PD-ABM-812

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

PROJECT DATA SHEET

1. TRANSACTION CODE: C (A = Add, C = Change, D = Delete) — Amendment Number: 2 — DOCUMENT CODE: 3

2. COUNTRY/ENTITY: Uganda PD-ABM-812

3. PROJECT NUMBER: 617-0114

4. BUREAU/OFFICE: USAID/Uganda

5. PROJECT TITLE (maximum 40 characters): Agricultural Non-Traditional Export Promotion Program

6. PROJECT ASSISTANCE COMPLETION DATE (PACD): MM 12 DD 31 YY 95

7. ESTIMATED DATE OF OBLIGATION (Under 'B.' below, enter 1, 2, 3, or 4)
A. Initial FY 92 B. Quarter C. Final FY 94

8. COSTS ($000 OR EQUIVALENT $1 =)

A. FUNDING SOURCE	FIRST FY B. FX	FIRST FY C. L/C	FIRST FY D. Total	LIFE OF PROJECT E. FX	LIFE OF PROJECT F. L/C	LIFE OF PROJECT G. Total
AID Appropriated Total						
(Grant)	(500)	( )	(500)	(7,500)	( )	(7,500)
(Loan)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other U.S. 1.						
Other U.S. 2.						
Host Country					3,150	3,150
Other Donor(s)						
TOTALS				7,500	3,150	10,650

9. SCHEDULE OF AID FUNDING ($000)

A. APPROPRIATION	B. PRIMARY PURPOSE CODE	C. PRIMARY TECH. CODE 1. Grant	C. PRIMARY TECH. CODE 2. Loan	D. OBLIGATIONS TO DATE 1. Grant	D. OBLIGATIONS TO DATE 2. Loan	E. AMOUNT APPROVED THIS ACTION 1. Grant	E. AMOUNT APPROVED THIS ACTION 2. Loan	F. LIFE OF PROJECT 1. Grant	F. LIFE OF PROJECT 2. Loan
(1) DFA				3,500		4,000		7,500	
(2)									
(3)									
(4)									
TOTALS				3,500		4,000		7,500	

10. SECONDARY TECHNICAL CODES (maximum 6 codes of 3 positions each)

11. SECONDARY PURPOSE CODE

12. SPECIAL CONCERNS CODES (maximum 7 codes of 4 positions each)

A. Code							
B. Amount							

13. PROJECT PURPOSE (maximum 480 characters)

To increase the range and value of non-traditional exports by resolving public and private sector constraints to export promotion.

14. SCHEDULED EVALUATIONS

Interim MM 12 YY 93 MM YY Final MM YY

15. SOURCE/ORIGIN OF GOODS AND SERVICES

☐ 000 ☐ 941 ☐ Local ☒ Other (Specify) 935

16. AMENDMENTS/NATURE OF CHANGE PROPOSED (This is page 1 of a ____ page PP Amendment.)

This amendment increases Life of Project funding by $4,000,000, modifies activities under existing project components and adds a venture capital component.

17. APPROVED BY

Signature: Keith W. Sherper *Keith W. Sherper*

Title: Mission Director

Date Signed: MM 08 DD 23 YY 94

18. DATE DOCUMENT RECEIVED IN AID/W, OR FOR AID/W DOCUMENTS, DATE OF DISTRIBUTION: MM DD YY

AID 1330-4 (8-79)

I have reviewed and hereby approve the methods of implementation and financing in this Project Paper.

________ CONTROLLER

United States
Agency for
International
Development

memorandum

DATE: September 7, 1994

TO: See Distribution

FROM: Norman L. Olsen, C/PPD

SUBJECT: Document Distribution

RE: Project Paper (PP)
Agricultural Non-Traditional Export Promotion Program
(ANEPP) - 617-0114

Distribution:

1. Controller, USAID/Kampala
2. Program Office, USAID/Kampala
3. James Dunn, USAID/Kampala
4. AFR/EA/U, AID/Washington
5. RLA/REDSO/ESA/PDPS/File Room, Nairobi/Kenya

ministerial level such as Cabinet. (FY93 NPA funds depend, for their disbursement, on the implementation of the aforementioned proposal.) During the past two years, USAID has consulted regularly with the GOU to encourage movement on these actions and has financed several studies designed to assist the GOU in making sound decisions on what to do with export promotion activities. One of these studies has served as the basis for a Cabinet paper which has now been tabled and clears the way for disbursement of the NPA tranche. Once Cabinet approves the proposal, USAID believes that it should be possible to move rapidly to amend the parliamentary act establishing the UEPC such that its structure would be rationalized, revitalizing the Export Promotion Council.

Second, in the course of designing the IDEA (Investment in Developing Export Agriculture) project, USAID put considerable thought into closely associating IDEA with the UEPC, were that entity to be reconstituted appropriately. In the event, the close connection was not feasible, primarily because prior to finalizing the IDEA design the process of revitalizing UEPC was inert. Given the imminent start-up of IDEA, USAID has informed the GOU that, from September 1994, all USAID support of export promotion and development will be through IDEA activities. This effectively means that the hands-on export promotion side of EPADU will cease as of the end of September 1994.

Towards a New Program

How can USAID best support the policy and regulatory aspects of the enabling environment for agricultural exports, in conjunction with our plans to provide direct assistance to producers and exporters through the IDEA project?

Recommendations of the Recent ANEPP Evaluation

ANEPP was evaluated by external and REDSO/ESA consultants in December 1993. The evaluators were asked to provide guidance for the planned amendment to ANEPP. The evaluation recommends that ANEPP continue. Within a few months of the evaluation, USAID/Uganda commissioned an external analysis which resulted in a paper entitled "Export Policy and Investment Promotion Options Under ANEPP." The recommendations in these two papers have been taken into account in formulating the export policy and development elements of Phase 4 of ANEPP.

The evaluation document notes that ANEPP had generally been a successful effort. Its flexibility had been both a weakness and a strength to the project: the flexibility of operations under ANEPP had made it difficult to assess outputs and impact, inasmuch as there was little solid information in the original project documents on these; on the other hand, the same flexibility had enabled project resources to tackle problems and constraints that have come up on the spur of the moment. The evaluation also noted that the constraints analysis in the original documentation was valid when prepared and still relevant today.

The evaluation urged USAID to turn its attention to second-tier policy and regulatory constraints, inasmuch as the macro-level constraints have now been dealt with. The evaluation concluded that USAID should enter into an institutional contract for future policy and regulatory work, and that such a contract should not only be responsible for analyzing constraints, but also lobbying for change and implementing reforms in these same constraint areas.

