PD-ABP-420

SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL DEMOCRACY FUND

A.I.D. Project No. 690-0284

PROJECT PAPER

Washington, D.C.

March 1995

PD-ABP-420

SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL DEMOCRACY FUND (SARDF)
A.I.D. Project No. 690-0284
Project Paper

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
i.	Executive Summary	i.
I.	Project Context	
	A. A Region in Transition	4
	B. U.S. National Interests	4
	C. African Soundings	5
	D. Problems and Opportunities	6
	E. No Time to Lose	8
II.	Detailed Project Description	
	A. Project Goal and Purpose	8
	B. Relationship to Program Strategy and Agency Priorities	8
	C. A Regional Approach	9
	D. Project Activities	10
	1. Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund	10
	a) Strengthened Legislatures	12
	b) Strengthened Capacity of NGOs to Promote Democracy	13
	c) Strengthened women's advocacy groups	15
	2. Research	17
	3. Eligible Groups	17
III.	Project Management Roles and Responsibilities	
	A. Project Management and Mission Coordination	17
	B. How it will work	22
	C. Relationship with Bilateral Mission and Donor Programs	23
	D. Project Timeline	24

A

E. Procurement Plan 26

IV. Expected Accomplishments

A. Expected Results 27
B. Indicators and Targets 28
C. Measurement 30

V. Project Analyses

A. Social and Political Feasibility 31
B. Economic Feasibility 33
C. Institutional Analysis 35
D. Environmental Considerations 38
E. Principal Risks and Assumptions 38

VI. Financial Management

A. Financial Plan and Method of Financing 39
B. Obligation Schedule 42
C. Audits and Financial Tracking 42

VII. Project Monitoring and Evaluation

A. The Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan 43
B. Impact Assessment 44

ANNEXES

A. Logical Framework
B. Grant Guidelines
C. Financial Plan
D. Bilateral D/G Projects in the Region
E. Initial Environmental Examination
F. Statutory Checklist
G. List of People Interviewed
H. Background Documents
I. Scope of Work for Project Managers

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Recommendation: AFR recommends the authorization of grant financing totalling $13.5 million from the Development Fund for Africa to finance the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund (SARDF), A.I.D. Project No. 690-0284. The grant will be authorized pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and will finance the foreign exchange and local costs associated with a five year effort to encourage and sustain regional efforts to promote the democratization of the nations of southern Africa. [1]

B. Summary Project Description: The purpose of the Southern African Regional Democracy Fund is to enhance the skills, knowledge base and capacity of individuals and organizations working to strengthen democratic values and processes in southern Africa. It is undertaken to address the serious constraints to democratization in the region identified by southern African "stakeholders," who are concerned about the fragility of many of the democracies in the region. These constraints include the fact that citizens do not yet fully understand their rights and responsibilities, or accept basic norms of democratic societies including rule of law, majority rule, and protection of minority rights; human rights continue to be violated; elections are not always free and fair; governments are not accountable, and there are few groups in civil society to challenge abuses of power; judiciaries and legislatures are weak; governments may manipulate or intimidate the media, with the result that there is insufficient information on the political affairs of state; and a significant percentage of the population does not participate in political affairs, particularly women.

The project will establish a $10 million "Democracy Fund" from which grants will be awarded to southern African organizations or networks undertaking programs that strengthen democratic values, processes and institutions in the region. The Democracy Fund is intended to be "demand-driven," that is, to support initiatives developed by southern African groups in pursuit of their own self-interest. Yet, to achieve impact, grants will be targetted toward three major results: to improve the capacity of civil society groups to develop, use and disseminate information and tools essential to informed citizen participation in a democracy; to enhance the skills of southern African legislators in order to enable them to improve the management and effectiveness of legislative processes; and to empower women to participate more fully in their nations' political life. These activities may include, inter alia: training and technical assistance aimed at strengthening the capacity of legislators,' women's advocacy or other

---

[1]The nations encompassed by this program are Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

organizations in civil society to undertake civic action; workshops and conferences to share experiences among individuals and groups and to work together to develop solutions to common problems; internships and exchanges to enable southern Africans to learn from each other; the development of curricula or materials for civic education; research and analyses on problems or approaches which advance the state of the art in democracy promotion in the region; and support for the development of networks and mechanisms/centers for information dissemination. Limited amounts of grant funds may also be utilized to purchase equipment and materials which are essential to achieving the purpose of the individual grants, such as fax machines, photocopiers and computers.

Priority will be given to proposals which involve multiple countries in the region, which target rural as well as urban beneficiaries, and women as well as men; and which have a greater chance for sustainability following the USAID assistance. Activities that reduce the level of violence and promote the peaceful resolution of conflicts will also be accorded preference.

The SARDF is expected to award between twenty to thirty grants per year, with an average grant size of $50,000-75,000. Over the life of project, an estimated 120 grants will be awarded.

The Democracy Fund will be managed on a day-to-day basis by two full-time professionals (one southern African and one American) under contract to the Regional Center for Southern Africa located in Gaborone, Botswana, with support from the Regional Contracting and Legal Advisors. Oversight will be provided by a senior direct hire project officer on the Regional Center's staff. The establishment of grant criteria, review of grant proposals, and progress monitoring responsibilities will be shared by project staff with an expanded project committee having representatives from all host countries in the region. Bilateral missions will be asked to nominate representatives to this project committee, as well as to designate a Mission contact for the SARDF whose role will be to coordinate post concurrence with SARDF-funded grants affecting that country. Analyses confirm that the recommended approach is the economically most cost-effective, and that the project is socially and institutionally feasible.

C. Summary Budget: Over the five year life of the project $10 million will be available for grants to southern African organizations. These grants will be made for activities described in this project paper and in accordance with guidelines specified in Annex B.

Of the $3.5 million budgeted for project support costs, approximately $1.8 million will pay for personnel; $370,000 will be devoted to office expenses; $500,000 to travel, outreach and project committee expenses; $500,000 to audits, evaluations and financial reviews of grantees; and the balance to baseline studies and contingencies.

I. PROJECT CONTEXT

A. A Region in Transition

The latest wave of democratization has reached southern Africa. Under popular pressure authoritarian regimes are giving way to democratically elected governments, and nations at war are making the transition to peace under new democratic arrangements. The most dramatic transformation underway in the region is the political empowerment of South Africa's black population. Denied fundamental rights for centuries and subjected for over forty years to the humiliations of apartheid, blacks have now assumed the leading role in a coalition government headed by President Nelson Mandela. Only weeks after majority rule was achieved in South Africa, Malawi entered the ranks of democratic governments following its first multiparty election in May of 1994. Mozambique held a similar election in October of 1994, and Tanzania is scheduled to complete its transformation to democracy with multiparty elections in 1995. Hopes are running high that the civil war in Angola will soon be ended and peace and democracy brought to that long suffering country during 1995. Namibia, Zimbabwe and Botswana are among the few African countries to have maintained democratic governments since they achieved independence.

