regional Sorghum/Millet Research (50% of LOP in FY 92-97)	2.50
	Sorghum Research Network of West Africa (ca. 30% of $0.80 million attributable to coping with dryland conditions)	0.24
	Maize Research Networks of East/South Africa (ca. 30% of $2.25 million attributable to coping with dryland conditions)	0.68
	Cassava Research Network of East/South Africa (ca. 20% of $3.5 million attributable to coping with dryland conditions)	0.69
TOTAL		$377.67

* USAID countries/projects participating in Southern Africa Regional Program's Natural Resources Management Project.

Source = ABS FY94 & FY95.

Annex B

Select List of USAID Documents Addressing Dryland Natural Resources Management and Sustainable Agriculture in Africa, 1991–1994

Associates in Rural Development. 1991. *A Conceptual Approach to the Conservation and Management of Natural Forests in Sub-Saharan Africa (Arid and Semi-Arid Forests and Woodlands).* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Africa, Office of Technical Resources. March.

Biodiversity Support Program. 1993. *African Biodiversity: Foundation for the Future — A Framework for Integrating Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development.* Washington, D.C.: Biodiversity Support Program.

Booth, Greg A. 1993. *Biological Diversity Monitoring Indicators within a Natural Resources Management Framework for Sub-Saharan Africa.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forestry Support Program and Office of International Cooperation. April.

Booth, Greg A., Carolyn Njuki, and Jonathan Otto. 1992. *Non-Governmental Organizations and Natural Resource Management in Africa: A Discussion of Issues and Priorities.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forestry Support Program and Office of International Cooperation. November.

Brown, Michael. 1993. *Non-Governmental Organizations and Natural Resources Management in Africa's Pastoral Sector: Where to Go from Here? — A Synthesis Document.* Washington, D.C.: PVO-NGO/NRMS Project. August.

Brown, Michael, and Barbara Wyckoff-Baird. 1992. *Designing Integrated Conservation and Development Projects.* Washington, D.C.: Biodiversity Support Program. January.

Brown, Michael, et al. 1993. *Non-Governmental Organizations and Natural Resources Management: An Assessment of Eighteen African Countries — Executive Summary.* Washington, D.C.: PVO-NGO/NRMS Project. March.

Clarkson Systems and Analyses. 1992. Implementation of the Africa Bureau Natural Resources Management Analytical Agenda — Workshop Proceedings, March 17–19, 1992. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. June.

Clarkson Systems and Analyses. 1991. *Implementation of the NRM Analytical Agenda: Workshop Proceedings.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Africa, Office of Technical Resources. September.

Erdmann, Thomas K. 1993. *An Analysis of 10 African Natural Resources Management Practices.* ARTS Technical Paper no. 8. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for

Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. October.

Gaudet, John, et al. 1993. *Dryland Management and the USAID Response in Africa: Combating Desertification through Development.* ARTS Technical Paper no. 6. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. May.

Kangasniemi, Jaaka, et al. 1993. *Food Sector Instability and Food Aid in Sub-Saharan Africa: Implications for Food Security.* ARTS Technical Paper no. 10. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. November.

Otto, Jonathan. 1993. *Seeking Success: Where and How to Look for Success Factors in USAID/NGO Natural Resource Management Projects in Africa.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forestry Support Program and Office of International Cooperation. November.

Ramanathan, T. R. 1992. *Non-Governmental Organizations and Natural Resources Management in Africa: A Literature Review.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forestry Support Program and Office of International Cooperation. November.

Swartzendruber, J. F. 1992. *Conserving Biomass Energy in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Assessment of Experience.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. November.

Swartzendruber, J. F., and Bernard Berka Njovens. 1993. *African NGO Participation in Natural Resource Policy Reform.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Forestry Support Program and Office of International Cooperation. November.

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). 1992. *Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa: Regional Environmental Strategy for the Africa Bureau.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. May.

USAID. 1993. *Towards a Sustainable Future for Africa: Improved Natural Resources Management under the Development Fund for Africa (DFA), 1987 to 1993.* ARTS Technical Paper no. 5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. April.

USAID. 1994. *Africa: Growth Renewed, Hope Rekindled — A Report on the Performance of the Development Fund for Africa, 1988–1992.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development.

Wells, Michael, Katrina Brandon, and Lee Hannah. 1992. *People and Parks: Linking Protected Area Management with Local Communities.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank. January.

Zimmerman, R. C. 1993. *Recent Reforms in Natural Resources Management in Africa: Trends in the Roles of Public-Sector Institutions / Phase II — Final Report.* ARTS Technical Paper no. 9. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development; Bureau for Africa; Office of Analysis, Research, and Technical Support. October.