Proposed Approach to Amending ANEPP

It is perhaps most useful to view the next two years in terms of several relatively discrete periods:

-- Between now and September 1994, EPADU will remain as currently constituted. This allows the institutional contract on the development (as opposed to policy) side to come to its end. On the policy side, a workplan for the July 1994--June 1995 period will be agreed upon.

-- At the end of September 1994, all EPADU staff who have been working on both policy analysis and export development efforts will cease to be employed by GOU/USAID as EPADU staff. By this time, the IDEA project should be starting up and will be able to take over EPADU export development activities. The acronym will be changed to EPAU - Export Policy Analysis Unit.

-- Substantive EPAU staff, between October 1994 and June 1995, will consist only of those on the policy analysis side of the operation. Current staff involved directly in this side include a non-Ugandan PSC and three Ugandan PSCs. Funding for a fourth Ugandan PSC will be provided under this grant if such a position is deemed necessary to carry out the approved plan of work. In such a situation, it would be inefficient to have managerial resources (i.e., Director and Deputy Director) in EPAU. Therefore, this policy analysis unit will report directly to the Commissioner of Planning within the Planning Department of MFEP. Its work will be guided by a ~~steering~~ committee,[1] and it will have sufficient short-term technical assistance resources[2] at its disposal to cope with the workplan elements (discussed in the following section). Given the much-reduced size of the EPAU staff, office space at Impala House will be correspondingly reduced.

-- Beyond June 1995, USAID support for such policy analysis functions would cease to exist in the form of EPAU. If there is any further USAID support for export policy

1 This committee might consist of a representative each from the MFEP, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, and a few other public and private sector entities.

2 Such resources could be made available through a buy-in to projects such as the Agricultural Policy Analysis Project.

analysis beyond this time, it will occur through an institutional contract, and the locus of this support will be open to discussion.

-- In addition to supporting these elements of ANEPP over the coming period, USAID also proposes to financially support an advisor to the Ministry of Trade and Industry (MTI) beginning in October. The two objectives of this new position are directly connected to establishing a working export promotion entity in Uganda. The first objective of the new position is to serve as an interim counterpart to the IDEA project, until the anticipated new UEPC is operational. We do not anticipate that the new UEPC will be ready to serve in the counterpart role envisioned in the IDEA project until perhaps the middle of 1995. The second objective of the new position is to work with appropriate entities to see that the new UEPC actually becomes operational. (With respect to the latter objective, this position will directly support ANEPP goals.) This position should be established initially as a nine-month contract ending June 30, 1995.

The foregoing can be summarized as follows: 1) the development side of EPADU will cease to exist after September 1994; 2) the positions of Director and Deputy Director of EPADU will also cease to function as of that time; 3) the remaining policy analysis side of EPAU will continue to operate and report to the Commissioner of Planning through June 1995; 4) from July 1995, any USAID support to export policy will flow through an institutional contract, and a decision prior to that time will be made as to whether such support will be connected to the MFEP or to the MTI (in direct connection to the newly formulated UEPC); 5) USAID will, from October 1994, provide financial support for an advisor to the MTI who will be responsible, ultimately, for ensuring that the new UEPC is formed and, in the interim, for acting as a counterpart to the USAID IDEA project.

The Policy Focus of ANEPP Through June 1995

The ANEPP evaluation proposed relatively specific areas in which it would be productive for EPAU to focus its attention over the coming twelve months. USAID proposes the following, based on not only the ANEPP evaluation, but also other areas that have emerged since that evaluation:

-- Streamline customs operations, such that spot checks are conducted rather than full inspections of all cargoes. Such a move, accompanied by sufficiently strong disincentives for those who are caught, should speed up what is currently an important bottleneck in external trade operations.

-- Examine airport fees to ensure that they are competitive with fees facing Uganda's export competition. (Some two years ago or so, airport fees were reduced, but they have been somehow revitalized.)

-- Revise the export finance scheme, making it a truly useful support mechanism and ensuring that it is at least as supportive of exporters as are similar schemes in countries which are Uganda's competitors.

-- Examine other export incentive packages, with an eye to encouraging exports without raising hackles among Uganda's competitors. One approach would be to modify the Investment Code such that it provides the most favorable incentives for firms that actually export.

-- Analyze the current situation with respect to import duty drawback, and ensure that the system operates smoothly and transparently.

-- Assess the reliability of export data in Uganda, and provide recommendations -- and probably technical assistance -- to upgrade these data, which are critical to any export policy function.

-- Carry out an analysis of the food security situation in Uganda, with an eye to allaying what are currently frequent calls to contain exports of lucrative foreign exchange earners: maize and beans.

The foregoing elements of an export-promoting regime are not trivial, and are not necessarily simple to implement. Nor are they all necessarily elements that all in Uganda would support. Thus, there is a need for solid analysis, which can be used to lobby for reforms. Such analysis should also clearly set out how implementation should occur, given GOU approval of reforms. EPAU's role should be not only to analyze the efficacy of reforms in these areas, but also to (first) work to ensure that appropriate supporting decision are taken within the GOU and to (second) follow through to ensure that implementation of reform decisions occurs.

B. Uganda Investment Authority

The Uganda Investment Authority (UIA) is a statutory body established under the 1991 Investment Code. The UIA while responsible to the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning enjoys considerable autonomy with its own Board of Director which in itself has significant private sector representation.

The UIA's stated mission[3] "is to make a significant contribution to Uganda's economic development in stimulating investments, promoting exports, and creating sustainable employment throughout all regions." In pursuit of this mission, the UIA has four guiding principles:

---

[3] From the UIA's Budget Framework for Fiscal years 1994/5 - 7.

- To achieve a level of performance at least equal to the best investment agencies in the world.

- Operate on the highest standards of honesty, dedication and integrity.

- Promote the best return of investment for the Government and people of Uganda.

- Recognize that the "client investor" is the most important person in our business and will be provided with the highest quality levels of service and assistance.

In order to implement its Mission, the UIA has identified a series of activities to be undertaken. These include:

- Provide serviced land to investors.

- Influence improvements in developing a conducive investment climate by carefully planning and scheduling amendments to the code and by instilling faster response to investor needs by partner agencies.

- Develop an institution which entails design and implementation of internal organizational and personnel systems, continuation of major staff training programs, and implementation of an integrated management information system.