But the region's nascent democracies have shallow foundations, and southern Africans fear that they may topple as the wave of democratization recedes. Ethnic and economic pressures could abort democratization in those southern African countries where transformations remain incomplete. There is widespread belief in the region that urgent action is needed to strengthen democratic forces so that recent gains can be consolidated, further advances reinforced, and Africa's best endowed region given an opportunity to achieve sustained economic growth. Southern Africans agree on the need to promote civil societies[2] in which there are broad-based commitments to democratic institutions and procedures. They see regional cooperation as essential to the realization of stable democracies.

B. U.S. National Interests

The United States has significant strategic, political, economic and humanitarian interests in the southern Africa region, including a stake in successful democratization. In the words of Secretary of State Warren Christopher, "As the world's oldest democracy

---

[2] Civil society is defined as all associational life and networks of public communication that exist between the household and the state. Civic society is that subset of civil society which is explicitly or implicitly concerned with advancing democratic norms and practice.

we have an enduring interest in the success of the new democracies of Africa." The United States Congress has called on the administration to "promote cooperation between South Africa and other countries in the region to foster regional stability and economic growth."

To meet the administration's objectives and comply with the congressional mandate, USAID is undertaking a special "Initiative for Southern Africa" (ISA). The ISA's goal is to promote equitable, sustainable economic growth in a democratic southern Africa. The Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund (SARDF) is the first project designed to address the ISA's subgoal of helping to "create a cluster of well-functioning democracies in the region."

Support for democracy has been a high U.S. priority in southern Africa since the start of the 1990's. USAID has bilateral democracy/governance projects in five countries of the region and expects to initiate similar projects in two more southern African countries in 1995. The region has also received considerable assistance under USAID-funded Africa-wide democracy projects. The SARDF will complement and in some cases supplement the bilateral programs by financing regional activities to strengthen democratic institutions and processes.

C. African Soundings

In announcing the Initiative for Southern Africa in January 1994, the USAID Administrator emphasized that sustainable development requires broad participation; that southern Africans must lead and own the process; and that donors should ensure that their assistance supports the initiatives developed by southern Africans. This philosophy of being "African-led and stakeholder-driven" has guided efforts to develop the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund.

In order to identify the major constraints to democratization in the region, and to probe southern African interest in a regional approach to addressing them, a small USAID team travelled throughout southern Africa in early 1994. Team members interviewed groups engaged or interested in the democratization of their countries (see Annex G). In face-to-face discussions with over a hundred men and women in nine southern African nations, the team found that interlocutors from many countries -- whether they were human rights activists, women's advocates, legislators, newsmen, student leaders, trade union officials, or members of other groups engaged in the construction of civil societies -- identified many of the same problems as obstacles to the consolidation of democracy. These problems are discussed below.

The team also found widespread and enthusiastic support for a regional initiative. Many of those interviewed already had participated in successful regional training programs conducted by the National Democratic Conference for International Affairs (NDI), the International Republican Institute (IRI) or European donors. They came up with a host of suggestions on how USAID and other donors could help them work with their counterparts elsewhere in the region to overcome common obstacles. Some knew their counterparts but many did not. Groups at the advanced end of the institutional development spectrum generally were willing to assist counterparts still struggling with problems they had overcome. Women's groups in particular expressed a readiness to share experience in strengthening political participation as well as to learn from more established women's organizations involved in political advocacy work, skills training, and voter and civic rights education. Thus, women's rights advocates in a country where their movement is new can profit from the experience of better established groups in neighboring countries where gains have been made in countering gender bias. The constraints to be tackled and activities to be financed by the SARDF have been selected from among those suggested by the southern Africans.

D. Problems and Opportunities

The constraint to democracy identified most frequently by southern Africans was the absence of a culture of democracy in a region where politics is commonly viewed as a zero sum game and many people do not even understand that as human beings they have civil and political rights. In some cases, citizens understand that they have rights, but may be unaware that the rights accorded by their governments fall below international norms, or they may be unable to ensure that their governments respect or protect their rights. By a culture of democracy southern African interlocutors meant the internalization of a political value system in which majority rule, minority rights, the rule of law, and the benefits of compromise are viewed as essential elements of the political process. A culture of democracy was further defined as an environment in which there is broad participation in the political process and the government is considered legitimate by most citizens. This absence of a culture of democracy, and even more basically a lack of understanding of the functioning of democracy, was seen to be evident in low voter turnout, a lack of recognition of internationally defined and recognized human rights, limited information available to citizens about their rights under the law, schools not providing civic education, and a lack of understanding on the role of special interest groups and opposition political parties. The limited participation of women in political life, and their virtual absence in elective office was a cause of special concern.

Although there are numerous NGOs in the region, many southern Africans cited the limited capacities of these groups as a serious constraint to the promotion of the vibrant

civic society needed for democracy to function well. Too much political space remains occupied by government in the absence of more robust non-governmental activity. However, throughout the region NGOs are able to function, including NGOs in such politically sensitive domains as human rights.

Southern Africans involved in government frequently spoke of the dominance of their executive branches and of the consequent need to strengthen the legislative and judicial arms of government to constrain tendencies toward authoritarian rule. A related concern was the vulnerability of the independent press to executive branch pressure and the consequent limits on the ability of the press to play its essential "fourth estate" role. Finally, there was concern in several countries that local military establishments are too independent of civilian authorities and might be tempted to follow the undemocratic example of the many African soldiers who have seized political power.

The attitudes of southern African governments toward democratization are not uniform. In Namibia, senior ruling party officials expressed concern to team members about the weakness of opposition parties and about the possibility that Namibia could become a de facto one party state. In contrast, Zimbabwean senior officials have denounced efforts to strengthen all political parties as an initiative directed against the government, in a country which has become a de facto one party state.

In addition to the consultations with southern Africans, the project design team also reviewed the recent academic literature and consulted widely with U.S.-based "stakeholders" and staff from USAID and the State Department, both in Washington and in the countries of the region. An informal survey on democracy problems in the region administered to USAID and State officers confirmed the opinions expressed by southern Africans themselves. The priority problems and the number of countries in which they were found to be major (first # in parentheses) and minor (second #) were found to be as follows: unskilled legislators (11-0), citizens uninformed of rights/responsibilities in a democracy (10-1), judiciaries have lack of skills or resources to function properly (9-2), legislature dominated or controlled by executive branch (9-1), unskilled journalists and broadcasters (7-3), weak opposition political parties (6-5), and weak women's advocacy groups (6-4).

Although other problems related to democracy and good governance, and in particular the need for decentralization and strengthened local government, were raised by some USAID officers, insufficient information on the interest and importance of these issues to regional stakeholders exists to justify inclusion of these problem areas in the initial two years of the project. However, these problem areas will be further explored during the development of a long-term democracy strategy for the ISA, and the project

amended as needed after the strategy is finalized in 1996. In addition, a planned "Regional Policy Dialogue Project" will provide another vehicle through which policy issues related to democracy and good governance can be addressed. This project will seek to broaden the participation of a range of interested groups, including the private sector and rural stakeholders, in the policy-making process.