- Market and promote investments based upon careful country, sector and company targeting.

- Develop local enterprise capacity.

Since it's inception in 1991 the UIA has made significant progress in realizing its stated goals and objectives. However, the UIA is not without its critics. As recently as June 17, 1994, in his address prior to the presentation of the 1994/95 budget to Parliament, President Museveni noted with concern the inadequacy of investor guidance and support in Uganda and decried the length of time that is required for a potential investor to obtain necessary documentation and establish a business.

The World Bank, while instrumental in creating the UIA under SAC I, is sharply critical of some of its future plans and, while acknowledging its overall positive impact on the investment climate in Uganda, will seek changes in the Investment Code under SAC II. Bank officials are mainly concerned with UIA interests in new areas such as development of industrial estates and entrepreneurship development. In stating their concerns World Bank advisors stress that the UIA was designed to operate as a very specialized but lean and efficient organization for promoting Uganda as an investment site. Given these concerns and in the interest of fully achieving a cost effective and efficient organization for investment promotion as envisaged at the conception and establishment of the UIA, the World Bank is withholding support to UIA until the results of a study to be carried out under SAC II in December 1994, are known. Essentially the study will re-examine and recommend refinement of what the UIA should be doing and how.

As stated previously, UIA was originally established under SAC I and was to be fully financed by the World Bank. Due to delays in securing funds at that time the GOU requested USAID to assume the organization's recurrent expenses. USAID agreed to provide funding from local currency resources for an interim period which will end in June 1994. In addition to supporting the recurrent budget, USAID has also funded a long term advisor who serves as Deputy Director of UIA, an investment mission, a computer system and several other activities. USAID also provided the down payment for UIA's purchase of a building that will reduce its operating costs and provide some revenue. In recognition of the precariousness of its financial situation, the UIA prepared a detailed budget framework for the period 1994/97. Support was envisaged from the World Bank, EC, UNDP/UNIDO, SWEDCORP, the GOU and USAID. Additionally, "fees for service" and petitioning for a share of the cess on imports are possible revenue sources. Potential World Bank support, as mentioned, is contingent on the December 1994 study which will be carried out as part of SAC II preparations.

In March 1994, The Services Group prepared a study for USAID/Uganda entitled Uganda Export Policy and Investment Promotion Options Under ANEPP. The report, while agreeing with some of the criticisms of UIA, felt many were unfair and that the organization had achieved much success given the short period of time it had been in existence. The consultants did, however, agree that there are areas which can be further improved and noted that UIA officials are in the process of addressing many of them. These, which USAID concurs with, include:

- better targeting of promotional efforts;
- lack of concise and inexpensive promotional materials;
- use of lower cost, but better targeted outlets in advertising campaigns;
- resolving problems with partner agencies on issues such as access to land, utilities, and work permits;
- lack of understanding within Uganda of what the UIA does and what it has accomplished.

The report goes on to recommend that USAID use this opportunity to diversify and strengthen the UIA's ability to become more financially self-sustainable. This recommendation implies continued USAID funding of certain UIA requirements for an additional period of time.

Based on these recommendations, as well as USAID's own assessments of UIA's contribution to economic development in Uganda, funding for an additional year of operation as well as provision of an additional year of a long term advisor is included in this amendment. This action acknowledges the World Bank's need for additional review and revision of the Investment Code and UIA activities but fully anticipates World Bank support following those actions. USAID support is also based on UIA's commitment to organizational strengthening and securing funding from the GOU and other donors.

C. Venture Capital

1. Background

This Project Paper amendment incorporates venture capital as a project activity which will contribute to the ANEPP project goal and purpose. This takes into account lessons learned -- both from the ANEPP project and from the Rehabilitation of Productive Enterprises (RPE) project (617-0104), an earlier agricultural enterprise development project in Uganda. Venture capital also capitalizes on the opportunities presented by the growth and enhanced stability in the Ugandan economy since the initial design of the ANEPP Project.

Under the RPE Project USAID established a venture capital facility through a $2 million grant to the DFCU. The purpose of the grant was to make equity investments in Ugandan businesses, with the primary emphasis on agricultural investments. Because of DFCU's strong performance and a larger than anticipated demand for equity financing the grant was subsequently increased by $550,000 before the RPE PACD.

Continuing to expand the availability of venture capital under the ANEPP project will build upon USAID's experience in promoting venture capital in Uganda. Incorporation of venture capital as an explicit component of the project will enable USAID to strengthen the financial sector's ability to finance new and expanding businesses, particularly in the non-traditional export sector where Uganda has a comparative advantage.

2. Relationship to Project Goal and Purpose

The goal of the ANEPP Project is to increase rural production and employment. The project purpose is to increase the range and value of non-traditional exports by resolving public and private sector constraints to export promotion. Inclusion of a venture capital facility is necessary to the achievement of both. First, by creating access to equity financing, more exporters will be able to initiate and sustain export-oriented enterprises. Logically, such an expansion in export oriented businesses will contribute to an increase in the range and value of NTEs. All investments are expected to generate employment and growth in the economy, including in rural areas, and so venture capital can also be expected to contribute directly to the achievement of the project goal. All investments will be tracked to determine people-level impact.

In design and subsequent implementation of the ANEPP project it has been recognized that a variety of interventions are necessary in order to stimulate the growth of non-traditional exports. To date, two streams of activities have been supported by ANEPP. One stream consists of firm level assistance -- technical assistance, training, and information services provided directly to non-traditional exporters. After September 1994, firm level assistance will be provided by USAID's IDEA Project. The other stream consists of interventions to establish the institutional building blocks necessary to support NTEs and to improve the enabling environment for non-traditional export growth. Examples of the latter have included sector analysis to determine products and markets of comparative advantage and constraints to sector expansion and economy-wide activities such as generic investment promotion and building a national cold storage facility.

Exporters and project implementors have identified access to financing as an especially critical constraint to the expansion of non-traditional exports. The availability of venture capital, in particular, is considered a necessary precondition for new starts or project expansions in the relatively high risk area of non-traditional exports. Thus, by reducing one of the principal constraints identified to date, support for venture capital expansion will contribute directly, though not exclusively, to the achievement of the ANEPP project goal and purpose. The venture capital facility itself, as the only equity finance mechanism in Uganda, will also provide a demonstration model for replication by other donors, financial institutions and indigenous investors.

3. Activity Description

USAID will make a grant to the Development Finance Company of Uganda (DFCU) to provide resources for a venture capital fund for equity investments and to share with DFCU the operational costs of managing the facility. The equity resources will be invested and managed on a commercial basis. DFCU will require separate appraisal and supervision of equity and debt investments. Each decision to invest either equity or debt will have a consolidated financial impact on the DFCU. If there are profits and capital gains from investments, the shareholders of DFCU stand to gain. Likewise if there are losses on the equity investments, the DFCU shareholders will share in the loss. There will be close cooperation and referral from the Mission's IDEA project, Mission staff and the other components of the ANEPP project to the DFCU for consideration of specific investments opportunities.

Equity investments from the venture capital facility will capitalize on Uganda's areas of comparative advantage which lie in export oriented production with primary reliance on locally-sourced inputs such as agricultural commodities and labor. The Development Finance Company of Uganda has developed an investment policy to govern their resource allocation and ensure stability and continuity of their portfolio. In order to achieve the diversification necessary for balance and growth, the investment policy gives primary emphasis to agriculture but stipulates that no more than thirty percent of the fund can be concentrated in any one sector. To limit investments to any one sector would distort the overall investment portfolio and create a situation where investment decisions are determined by factors other than the viability of the proposed project. This would make the fund vulnerable to sector-specific disruptions, such as drought. The DFCU investment policy, which has been reviewed and approved in writing by USAID/Uganda and the Regional Legal Advisor of REDSO/ESA, will govern the investment decisions of the DFCU in accessing USAID resources.

The DFCU will have the option but not the requirement to obtain USAID concurrence in individual investments prior to submission to their Board. Once the DFCU Board has approved an investment the DFCU can either obtain an advance from USAID which will be disbursed in the equity investment, or disburse funds to the investment and seek reimbursement from USAID.

The DFCU will provide investment monitoring and impact reporting to USAID on a quarterly basis. During the grant period the DFCU will continue with staff development, monitoring and information system expansion, and pursue options for continuation and expansion of venture capital activities through wider participation in this fund or through creation of a secondary equity fund.

4. Choice of Development Finance Company of Uganda

The DFCU has been identified based upon its proven ability to manage a venture capital finance program and to satisfy conditions and regulations required of USAID grantees. USAID identified DFCU as a potential manager of a USAID-funded venture capital fund in 1993 under the RPE project. A detailed evaluation of the Development Finance Company of Uganda was conducted as of September 20, 1993. This review encompassed an evaluation of the institution's key functional areas for the purpose of determining its suitability and capacity to manage a new venture capital company. The areas evaluated included management, financial status, operations investment management, audit, future prospects and other significant activities. Other specific areas of interest that were evaluated included loan loss reserve policy and trends, institutional liquidity, capital adequacy, earnings and assets.

Venture capital and lending operations were reviewed to determine the adequacy of the firm's operating policies, procedures and internal controls. No major exceptions were noted and the firm was determined to have the capacity both to effectively manage an equity investment program and to adhere to USAID regulations and guidelines for Grantees. Prior to extending an initial grant to the DFCU, the Controller's Office conducted a financial and systems review of the DFCU and determined their suitability to receive and manage US Government funding. The complete institutional analysis and the results of a subsequent evaluation carried out in February 1994 are reported in Annex B.

A grant totalling $2.55 million has already been made to the DFCU to cover start-up and partial operating costs, and to finance those equity investments which could be appraised and invested within a six month period (imposed by the PACD of the funding source). Seven investments have been approved, utilizing $2.246 million of the fund equity and leveraging $ 26.6 million in new investment in Uganda, have been made. The investments are in the areas of cotton ginning for export, fish processing for export, leasing of machinery and equipment (primarily agricultural), an office building, housing finance, insurance, and executive apartments. As expected, the initial investments made from a facility with a tight disbursement window are largely urban-based and represent those projects and sponsors that were fairly far along in development of feasibility studies, sourcing of materials and markets, and consummation of joint venture agreements. In the next phase of venture capital support, greater emphasis will be able to be given to developing rural agricultural investments, particularly in the non-traditional export sector.

III. FINANCIAL PLAN

This amendment increases LOP funding by $4,000,000 to a new total of $7,500,000 and re-allocates the budget between line items. The previously authorized LOP budget and the revised LOP budget are summarized below. A new line item for provision of venture capital has been added. The host country contribution will remain at the previously specified level of $3,150,000.

SUMMARY

A. Funding for the technical assistance and training element will be provided to:

1) Fully fund the third and final contract year of the long term advisor to the Uganda Investment Authority (UIA).

2) Fund the remaining balance of the current two year contract of the senior policy advisor to Export Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU).

3) Provide funding for various internal and external training programs in areas such as policy, investment, management and computer systems.

4) Fund short term specialized expertise to carry out studies/analyses on various policy/investment issues related to UIA and Export Policy Analysis and Unit work plans.

B. This amendment provides $1.1 million to the UIA and $.5 million to the policy unit (EPAU) for the period of July 1, 1994 to June 30, 1995. It is anticipated that the policy unit will become an integral part of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MFEP) structure beginning in October, 1994, but will continue to focus on policy issues related to export of non-traditional agricultural commodities. For both UIA and the policy unit, funds are being provided for normal operational costs.

C. An amount of $1.8 million is included in this amendment for venture capital which will be provided to DFCU. $350,000 of this amount is for start-up and operational costs and the balance of $1,450,000 is for equity capital.

Summary Grant Budget

ELEMENT NO.	ELEMENT DESCRIPTION	PREVIOUS BUDGET ($)	THIS AMENDMENT ($)	NEW LOP BUDGET ($)
01	Techn. Asst.,Spec. Act. & Training	600,000	600,000	1,200,000
02	African Project Dev. Facility	200,000	- 0 -	200,000
03	Small Enterprise Assistance	80,000	- 0 -	80,000
04	Infrastructure (cold storage)	1,000,000	- 0 -	1,000,000
05	Support to UIA and EPADU	1,220,000	1,600,000	2,280,000
06	Support for purchase and renovation of UIA building	200,000	- 0 -	200,000
07	Venture Capital	- 0 -	1,800,000	1,800,000
08	Audit	100,000	- 0 -	100,000
09	Evaluation	100,000	- 0 -	100,000
	TOTALS	3,500,000	4,000,000	7,500,000

IV. REVISED IMPLEMENTATION AND PROCUREMENT PLAN

The Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning will continue to be the primary GOU implementing entity for this project. The

Development Finance Company of Uganda (DFCU) will implement the new venture capital component.