E. No Time to Lose

The southern Africans interviewed expressed a common belief in the urgent need pro-democracy forces have for outside assistance. Many emphasized that the absence of a culture of democracy at the popular level makes backsliding to authoritarian government in southern Africa an immediate threat. Without more widespread understanding that democracy demands respect for basic principles such as minority rights, the rule of law and the value of compromise, southern Africans do not know what they must protect in order to preserve democracy. Except in South Africa interlocutors had little familiarity with evolving conflict resolution practices and their usefulness responding to rival ethnic and economic demands which could undermine democratic governments. The problem of the dominance of national governments by their executive branches was seen by many southern Africans as another immediate threat to democratic life in some area states.

II. DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION

A. Project Goal and Purpose

The **goal** of the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund Project (SARDF) is to strengthen democratic processes and institutions in southern Africa.

The **purpose** of the SARDF is to enhance the skills, knowledge base and capacity of individuals and organizations working to strengthen democratic values and processes in southern Africa.

B. Relationship to Program Strategy and Agency Priorities

The project purpose is identical to the strategic objective for the democracy component of the ISA strategy, and directly addresses the ISA program subgoal of helping to create a cluster of well-functioning democracies in the region.

SARDF will fund activities that address at least three of USAID's priorities in democracy promotion as outlined in Agency guidance: civil society, rule of law, and governance. The development of civil society will be the primary focus, since grant funds are expected to be awarded principally to organizations that are engaged in civic action to promote, protect and advance participatory democracy, and in particular participation by women. However, project grants are also expected to contribute to an enhanced understanding of and respect for the rule of law and basic human and legal rights, and strengthened legislative capabilities, as explained further below. More than merely promoting the development of civil and civic societies, the resources of the fund are to be used to improve southern Africans' understanding of what they must do to protect and advance democracy. Target grant recipients are not only those NGOs and individuals active in building civic societies, e.g. women's advocacy groups, but elements of government which also have an institutional bias against authoritarian executive branch rule, e.g. the legislature.

C. A Regional Approach

The Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund, as is true of the other components of the Initiative for Southern Africa, has as an underlying purpose to further mutually beneficial cooperation and integration among the countries of the southern Africa region. Building and sustaining contacts among individuals and organizations at a multiplicity of levels and in multiple sectors are instrumental in achieving this purpose.

There are other justifications for undertaking a democracy program at the level of the southern Africa region. As indicated above, many of the countries of the region face common problems in the development of their democratic systems, such as the need to inculcate democratic values and to strengthen weak legislatures. However, the eleven countries of the region are at various stages of political development, and the capacities of groups within those countries also varies widely. Southern Africans voiced support for a regional approach to democratization in the belief that it will allow democracy advocates in one country to take advantage of local experience in other countries confronting problems common to the region. Thus women's rights advocates in a country where their movement is new can profit from the experience of longer established women's rights groups in neighboring countries where gains have been made in countering gender bias.

Beyond sharing experiences in dealing with common problems, organizations could also work together to develop solutions to these problems or new approaches to advance common interests. Some southern Africans stated the belief that addressing some of the more dangerous threats to democracy -- such as the impunity of police and security

officials -- on a regional basis may be more productive than trying to do so in individual countries.

In addition, from a USAID program perspective, it may be more cost effective to address common problems on a regional level rather than on a bilateral basis. For example, it should be possible to achieve economies of scale in various types of training and capacity-building activities, such as training legislators from multiple countries at the same time in techniques such as coalition building, dispute resolution, and drafting of legislation. Civic education curricula or publications on democratic procedures may have applicability to more than one country in the region.

There was widespread belief among southern Africans that creation of networks among groups of similar purpose, e.g. human rights organizations, will not only encourage greater professionalism but also will afford individual organizations greater protection against government interference. Some interlocutors also stated that their governments would be much more receptive to pressure from within the region than to that which might be applied from outside by foreign governments. The logic of these southern Africans was that residents of the region usually treat each other respectfully and tactfully, prompting greater cooperation than that given to less culturally sensitive outsiders, some of whom provoke defensive responses due to lingering resentment of their backgrounds as former colonial rulers.

D. Project Activities

1. The Southern African Regional Democracy Fund

The primary intervention to be funded by the project is the establishment of a $10 million regional Democracy Fund. Under this fund, grants of up to $250,000 will be made available to southern African organizations for a variety of types of activities which advance the project purpose and assist in achieving the three project results outlined below.[3] These activities may include training and technical assistance aimed at strengthening the capacity of legislators, women's advocacy and other organizations in civil society to undertake civic action; workshops and conferences to share experiences among individuals and groups and to work together to develop solutions to common problems; internships and exchanges to enable southern Africans to learn from each other through on-the-job training; the development of educational curricula or materials for civic education; research and analyses on problems or approaches which advance the

---

[3]Grants in amounts exceeding this limit may be approved on an exceptional basis by the project committee.

state of the art in democracy promotion in the region; and support for the development of networks and mechanisms/centers for information dissemination. These activities are illustrative, and are not intended to circumscribe the types of initiatives which the SARDF might support. Limited amounts of grant funds may also be utilized to purchase equipment and materials which are essential to achieving the purpose of the individual grants, such as fax machines, photocopiers and computers.

While the grants will serve the initial purpose of strengthening the skills, knowledge and capacity of organizations which promote democracy, they must also clearly have an ultimate purpose which extends beyond the organizations to the citizens which they serve. For example, women's advocacy groups will be assisted in efforts to increase women's participation in political life, legislators will be trained to develop legislation which serves their constituent's interests, human rights and lawyer's groups will be assisted in efforts to inform citizens of their rights and in defending those rights, and media associations will be assisted so that journalists are trained to write articles that help citizens monitor the activities of elected officials and make informed choices during elections. In addition, synergy among the three focus areas of the project will be encouraged by supporting activities that simultaneously advance more than one of the results, e.g. sponsoring a workshop for parliamentarians (particularly female) to develop legislation that removes barriers to female participation in political activities.

The Democracy Fund is intended to be "demand-driven," that is, to support initiatives developed by southern African groups in pursuit of their own self-interest. The existence of the Fund will be publicized widely in the region, and project management staff will travel throughout the region to meet with organizations active in democracy promotion to make them aware of the Fund, and the process for submitting proposals. However, in the event that regional groups interested in receiving support under one of the areas of emphasis of the Fund have difficulty meeting the requirements for funding, project management may decide to provide funding for the development of proposals based on "pre-proposals." Project management could initiate the process by advertising a request for pre-proposals, or simply consider for preproposal funding those worthy but incomplete grant proposals submitted under the grant guidelines. Under this alternative approach, the Democracy Fund will award up to $15,000 to organizations wishing to develop a full proposal in collaboration with individuals or groups in other countries in the region. These pre-proposal grants could fund travel costs within the region, analytical work, the hiring of technical experts, or other costs associated with formulating full proposals. Such pre-proposal grants may be received only once by an organization. It is estimated that not more than 10% of total grant funds in any year would be allocated as pre-proposal grants.