Implementation Schedule

Date	Activity	Responsible Parties
8/30/94 Quarterly thereafter	Process payments for UIA and EPAU operational costs	USAID/GOU
9/1/94	Order commodities for EPAU	USAID
9/13/94	ISTI Contract ends EPADU Development program ends	
9/15/94	Sign DFCU Grant	USAID, DFCU
9/15/94	Sign PIL transferring policy analysis functions to Planning Dept. (MFEP)	PIL by GOU/USAID
10/1/94	Re-appoint or employ required staff for policy unit	GOU(MFEP)
10/1/94	Contract technical assistance for MTI	USAID
6/1/95	Export Policy Advisor's contract ends	
6/30/95	Funding for UIA and policy unit ends	
12/31/95	Project Assistance Completion Date	

After the end of September, the project will not have an institutional contractor. As indicated in the table below, operational support for UIA and EPAU will be provided by means of Project Implementation Letters (PILs). Long-term technical assistance for UIA and EPAU will be provided using Personal Services Contracts and short-term technical assistance will be procured through local contracting, buy-ins to USAID/Washington projects and delivery orders under Indefinite Quantity Contracts (IQCs). The DFCU will receive a grant.

Methods of Implementation and Financing

Project Element	Method of Implementation	Method of Financing	Amount ($000)
APDF	Grant	Direct Pay	200
Tech. Assist.	Contracts	Direct Pay	1,200
Sm.Enterprise	Grants	Direct Pay	80
UIA/EPADU	PIL	Reimbursement	2,480
Cold Storage	Host country contract	Letter of Commitment	1,000
Audit & Eval.	Contracts	Direct Pay	200
DFCU	Grant	Direct Pay	1,800

V. MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

A. Introduction

The ANEPP Project Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan will track and assess project performance and impact. It will provide periodic feedback on progress towards the attainment of the project outputs and purpose. This information will be used by USAID, the implementing entities like the UIA, EPAU, DFCU, the GOU, and the private sector in adjusting efforts to keep the project on course, as well as for reporting results to AID/Washington.

Monitoring and evaluation of this project focuses on constraints analysis to export promotion of public and private sector activities that influence the enabling environment for both export and investment (see logical framework, Annex A). USAID will have overall M&E responsibility and will review all reports. The hierarchy of M&E responsibilities is shown in Exhibit 1 below.

Exhibit 1

Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibilities

WHO	WHAT	HOW
USAID/KAMPALA	* Case studies of selected sites and NTEs * Increased Incomes * Increased NTEs	* Rapid Appraisal * Supervise M&E * GOU Monitoring/Public Sector export data
UIA	* Investments * Jobs created	UIA MIS
DFCU	* Financed ventures/firms	DFCU MIS
EPAU	* Policy studies * Policies reviewed and Implemented	EPAU MIS/SURVEYS
COLD STORAGE	* Volume of Perishables	MANAGEMENT MIS
MTI/UEPC	* Restructured UEPC * IDEA Implementation	TA REPORTS/ADC

This monitoring and evaluation plan is intended as a flexible guide rather than a strict recipe for M&E activities. Adjustments to the indicators and the methodology should be expected and indeed encouraged as a means of keeping in tune with project realities.

B. Monitoring

Monitoring will include tracking and reporting End-of-Project Status (EOPS) indicators and outputs through periodic feedback from the various project affiliated entities mentioned above. Monitoring reports on results achieved will so far provide the baseline and progression of data required to measure achievement of planned outputs, data for USAID's annual Assessment of Program Impact (API), and information on people-level impact.

The project goal is to **increase rural mens' and womens' income from agricultural exports.** The impact of export promotion will be assessed mainly through case studies of selected NTEs to generate the goal level logical framework indicator:

* Average dollar values per producer of selected NTEs from selected sites, which will be preferably rural settings.

The project purpose is to **increase the range and value of Non-Traditional Exports (NTES) by resolving public and private sector constraints to export promotion.** Achievement of these purpose-level indicators will be tracked both through EPADU records[4], GOU export and other relevant statistics departments. Logical Framework indicators to be applied are:

* Number of NTEs with value greater than $2 million from 9 to 14 by 6/95.
* Annual dollar value of NTEs.

End of project Status indicators (EOPS) and outputs will be reported by each project affiliate with the assistance of long-term technical assistance personnel. Output indicators to be incorporated into the monitoring and reporting process are shown in Exhibit 2. USAID'S Agriculture and Natural Resources Office will track accomplishment of outputs and output indicators as set forth in the logical framework with the cooperation of various relevant entities shown in Exhibit 2 as well. Each of these organizations has an established database through their existing management information systems (MISs).

[4] EPADU has been contracting "MSE Consultants", a local consulting firm to derive NTEs volume and $ values form ISTC Customs data. This effort has been very fruitful and timely and **is therefore recommended for continued** funding by USAID.

Exhibit 2: Output Indicators

UIA:

* Increase number of approved, licensed (622 projects) and implemented investments from 219 in 12/93 to 650 in 6/95.
* Increase in number of new jobs created through UIA assisted firms to 49,342 by 6/95.

EPAU:

* Number of policy studies conducted and number of policies reviewed by GOU as initiated by EPADU. From 5 in 93/94 to 10 in 94/95.

DFCU:

* Increase in number of DFCU financed ventures from 3 in 5/93 to 8 by 12/95.

MTI:

* Local TA meeting output
* Timeliness of IDEA Implementation activities.
* Restructured UEPC

CAA/Cold Storage Contractor:

* Increased volume of perishable exports through Entebbe Airport.

C. Environmental Monitoring

Environmental considerations will be tracked jointly with the IDEA project concerns. The two projects are complementary and have a similar goal, therefore any significant adverse environmental impacts resulting from project-related activities will be tracked through the joint **Environmental Monitoring, Evaluation and Mitigation Plan (EMEMP)**. Not much environmental damage is envisaged under the ANEPP project activities per se but because it will be responsible for creating a conducive environment for expanded NTE production, the EMEMP has been designed in the IDEA project to capture environmental effects generated by both projects.

The EMEMP consists of three major activities: (1) Environmental Impact Reviews; which have been done on five of the selected NTAE target sectors under IDEA, (2) a continuing environmental M&E Program, to monitor the environmental status of NTAE development in Uganda and effect any mitigative measures in a timely manner, and (3) a procedure for the environmental Review of new entrants into the NTAE to provide more mitigative guidance as development plans and proposals become more definite. Implementation of the EMEMP is currently underway, with the environment M & E plan under review to be finalized soon.

This joint approach to meeting projects environmental requirements provides an efficient and effective application of resources.

D. Evaluation

Monitoring tracks progress towards established objectives. Evaluation goes beyond monitoring to assess impact and effectiveness, and to consider possible design alterations. This ANEPP redesign has been phased into two periods with the initial period running from July 1993 to June 1995. The second phase of the project redesign will bring in new activities, whose viability is being researched before they can be incorporated. Therefore it will be necessary to carry out a quick "rapid appraisal" as opposed to a fully fledged evaluation, which would only cover activities in this interim period to answer some of the following questions necessary for the second phase redesign:

* Are the assumptions made at the time the project was designed still valid?
* Are the approaches and delivery mechanisms (UIA, EPADU, DFCU) selected at the design stage still operating effectively? How can they be improved?
* Has the project managed to resolve constraints to both private and public sector activities that would have anticipated impact on increasing range and value of NTEs?
* What factors are facilitating or impeding progress?
* If there are any unanticipated factors impeding implementation? How well have they been addressed?
* Evaluate changes in the Ugandan and World Market environments influencing the Project activities.
* Analyze implications for project adjustments

Data for this quick appraisal will be drawn from the monitoring database, the case studies, and contextual reports from the project affiliated organizations.

E. Case studies:

The goal logical framework indicators will require use of case studies to track increases in income from agricultural exports. This data will be derived from selected sites for selected NTAEs. For example, taking a maximum of 3 out of the 9 NTEs being grown in clearly bounded geographical areas (but not for Maize and Beans), for example:

Case No.1:
Could assess Vanilla, Chilies and Cut Flowers growing and exports revenues out of Mukono district.

Case No.2:
Could assess Mushrooms, Snow peas and Pyrethrum growing and exports revenues out of Kabale district.

A sound methodology will be worked out to measure the product coming out of that area, and a census of producers[5], which will include the producers' own estimates of area cultivated and production. Data generated will be used together with the smallholder crop budget data from the Agricultural Secretariat to estimate incremental income.

USAID will have to contract with a local firm to undertake these case studies in liason with the IDEA project existing baseline information, under the supervision of the ANR M&E officer.

F. Workplan:

The Monitoring and Evaluation Work Plan which details tasks, responsibilities and scheduling is shown in Exhibit 3. USAID has overall supervisory responsibility and will coordinate monitoring of GOU activities, receiving and access data from progress reports from various government agencies and project affiliated organizations for purposes of USAID periodic reporting. DFCU and UIA will take the lead in monitoring private sector firms and investments respectively, while EPADU will lead in monitoring results of policy interventions.

---

[5] The approach to be used can be along the lines used by "Hivalue" effort which was taken for Vanilla in Mukono by EPADU.

AGRICULTURAL NON-TRADITIONAL EXPORT PROMOTION PROJECT
Second Project Paper Amendment

I. BACKGROUND

The Agricultural Non-Traditional Export Promotion (ANEP) Project (617-0114) was authorized on September 29, 1992 with Life-of-Project (LOP) funding of $2.5 million and a Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) of March 31, 1995. It was designed to provide complementary technical assistance and other support for export policy reforms receiving non-project assistance (NPA) under the Agricultural Non-Traditional Export Promotion Program (617-0113). Prior to FY 92, the latter program had included both NPA and project funds under the same project number. The purpose of both the NPA program and the project is **"to increase the range and value of non-traditional exports by resolving public and private sector constraints to export promotion."** The ANEP project was amended for the first time in August 1993 to increase LOP funding by $1 million and add components for operational support for the Export Policy Analysis and Development Unit (EPADU) and the Uganda Investment Authority (UIA), two key export-related institutions, and for construction of a cold storage facility at Entebbe airport. The project did not begin expending funds until September 1993 since project funds under 617-0113 were utilized first.

Over the past year, the ANEP project has financed a number of activities that are improving the environment for non-traditional agricultural exports (NTAEs). These include the work of the Export Development Advisor and a Export and Investment Policy Advisor at EPADU and continued development of the UIA's investment promotion capability. During the past year and a half, EPADU and USAID have sought a greater balance between the policy agenda and production level export promotion activities. As a result, the output of policy initiatives has decreased somewhat, but important policy issues remain and are clearly defined in EPADU's 1993/94 and 1994/95 workplans. The ANEP program, including project activities, was evaluated in December 1993, and some of the modifications presented in this amendment are based on evaluation recommendations.

The ANEP project is now being amended for the second time. There are several reasons for the amendment: 1) EPADU's production-level assistance to NTAEs will end in September 1994 with the end of the institutional contract with the International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI) and the start-up of USAID's Investment in Developing Export Agriculture (IDEA) project, making it necessary to redefine EPADU's function; 2) a one-year extension of USAID operational support for the UIA is necessary because the World Bank project that was expected to provide resources for this purpose has been delayed; and 3) USAID has identified the absence of venture capital in Uganda as a key constraint to the development of non-traditional exports and wishes to support development of a venture capital fund. This amendment will add $4 million to the project, bringing LOP funding to $7.5 million. The current PACD, June 30, 1995, will be extended by 6 months to December 31, 1995 to accomodate the venture capital grant.

II. REVISED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Export Policy and Development

EPADU Today

Over the three previous phases of the ANEP program, export policy and development has been the focus of EPADU, the Export Policy Analysis and Development Unit associated with the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning (MFEP). Developed as the implementing unit for ANEPP, EPADU was put in place because the UEPC (Uganda Export Promotion Council), which was arguably a more appropriate home for policy analysis, was effectively moribund. EPADU was connected with MFEP because individuals in the GOU most supportive of liberalization were in that ministry, and the then Ministry of Commerce, Industry, and Cooperatives was widely and correctly regarded as the loser in the economic liberalization process underway.

During its first two-plus years, EPADU engaged primarily in analyzing policies that affected export activity, and had significant influence on, for example, Uganda's liberalization of the trade and payments system, including exchange rate reform. As ANEPP progressed, it appeared that there was an increasing need to provide support to exporters directly rather than merely influencing the enabling environment. At the same time, it became clear that policy analysis could benefit greatly from having those carrying out the analysis be associated more directly with exporters. With the emphasis on production and marketing activities over the past two years, there has been less output on policy analysis. Important policy issues remain, and the reactivation of a high level steering committee to guide the policy agenda and EPADU's development of a comprehensive workplans for 93/94 and 94/95 has refocused attention on policy analysis.