In order to ensure that no one country benefits disproportionately from the Democracy Fund, a ceiling will be established of the maximum percentage of grant funds that any one country (through its grantee organizations) can receive in any given year and over the five year life of project.

A set of guidelines, including criteria by which grant proposals will be judged, will be approved by the project committee. An illustrative set of criteria which might be included in these guidelines is provided in Annex B, and includes specification of the information that must be included in grant applications, those costs which will not be covered by grants, and the limitation on the amount of the Democracy Fund grants which can be used to benefit any one country in the region. Only grants which involve two or more countries in the region will be considered for funding.

The following sections outline the intended project results towards which efforts under the Democracy Fund will be directed, and provide further illustrations of the types of activities that may be supported.

a) Result #1: Enhance the skills of southern African legislators with the aim of improving the management and effectiveness of legislative processes.

An ineffectual legislative process, due at least in part to a lack of skills among legislators and parliamentarians, has been identified as one of the highest priority problems shared by the nations of southern Africa, according to the informal survey of State and AID Desk and regional democracy officers undertaken by the design team. A second related problem is that legislatures are dominated or controlled by the executive, with the result that there is a weak separation of powers among the branches of government. While many country-specific problems are best addressed through internal and bilateral mechanisms, other legislative difficulties are common to the region as a whole and important economies of scale can be achieved through a regional approach. The constitutional similarities among many of the democracies of southern Africa offer opportunities to train elected officials in the use of a variety of techniques and skills essential for the efficient functioning of national legislative bodies. These include mechanisms and techniques to gather information, build coalitions, share information and power, and resolve political conflict. There is a particular need to strengthen legislators' outreach to constituents, to enshrine the democratic principle that legislators are elected representatives of the people, advancing the constituents interests and accountable to them. Achievement of this outcome will contribute to measurable improvements in priority legislative processes, as well as a general strengthening of the legislatures of the region to provide more effective checks and balances on the executive branches.

Activities envisioned for support by the Southern Africa Initiative Democracy Fund include workshops and conferences that would give elected representatives an opportunity to share information, exchange experiences, and identify common problems and possible solutions. The topics addressed by the workshops will range from generic governance issues such as the difficulties involved in bridging the disjuncture between constitutionally-defined balance of power and legislative praxis, to more mechanical processes such as the legislative role in annual government budget preparation and oversight, and election campaign techniques. The workshops could also be structured to provide a greater understanding of the implications of laws as they relate differently to women and men, on the role of the legislature vis-a-vis special interest groups, the importance of building constituencies, and the role of opposition and minority parties within the legislature.

The Democracy Fund could also support training to enhance the professionalism of legislators. Training activities might include sponsoring the participation of legislators in courses which develop skills and/or techniques such as drafting legislation, using parliamentary procedure, or building coalitions with colleagues from opposition parties; the development of such training courses by regional training institutes; or the training of "trainers" or faculty to teach such courses. Initiatives to create or strengthen regional networks among legislators will also be supported. The diverse experiences of southern Africans in maintaining the independence of their legislatures offer scope for cross fertilization.

A second, related area of activity envisioned for Democracy Fund support will be to promote applied research and analytical studies to identify legislative problems common to the region and propose possible interventions. These studies will, in many cases, serve as precursors to topic-specific workshops and conferences held to instruct elected legislators in methodologies and procedures to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of legislative processes in their respective countries.

b) Result #2: Improved capacity of civil society groups to develop, use and disseminate information and tools essential to informed citizen participation in a democracy.

Southern African stakeholders interviewed during project design considered the absence of a culture of democracy to be the primary constraint to democratization, in a region many citizens are unaware that they have civil and political rights, or are unaware that the rights they are given may not accord with international norms, or finally, may know that they have rights but may be unable to ensure that their governments respect them. These stakeholders emphasized the fact that many southern Africans have not yet

absorbed the political values inherent in a truly democratic system, including rule by the majority, minority rights, the rule of law, the need for citizens to make their voices heard through their vote and their participation in civic action, and the benefits of compromise and tolerance. USAID and State Department officers surveyed on democracy problems in the southern Africa also rated the fact that citizens are uninformed of their rights and responsibilities as a major democratization problem in ten of the eleven countries of the region. Southern Africans recommended that USAID provide support for information dissemination (including efforts to strengthen the independent media), civics education, and coalitions of regional and national NGOs which serve as watchdogs of the political system and advocate on behalf of citizens' fundamental democratic rights.

Civic education activities are expected to be the primary means for achieving this project result. In particular, the project will encourage civic education initiatives directed at incorporating information on the nature and functioning of a democratic state in school and adult education curricula as well as in news publications and programs disseminated by the mass media. Particular attention will be given to conferences, workshops, exchanges, etc. focused on how to teach the basic rights and duties of citizens, on voter education and on opportunities for legal redress. The focus of the activities may vary among countries depending on the level of citizens' awareness of their rights, and the discrepancies between rights legally granted on the one hand, and the degree to which they accord with international norms and/or are respected on the other hand.

Grants could be provided to a variety of groups for efforts to inform and educate citizens, including legal and human rights groups, lawyers associations, legislator or jurist networks, women's groups, teachers and students associations or other academic groups, media associations and journalist networks, as well as a whole range of non-governmental organizations whose primary purpose may not be civic action, but which seek support under SARDF for activities consistent with the project purpose. Activities funded by these grants could include: the development of educational materials (curricula, pamphlets, radio programs, videos) to inform citizens of their rights and educate them on how they may participate in the democratic life of their societies; the printing and distribution of materials; training courses or workshops for teachers, legislators, journalists or others involved in educating citizens; research/studies on the best approaches for providing civics education to citizens; networking among groups that have as a primary responsibility informing citizens about their rights and responsibilities in a democracy or advocating for the respect of those rights, such as human rights organizations; strengthening of an information center which makes information available to groups that provide education to citizens; or many types of activities to strengthen the capacity of groups that undertake such educational roles, including training, provision of equipment and materials, and assistance in improved financial and program management.

Civic education programs can both build on local traditions and take advantage of modern technology. Thus, in countries in which touring drama troupes have long been an established mode of cultural expression, civic educators can be encouraged via workshops to commission and sponsor plays with a civic action message. Workshops could also assist civic educators and radio and television producers to develop civic action materials in vernacular languages.

In addition, project grants may assist non-governmental organizations to gain insights, techniques and tools and to provide them to citizens in order to increase citizens' participation in government, including their interaction with elected representatives. These techniques and tools may include those involving electing, petitioning, and monitoring the performance of governmental representatives in the executive and legislative branches for greater governmental transparency and accountability; or citizen organization for democratic political action -- including fundraising, coalition-building, advocacy, relations with political parties, and needs assessments.

Given the mortal danger to democracy posed in parts of southern Africa by ethnic hostility and by quick recourse to violence, civic education activities aimed at increasing awareness throughout the region of peaceful conflict resolution techniques will receive a high priority. Awareness of dispute resolution modalities will be fostered via conferences and workshops for the mass media as well as in workshops, exchanges, etc. which are targeted more precisely, e.g. on tribal leaders.

An increased role for the media in educating citizens will be fostered through training in basic tradecraft, political reporting, etc. so that the independent media will have greater readership/audience appeal. Such training could be provided through regional media organizations, such as the Media Institute of Southern Africa or the nascent Association of Southern African Broadcasters. There will be close coordination with United States Information Agency (USIA) representatives in southern Africa to ensure that SARDF activities and those undertaken by USIA are mutually reinforcing and not duplicative.

c) Result #3: Women's organizations empowered to participate more fully in the democratic political process.

Women throughout southern Africa are becoming increasingly involved in the democratization of their countries, as witnessed by the growth in the number of politically active women's organizations. However, discrimination against women remains widely prevalent. Since these patterns of discrimination inhibit women's participation in their nations' political life, the SARDF will accord priority to proposals which work to

overcome gender biases. The ISA strategy operates on the assumption that networking successful women's organizations and political actors (female legislators and judges) will further the ability of women in the region to participate in the political direction of their lives and countries.

Women's organizations eligible for assistance will be primarily those with central purposes directly related to democratization, e.g. women's advocacy groups. Activities related to democratization, such as technical assistance in mastering lobbying techniques, are preferred to those which may encourage political participation but are not directly related to women's involvement in the more formal political institutions of their countries, e.g. women's decision-making in agricultural cooperatives.

Illustrative activities which may receive SARDF funding include those which seek to build networks among women's organizations at the regional level, strengthen the capacity of women's rights groups, research issues specifically related to women's political participation and the constraints thereto, and sponsor organizational and institutional exchanges. Activities to establish or strengthen regional women's networks might include support for organizational meetings and seminars, technical assistance, training for network professional staff, and purchase of communications equipment (fax machines). Activities to expand the capacities of individual NGO's might include technical and administrative training, instruction in advocacy skills and fund raising, and the use of the media.

Working with women's groups could prove to be especially fruitful considering the benefit that networking and institutional strengthening will likely have at cross-sectoral and cross-societal levels (linking urban and rural communities). As an illustration, at a workshop last December in South Africa, women from many countries in the region agreed to concentrate on a package of reforms and to work with a variety of structures and institutions, including national, regional and local government; the judiciary; research institutes; and grassroots organizations. A consensus emerged among the workshop's participants that interventions must target and incorporate rural women for such a package to work. South Africa is certainly not the only country in the region with important transferrable lessons. Namibian women are actively working to ensure that the rights of women are codified in the constitution, represented at the executive level, and addressed in the new Labor Code. Illustrative as well is the NGO Coordinating Committee (NGOCC), an umbrella organization for 40 NGO's primarily concerned with women's issues in Zambia. NGOCC's 3,000 volunteers are primarily engaged in civic education. Some of its members told USAID program designers that they are anxious to participate in regional workshops, seminars, exchanges, and internships.

2. Research

As indicated above, funds will be made available through the Democracy Fund for collaborative research activities that advance the "state of the art" of democracy promotion in southern Africa. Such research efforts must fall within the three areas described above, and must involve groups or individuals from two or more countries. Illustrative activities could include the identification of effective approaches for utilizing the mass media to provide civic education, particularly to reach citizens in remote rural areas; the analysis and selection of traditional conflict resolution techniques from the region which could serve as models, and around which workshops or educational materials could be developed; an analysis of the constraints to women's participation in political life; or to develop approaches for resolving legislative problems common to the region.

3. Eligible Groups

A wide spectrum of governmental and non-governmental southern African organizations will be eligible to receive grants under the SARDF. Eligibility to participate will be determined principally by the types of activities to be supported, rather than the nature of the group. However, it is expected that organizations receiving assistance will be primarily those with central purposes directly related to democratization, e.g. women's advocacy groups, human rights groups, civic or voter education programs. Those organizations whose contributions to democratization will be limited to their participation in the creation of civil societies will be eligible for assistance only for activities directly related to democratization, e.g. technical assistance in mastering lobbying techniques. Grants also may be made to regional NGO institutions which give significant support to pro-democracy forces, e.g. the Media Institute of Southern Africa. Grants also may be given to regional multi-lateral organizations, such as the SADC secretariat.

III. PROJECT MANAGEMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

A. Project Management and Mission Coordination

Project management roles and responsibilities will be shared among the staff of the Regional Center for Southern Africa, professional staff contracted under the project who will constitute the project secretariat, a project committee, and coordinators from each of the U.S. bilateral posts in the region. The proposed management arrangement was selected following extensive consultation with contracting officers and project officers who have managed democracy programs in the Africa region. While there was a strong preference for locating the Democracy Fund within an indigenous organization now

promoting democracy in the region, no suitable organization was found to exist. The option of establishing a new "Democracy Center" was also discussed, but ruled out as costly and having questionable sustainability in view of other USAID experience with such institutions. Several other management options considered and rejected were: 1) awarding a cooperative agreement to a competitively selected NGO or consortia to manage an umbrella grant program, 2) contracting out the grant management function to a private firm, or 3) hiring an NGO to serve as the administrative secretariat for a USG-dominated committee which would retain authority to approve grants. The proposed option was selected because it confers three major advantages over alternative arrangements: it allows the U.S. government to maintain substantial control over decisions on grants which may have sensitive political dimensions; it encourages substantial southern African involvement through the multiple functions -- including monitoring of democracy indicators -- of a proposed project committee which will have representatives of all participating countries; and it minimizes administrative costs.

The roles of the Regional Center, the project staff, the project committee, and the bilateral mission coordinators are outlined below. Section B which follows describes how the grant-making process will work.

Role of the Regional Center: Within the Regional Center for Southern Africa in Gaborone, Botswana -- which has responsibility for managing the programs funded under the Initiative for Southern Africa -- a USAID direct hire officer will be the designated SARDF project officer. S/he will have responsibility for overseeing the work of the contractors staffing the project secretariat, and will approve all grants recommended for funding. S/he will work closely with the project staff on all aspects of the program, including outreach to potential grant recipients, providing assistance to inexperienced organizations in the development of viable proposals, monitoring the progress of grantee programs, and evaluating where the SARDF could have its greatest impact. S/he will ensure that the regional Democracy Fund supports activities that are compatible with other USAID-funded bilateral and regional democracy programs in southern Africa, and will be the principal liaison between the SARDF and U.S. Mission personnel in the region, both from USAID and from the Embassies. S/he will verify that U.S. Mission concurrence has been obtained from any country in the region in which SARDF-funded activities will operate. S/he will also have the lead role in coordinating with other donors working on democracy programs in the southern Africa region. To monitor grantee activities, the SARDF project officer will visit or otherwise contact each grantee annually. The project officer will also have responsibility for preparing annual progress reports mandated by USAID, with input from the SARDF project staff.