In March of 1992, following bureaucratic disagreements between the finance/planning (now MFEP) and the trade/industry ministries (now MTI), a Cabinet decision was taken that EPADU functions should be segregated, at least insofar as their ministerial connection. Regarding the export development (or promotion) function of EPADU, Cabinet ruled that it should move out of EPADU (and direct association with MFEP), but that this should not occur until the UEPC were revitalized. With respect to the policy analysis functions of EPADU, they should devolve into (or, perhaps, remain within) the MFEP. It is now more than two years since this decision, and it is yet to be implemented.

USAID/Uganda has closely monitored the progress, or lack thereof, in implementing this decision for several reasons. First, NPA conditionality under ANEPP calls for the GOU to revitalize the country's formal export promotion function. NPA funds obligated in September 1992 require, prior to their disbursement, that a proposal for regularizing export promotion be tabled at a supraunqualified opinion in favor of the firm's financial records and accounting processes. The management and internal control review, on the other hand, disclosed several internal control and operating deficiencies which have since been corrected by senior management.

Prior to extending an initial grant to the DFCU, the Controller's Office conducted a financial and systems review of the DFCU and determined their suitability to receive and manage US Government funding.

An external evaluation of the DFCU venture capital activity was conducted in April by Harvey and Company via the Africa Venture Capital Project. The evaluation report stated "the DFCU is a well structured and managed development finance institution. Aggressive management and a dedicated, competent local staff are demonstrating that sound financial investments can be made in the still restructuring Ugandan financial environment. A continuation and expansion of the USAID funds for equity investment through DFCU would be an appropriate vehicle for taking a leadership role in financial sector development."

of DFCU is also sufficiently supported by a team of technical consultants that provide specialized assistance in appraising the merits of venture capital transactions.

As of the June 30, 1993, approximately $6,000,000 was outstanding from a total combined credit line of $14,000,000. Each governing agreement for a line of credit was reviewed to determine if a USAID grant would have any impact over the condition of the credit lines or vice versa. No problems or concerns were evident from this viewpoint. To date, DFCU has abided by the payment terms and covenants of each of these agreements.

Evaluation of the DFCU reveals that it has a very experienced and proactive Board of Directors, a sound internal management team, sufficient capital, and a suitable loan and equity investment track-record that evidences the performance of sound investment judgement. DFCU made a profit during each year between 1987 and 1992. In the last year profitability had been significantly hampered by provision for non-performing loans and insufficient portfolio growth. Because of the disruption of the company's business cycle during the years of turmoil and the historical default rate of the firm's clientele, DFCU's board modified its standards for making provisions for loan losses. Significant dollar provisions were made during 1989-1993. It is evident that the charges were higher during this period due to management's decision to make provision for all non-performing loans made during the years of political and economic instability. As a result, net operating losses, ending June 30, 1993, were averaging $5,000 per month. Management indicated that loan/venture capital portfolio growth, income from alternate product lines and continued economic stability will substantially reduce future provisions for losses and eliminate operating deficits. Until then, shareholder capital and related interest income is quite adequate to maintain operations.

Interest income from loans between 1987 to present constitute 50 -70% of the firm's total net income from operations. DFCU has acquired a minority interest in two companies for its own account. The financial objective of these investments is to diversify the firm's income stream. The firm has done an excellent job of managing its asset/liability spread.

The firms's working capital position required improvement at the time of the appraisal. The evaluation of the firm's current assets to its current liabilities revealed that the firm's ratio has not been at least one times. This has been caused primarily by provision for loan defaults. Liquidity from equity capital investment was determined to be adequate. The firm's ratio of debt to equity is considered adequate, however management was advised to continue monitoring the percentage of debt used to fund daily operations.

Venture capital and lending operations were reviewed to determine the adequacy of the firm's operating policies, procedures and internal controls. No major exceptions were noted and the firm is considered sound from this viewpoint. The major operational areas are documented by policy and procedure and internal control standards to assure that proper checks and balances are maintained through the separation of duties and reconciliations. All third party services were reviewed for the propriety of such arrangements. No deficiencies were noted. It has been recommended that modifications be made to the present software system to accommodate the anticipated increase in equity funding transactions which will require maintenance of additional information not presently resident on the firm's lending system.

Analysis of the firm's venture capital investment management track record revealed that there are four equity investments that were made prior to 1989 totaling $50,000. These include Uganda Consolidated Properties, Uganda Grain Millers, Uganda Associated Industries, Hire Purchase Finance, and Housing Finance Company of Uganda.

Significant unbooked appreciation and dividend returns of better than 30% per annum were observed in the shareholdings of Housing Finance and Uganda Grain Millers. The other investments from this period yielded returns that were marginal to poor. Recent equity investments include Uvan Ltd., Nile Roses Ltd. and Crown Tiles. Each was reviewed to determine the adequacy of the analysis, review, and approval process. The firm is considered capable of making suitable venture capital investments as it transitions, through additional training and staff realignment, into a venture/merchant banking operation.

Overall, the firm's ability to make successful equity investment decisions rests with the experience of the Board of Directors, the general manager and the present manager of new business all of whom have participated in or actively conducted equity investments in the past. Most of the firm's existing equity portfolio was in place prior to the arrival of the existing management team and performance of these investments was interrupted during the periods of political turmoil. DFCU's track record in this arena is considered good given the condition of the lending environment in Uganda to date. The firm's dividend record is good.

Investment management policies at present are formulated by the Board of Directors and the firm's general manager. For the most part, the investment policy is strongly influenced by the covenants and lending restrictions established by each credit agreement. The DFCU has established an investment policy, strategy and approach that assures the long-term growth and preservation of the venture capital fund.

The firm's general auditor is the international accounting firm of Price Waterhouse. The scope of the audit encompasses a review of the firm's financial records as well as the management and internal control review. The most recent audit resulted in an

ANNEX 8: INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT OF DFCU

A detailed evaluation of the Development Finance Company of Uganda (DFCU) was conducted as of September 20, 1993. This review encompassed an evaluation of the institution's key functional areas for the purpose of determining its suitability and capacity to manage a new venture capital company. The areas evaluated included management, financial status, operations investment management, audit, future prospects and other significant activities. Other specific areas of interest that were evaluated included loan loss reserve policy and trends, institutional liquidity, capital adequacy, earnings and assets.