Role of the Project Staff/Secretariat: A small project management unit/secretariat will be established to carry out all the tasks associated with promoting, reviewing applications to, and monitoring progress under the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund. This management unit will be staffed by two professionals -- one southern African and one American citizen -- and an administrative assistant. These staff will work under direct contract to the Regional Center. One of the two professional staff will be designated project manager, and will supervise the other two employees. The project manager will report to the USAID direct hire project officer.

The project staff will be responsible for preparing promotional materials which explain the purpose of the Fund, and the procedures to be followed in applying for grants. They will also advertise or issue RFA's for grant applications as instructed by the project committee. They will recommend appropriate grant criteria and guidelines to the project committee, and once finalized, will publish these criteria and guidelines. They will prepare standard forms for reviewing and scoring grant proposals, and will train project committee members on the use of these forms as needed.

Project staff members will play a leading role in promoting the Democracy Fund to appropriate groups within the region. They will travel frequently to meet with organizations which have applied or may want to apply for grants. They will advise on the preparation of grant applications, and will assist groups in making contacts with potential collaborators within the region. As needed, these individuals may also assist organizations in identifying appropriate U.S. organizations or institutions which could provide specific technical assistance or training.

The project staff will direct the grant review process developed by the project committee, as detailed below. They will carry out a preliminary screening of all grant proposals for compliance with guidelines and criteria, and will have the authority to recommend approval of small grants. Communications with grantees will also be the responsibility of the project staff, as delegated by the USAID project officer. Project staff will prepare materials needed to negotiate grants as required by the USAID grants officer, as well as make arrangements for financial assessments of grantees which have not yet been certified to receive USAID grants. (Note: it is anticipated that a financial IQC will be established by the Regional Center to facilitate carrying out of financial reviews/audits of potential grant recipients.)

The project staff will also play a key role in monitoring grant performance, and progress toward achieving the overall purpose of the SARDF. With respect to grant performance, they will work closely with project committee members to assure adequate site visits and monitoring of grantees. They will travel in the region to maintain contact

with target groups, and to attend some of the conferences, workshops, etc. financed by the Fund. They will ensure that bilateral mission "coordinators" (whose role is described below) receive information on the project, and will maintain contact with these coordinators during any visits to their countries. Staff will propose a monitoring and evaluation plan to the project committee, and will collaborate with the assessment subcommittee described below on the implementation of this plan. Staff will oversee the collection of both baseline data and performance data which measure progress toward meeting project indicators.

Project staff will prepare an annual workplan, which follows decisions taken during the annual project committee meetings. Travel plans for the subsequent twelve months will be included in the workplans submitted to the SARDF project officer. Project staff will also contribute toward the preparation of annual progress reports on the project, as well as any special monitoring reports.

Finally, project staff will make arrangements for the annual meetings of the project committee. They will serve as the "secretariat" of the project committee in implementing decisions made by the committee. They will maintain regular communications with project committee members, tracking work performed and recommending payments of honoraria for committee members.

The secretariat's role will be reassessed at the time of the mid-term evaluation, to determine whether its functions could be expanded. Since staff will travel frequently in the region, and maintain contact both with a diversity of southern African organizations and USAID/Embassy inter-agency democracy committees, the secretariat will gather a wealth of information about ongoing democracy/governance programs in the region. There may be value in having the secretariat serve as an information clearing house and coordination center. It could -- in collaboration with bilateral missions -- organize workshops, exchanges, and internships among institutions in southern Africa. Utilizing an expanding data base reflecting acquired experience and lessons learned, the secretariat could identify and encourage replication of successful approaches to democratization in the region.

Role of the Project Committee: A project committee will be established at the outset of the project to assist in the planning, implementation, and oversight of the grant program. This committee will consist of representatives of USAID and of each of the eleven southern African countries which are eligible to participate in the program. USAID will be represented by the direct hire project officer for the Regional Center, and the two professional project staff members hired under contract to USAID. The Southern African members will be selected following recommendations by the U.S.

country team in each of the eleven countries. Each country will be represented by a member and an alternate, one of whom must be able to attend the annual meeting of the project committee. These individuals should be non-partisan, respected citizens, who have demonstrated personal or professional experience and commitment to promoting democratic values and processes in the southern African region. They must be able to travel within the region to attend project committee meetings, as well as within their own countries to assist with monitoring grantee performance. Efforts will be made to ensure that the committee members reflect a diversity of groups and peoples found in southern Africa; at least one member from each country shall be female.

Committee meetings shall be co-chaired by the senior USAID project staff member, and one of the southern African committee members, with the latter elected at the preceding meeting. Full committee meetings shall be held at least once a year.

The project committee will establish the guidelines and criteria for the grants; will approve any decisions to issue RFA's for pre-proposals; and will monitor progress toward achievement of the Democracy Fund's purpose. Committee members will all be expected to play an active role in promoting the grant program, review at least some of the grant proposals submitted each year, and monitor performance (through participation in grantee program activities, site visits, or review of reports) of grant recipients within their home country. To effectively perform these roles, committee members will be provided with some training during the initial meeting on the methods for reviewing grant proposals and for monitoring grants. They will also receive a small honorarium for work performed on the committee, according to a schedule proposed by the secretariat and approved by USAID (for example, $50 for every grant application reviewed, $25 per monitoring visit, and $100 for attendance at the annual meeting, in addition to actual costs associated with travel and communications).

Role of Bilateral Missions/Embassies: The active participation of bilateral posts in the region will be critical to the success of the SARDF. Each post in the region will be asked to designate a "coordinator" or "contact" for the Regional Democracy Fund. That person's role will be to ensure the review and submission of post comments/concurrence on any grant proposal submitted to the SARDF that will involve individuals or organizations from that country. The coordinator may perform the review himself/herself, or ask another U.S. official at post to conduct the review. Comments should be provided on the representativeness, credibility, and effectiveness of the prospective grantee. In addition, all posts will be asked to nominate citizens of their countries to serve on the project committee. Finally, the post will be supplied with information on, and applications for, the SARDF, and will be requested to encourage appropriate groups to submit applications.

In return, posts will be furnished all reports provided on achievements of the grants, as well as periodic progress reports for the SARDF as a whole.

B. How It Will Work

The process and criteria by which grants will be reviewed and funded will be determined by the project committee. However, an illustration of how this might work follows. All grant proposals will be screened by the professional project staff, for compliance with the guidelines established by the project committee. (See Annex B for illustrative Grant Guidelines) Proposals that do not meet the guidelines will be returned to the proposing organization with comments indicating in what way the proposals are deficient. Proposals that do meet the guidelines will be reviewed following two tracks, depending on the level of funding involved. Proposals requiring less than $50,000 will be reviewed by the secretariat using the criteria and priorities set by the project committee, with decisions documented on scoring sheets and kept on file. These decisions will be reported to the project committee at its next meeting. Approval will also be subject to concurrence by the Mission Coordinators in those countries in which grantee activities will take place, and the USAID Regional Center project officer. Proposals requiring funding of more than $50,000 will, in addition to the procedures followed for smaller grants, be reviewed by at least three southern African members of the project committee. These members will include at least two from countries which will benefit from grant-funded activities, and one member with technical expertise in the subject of the grant whose country will not be a primary beneficiary. An attempt will be made to equalize the number of proposals reviewed by each project committee member over the course of a year. Each reviewer will be required to "score" the proposal. When the scoring sheets and comments have been received from all reviewers, the scores will be averaged, and only those proposals with average scores above a predetermined level will be funded. Every decision will be documented.

In the event that requests for grants exceed funds available in a given year, proposals approved during the same review period will be rank ordered by score and funded in order. Excellent proposals unable to be funded one year may be carried over for funding in the subsequent fiscal year by decision of the project committee.

Proposers will be notified of approval or disapproval with explanation, normally within 60 days of receipt of completed proposals. Once approved, grants will be prepared and negotiated by the USAID Regional Center Grants Officer.

In order to quickly launch the project in FY 1995, a notice of availability of grant funds and the criteria by which proposals will be assessed for the first year, will be

published within 60 days of authorization of SARDF. To the extent feasible, and depending on the arrival of staff and its ability to mobilize the project committee, the review procedures outlined above will be followed from the start. If this proves impossible, a small committee consisting of Regional Center staff will be established to review proposals received during the first few months until the formal project committee and staff structure can be established.

C. Relationship with Bilateral Mission and Donor Programs

1. Relation to Bilateral Mission Programs

The Mission programs in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Namibia, and Tanzania have strategic objectives in the area of democracy/governance, while the programs in Malawi and Zambia consider democratic governance to be a cross-cutting issue. All seven countries have ongoing or planned bilateral democracy activities. (see Annex D)

Every effort will be made to ensure that the regional Democracy Fund does not duplicate activities funded by bilateral missions, but rather complements and reinforces efforts initiated at the country level. This complementarity will be maintained through a variety of actions. First, in developing this project, design committee members obtained information on ongoing and planned projects, and sought input from bilateral democracy/governance advisors on appropriate interventions for the regional program. SARDF project staff will be required to become familiar with all these ongoing and planned bilateral projects as well as any Africa regional D/G projects. Secondly, every bilateral post (through its inter-agency democracy committee, perhaps) will be asked to nominate a "coordinator" to the SARDF, as explained above. This coordinator will review and provide concurrence for all activities proposed to be funded under the SARDF. He/she will also have literature on the SARDF, and will be asked to encourage organizations to submit appropriate proposals to the SARDF for funding. Finally, the Regional Center's democracy officer and project staff will travel frequently in the region and will maintain continual contact with bilateral democracy advisors. These visits should provide ample opportunity for communication on programs.

2. Donor Coordination: As explained above, the donor coordination function at the field level shall be the responsibility of the SARDF project officer working in the Regional Center for Southern Africa. AFR/SA will continue to interface with other bilateral donors in Washington and in donor capitals. Both Regional Center and

AFR/SA staff will maintain contact with the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC)'s new sector coordinating unit which encompasses democracy promotion.

There are a large and growing number of democracy programs funded by other donors and private organizations in the southern Africa region. The Nordics, some of the Western Europeans and the Canadians conduct programs which support democratization. Most of these activities are bilateral and are frequently conducted outside normal assistance channels, e.g, by the German political foundations. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the OECD has given its blessing to further assistance of this nature and has welcomed news of the SARDF. Close consultations on democratization policy will continue with senior officials of other donors interested in supporting this process. However, high level coordination from donor capitals of the award of modest grants involving scores of small-scale activities appears less feasible than coordination of implementation by local donor representatives in southern African capitals. Thus a two track approach involving discussions both in donor and in southern African capitals will be followed for coordination with other bilateral donors.

Some American NGOs are supporting democratization in southern Africa with regional programs that are not financed by USAID. Liaison with these American NGOs will be maintained by the Democracy Fund secretariat and the Regional Center project officer.

D. Project Timeline

Action	Date
Project Paper Authorized	April 1995
Scopes of Work for Project Staff Finalized	April 1995
Project Staff Recruitment Initiated	April 1995
Project Staff Selected	May - June 1995
RFA Issued for Initial Year Grants	May 1995
Project Committee Members Selected	May - June 1995
Applications for Initial Year Grants Mailed	May - July 1995

SARDF Project Officer Arrives at Post	June - July 1995
First Project Committee Meeting	July 1995
Proposals for Initial Year Grants Reviewed	June - Sept 1995
Initial Year Grants Signed	July - Sept 1995
Baseline Study Undertaken	Sept - Nov 1995
Final Grant Criteria and Guidelines Published	Sept 1995
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Finalized, including Baseline Data	Jan 1996
Project Committee Meeting	Mar 1996
Workplan for 2nd Year Prepared	Apr 1996
Project Evaluated for Consistency with RC Strategic Plan and Revised as Necessary	Nov - Dec 1996
Project Committee Meeting	Mar 1997
Workplan for 3rd Year Prepared	Apr 1997
Audit	Sept 1997
Project Committee Meeting	Mar 1998
Workplan for 4th Year Prepared	Apr 1998
Project Mid-Term Evaluation	May 1998
Project Committee Meeting	Mar 1999
Workplan for 5th Year Prepared	Apr 1999
Audit	Sept 1999
Project Committee Meeting	Mar 2000

Project Completion June 2000

Final Project Evaluation

Oct 2000

E. Procurement Plan

1. Grants: The process by which grants to indigenous organizations under the Democracy Fund will be awarded has been described in section III. B. above. The first request for grant applications will be issued shortly after the project is authorized, in order to immediately launch the Democracy Fund. This request will be advertised in newspapers in all eleven participating countries. Proposals received in response to this solicitation may be reviewed by USAID staff using interim guidelines and criteria, in the event that project maangement has not yet been put in place. However, once guidelines and criteria have been formalized by the project committee, brochures with application procedures for the SARDF will be developed by project staff and printed for distribution. The brochures will be distributed by project staff, project committee members, and bilateral mission coordinators. Additional solicitations through RFA's may also be issued in subsequent years as determined by the project committee, to encourage proposals in any of the three project emphasis areas (training of legislators, strengthening of women's participation, increasing education and information about democratic values and processes).