The major shareholders of DFCU are financially sound and well capitalized and include Commonwealth Development Corporation (CDC), International Finance Corporation (IFC), the Ugandan Development Corporation (UDC), and the German Finance Company For Investments in Developing Countries (DEG). Each owns an equal share in DFCU and constitutes a major source of future private equity capital and credit that is available when needed. For this reason, the financial condition of the company is considered to be sound. The company was sufficiently capitalized upon its organization as a limited liability company in 1964 in the amount of $1,000,000, most of which was depleted by working capital needs during periods of economic and political unrest.

A share subscription agreement dated December 16, 1992 increased the equity capital position of the company to $1,800,000. Another $2,500,000 has been infused by DEG in the form of $600,000 in cash and $1,900,000 in income notes at 0% interest, considered to be a hybrid form of equity capital. This brings the total equity capital position of DFCU will be approximately $4,400,000.

Evaluation of the supervision by the Board of Directors indicates that all major matters are approved and reviewed by this body. Review of the board minutes also indicates that all policies and procedures and subsequent amendments are done under the supervision of the Board of Directors. Two internal operating committees, the portfolio committee and the new business committee, conduct oversight and review efforts that are also supervised by the Board of Directors. The full board is also responsible for assuring that suitable audits are conducted as its relates to the company's internal control and operating standards.

The senior management team of DFCU is headed by a General Manager who is on contract from CDC. His experience and background provide sufficient assurance that DFCU and its staff will function in accordance with USAID's provisions for managing a direct grant. In addition, the managerial staff of DFCU possesses the requisite knowledge and skills to select and manage venture capital investments. The current venture capital effort

Narrative Summary (NS)	Measureable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification (MOV)	Important Assumptions
3.1 Provide support to DFCU to administer a venture capital fund.		3.1 USAID/Controller and DFCU records.	
4.1 Liason between UEPC, MTI, ADC and MTI.		4.1 LOCAL TA/USAID Contractor Reporting.	
4.2 Work on restructuring of UEPC.		4.2 Same as above.	
5.1 Construction of Cold Storage facility at Entebbe.		5.1 USAID/Controller's MACs report and CAA reports.	

Project Name : **ANEPP Amendment IV**
Est. Completion : **June, 95**
Date of Revision:
Design Team : **S.Fine, R.Phillips, J.Dunn**

Narrative Summary (NS)	Measureable Indicators (OVI)	Means of Verification (MOV)	Important Assumptions
Goal: 1 Increase rural mens' and womens' incomes from agricultural exports.	1.1 For SELECTED sites and NTEs the average $ value per producer $\bar{X} = \frac{\text{\$ farmgate value}}{\text{No. of producers}}$	1.1 Case studies.	(Goal to Supergoal) 1 Not Applicable.
Purpose: 1 Increase the range and value of NTEs by resolving public and private sector constraints to export promotion.	1.1 Number of NTEs with value greater than $2m from 9 in 1993 to 14 by 6/95. 1.2 Annual $ value of NTEs.	1.1 Project records. 1.2 Statistics Dept./Customs of MFEP.	(Purpose to Goal) 1 Provided there are no adverse negative externalities to the social sectors.
Outputs: 1 Increased level of domestic and foreign investments.	1.1 Increase number of approved, licensed (622 Projects) and implemented investments from 219 in 12/93 to 650 in 06/95. 1.2 Increase in number of new jobs created through UIA assisted firms to 49,342 by 06/95.	1.1 UIA database 1.2 UIA database	(Output to Purpose) 1 World market price of NTEs does not decline sufficiently to provide a disincentive to producers and exporters. The GOU continues to pursue supportive macro-economic policies. Favourable climatic conditions.
2 Export and production policy constraints alleviated.	2.1 Number of policy studies conducted and number of policies reviewed by the GOU as initiated by EPAU. From 5 in 93/94 to 10 in 94/95.	2.1 Statistics dept.	Other production and marketing constraints addressed by other projects.
3 Improved capacity to finance new and expanding ventures.	3.1 Increase in the number of DFCU financed ventures from 3 in 5/93 to 8 by 12/95.	3.1 DFCU records.	
4 Improved communication between UEPC, ADC, MTI AND USAID which will facilitate implementation of IDEA and restructuring of the UEPC.	4.1 Outputs of meetings. 4.2 Timeliness of IDEA implementation activities. 4.3 Restructured UEPC.	4.1 TA reporting. 4.2 IDEA Gantt chart. 4.3 UEPC.	
5 Improved facilities for perishable NTEs.	5.1 Increased volume of perishable exports through Entebbe.	5.1 Cold Storage management contractor reporting.	
Activities: 1.1 Undertaking sector profiles.	Inputs/Resources: $'000 1. Support to UIA 1,000	1.1 USAID/Controller Reports.	(Activity to Output) 1 EPAU, UIA & DFCU operate efficiently. Workplans and Implementation issues adhered to.
1.2 Staff training.	2. Support to EPADU 600	1.2 Number of UIA trained.	
1.3 Implementing the Generic Investment Promotion MIS.	3. Venture Capital 1,800 4. Audit 100	1.3 UIA GIPMIS.	
2.1 EPAU undertakes policy studies.	5. Technical Assistance & Training 500	2.1 EPAU Quartely reports.	
2.2 EPAU develops the vanilla private sector.	------ 4,000 =======	2.2 Vanilla Exporters Association Reports.	

Exhibit 3: MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK PLAN

PRINCIPLE TASKS AND DELIVERABLES	RESPONSIBLE AGENCY	SCHEDULE YEAR 1993: 7 8 9 10 11 12	SCHEDULE YEAR 1994: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	SCHEDULE YEAR 1995: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
Supervise Monitoring and Evaluation	USAID	————	————	————
ANR M&E Data Collection	USAID	——	——	——
Case Studies (Rapid Appraisal)	USAID/ST CONTRACT			●
UIA Quarterly Progress Reports to USAID	UIA		●	●
EPAU Surveys & Quarterly Progress Reports to USAID	EPAU/ST Contract		●	●
DFCU Progress reports	DFCU		●	●
Cold Storage Management Progress Reports	CAA		●	●
			●	●
Input for API(SO1) to AID/W	USAID			●

———— continuous activity, ● due date.

29