2. Contracts: Project management staff will be hired under personal services contracts following competitive selection. They will be recruited through public advertisements as follows: internationally for the U.S. advisor, throughout the southern Africa region for the southern African democracy advisor, and within Botswana for the administrative assistant. Advertisements are expected to go out within one month of project authorization, and contracts to be awarded within three months. A preliminary scope of work for the democracy advisors is provided in Annex I.

Other small procurements over the life of the project -- for printing, office space and equipment, leasing facilities for annual project committee meetings, data collection, audit and evaluation services -- will take place as and when needed, and will follow Agency procurement guidelines with respect to source/origin and competition. Although most goods and services are expected to be obtained from within the southern Africa region, geographic code 935 will apply.

IV. EXPECTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Expected Results

The logical framework contained in Annex A provides an overview of results expected at the goal, purpose, and output levels, as well as the indicators and targets by which their achievement will be measured. As described in section II. D. above, the project is expected to achieve the following primary results:

Result #1. Southern African legislators will have enhanced skills which enable them to improve the management and effectiveness of legislative processes. Over time, it is hoped that legislatures will be strengthened to the point where they become effective counterweights to the now dominant executive branches, and are able to enact and implement legislation which reflects the needs and interests of the citizenry.

Result #2. Civil society groups will have improved capacity to develop, use and disseminate information and tools essential to informed citizen participation in a democracy. The project will work primarily with NGOs directly engaged in democratization activities. It will both strengthen their capacities -- through training, technical assistance and help in forming mutually supportive regional networks -- and expand or improve the programs the groups undertake to overcome other constraints to democratization.

Result #3. Women and women's organizations will be empowered to participate more fully in the democratic political process. Capacity-building activities will enable women's organizations to more effectively represent women's issues in political fora, involve more women in political action, and ensure that legal and other constraints to women's participation are addressed. Through participation in supportive networks, conferences, and exchanges, individual women will be encouraged to run for elective office and to speak out in defense of their interests.

In particular, project activities should:

- provide legislators with the skills and motivations necessary to solicit their constituents views and be responsive to constituents' concerns in the form of new legislative initiatives;

- provide organizations in the region with knowledge, techniques and equipment which enable them to mount more effective programs, increase membership, and address constraints to the spread of democracy;

- increase the quality and quantity of information available to citizens in both urban and rural areas -- information in the form of civic education for students of all ages, voter education, and items in the media about the workings of democracy in general and its operation in specific countries in the region -- so that citizens know their rights and responsibilities, and can hold their elected officials accountable;

- help citizens understand how they may participate more effectively in democratic processes;

- strengthen the capacity of women's groups to lobby on behalf of their constituents and to support candidates for political office;

- contribute toward building a widespread acceptance of the norms of democracy in the region, as witnessed over time by growing respect for human and civil rights, the holding of free and fair multi-party elections, peaceful resolution of disputes, high citizen participation (and particularly of women) in elections and civil society groups, and an increasingly diverse and active civil society.

Although the project will not interact directly with the 100 million people of southern Africa, it will, if successful, benefit all of them. The human rights of everyone will be better respected in stronger democracies, the possibility of interstate and inter-ethnic conflict will be reduced if all regional states are true democracies and the culture of democracy becomes ingrained, and local economies will be stimulated if political stability leads investors to commit greater resources to the region.

B. Indicators and Targets

The project purpose will be achieved if an increased number of organizations are able to play effective roles in promoting democratic values and processes, and/or if assisted organizations increase the size, number or scope of their civic action programs. As part of the baseline work to be undertaken upon establishment of the project committee, the criteria for organizational effectiveness will be more precisely defined. One criterion which has been suggested is that the average number of citizens reached by assisted organizations increases.

The following indicators and targets are proposed for each of the three results:

Result #1:

Indicator: Number of legislators employing the skills/techniques transmitted through Democracy Fund-supported activities.

Target: 250 of 500 expected to be trained.

Result #2:

Indicator #1: Number of organizations which improve and/or increase their civic education activities.

Target: 50 organizations

Indicator #2: Number of organizations which engage in development and dissemination of democracy-building information for the first time as a result of the project.

Target: 20 organizations

Indicator #3: Number of organizations assisted by project employing new or improved approaches for increasing citizen participation in elected government.

Target: 25 organizations among 5 countries

Result #3

Indicator: Number of assisted women's groups/networks which undertake new advocacy programs.

Target: 10 organizations among 5 countries

At the goal level, the indication that "a cluster of well-functioning democracies have been created" will be: the fact that fair periodic local, subnational, and national elections have been held in most countries; that citizens' basic rights are respected and protected;

that there is a diverse and active civil society; and that there is a functioning system of checks and balances between branches of government in all countries.

Project indicators and targets will be verified by the baseline survey expected to be completed in December of 1995, re-verified through project monitoring and evaluation activities, and refined if and when necessary by the project committee.

C. Measurement

A variety of data sources and information collection techniques will be employed to provide data to measure whether project targets are being achieved. Each grantee under the Democracy Fund will be required to include in its grant proposal a monitoring and evaluation plan, which specifies the organizations' own criteria/indicators for the program's success, and how they will be measured. The grantee also will be required to report on progress achieved, how many people participated or benefitted, and in what ways. For example, grantees will be encouraged to have workshop participants complete evaluations, which its reports would summarize. Where feasible, conference and workshop organizers will be asked to monitor participants' utilization of techniques or tools taught over a pre-determined time period to assess the long-term impact and extent to which new methods are being incorporated into ongoing work. In addition to the grantee's own measurement and reporting at the "output" level, USAID direct hire and project staff (including project committee members) will measure progress through site visits, follow-up participant/beneficiary surveys, and other means. To conduct surveys of participants, USAID will need to require grantees to furnish a list of participants, and to specify in the grant document that USAID may conduct such surveys. USAID could also hire experts to assess qualitative changes in programs (e.g. civics education), processes (e.g. functioning of legislative processes), or organizational capacity (e.g. women's groups lobbying efforts), perhaps as part of the planned evaluations. Progress will be measured against the results of the baseline survey to be carried out during the first year of the project.

To measure progress at the purpose level, project staff will be required to compile and analyze data supplied by all grantees, accompanied by its own observations and those of experts hired for evaluations.

Progress at the goal level will be tracked primarily through periodic review of State Department reports, such as the annual human rights report, as well as by the project committee's assessment subcommittee which is described in Section VI. B. below.

V. PROJECT ANALYSES

A. Social and Political Feasibility

The diversity of the populations, history and institutions of southern Africa's eleven countries inhibit generalization. There are democratic aspects to traditional practices among some ethnic groups, while other groups, e.g. the Zulus, have long functioned in a hierarchical mode. Extended periods of paternalistic expatriate rule -- four centuries in the case of Angola and Mozambique -- may have extinguished participatory expectations among that portion of the local populations brought under effective colonial administration. In more recent times, recruitment for work abroad and urbanization have significantly altered the value systems of millions of southern Africans. One, therefore, cannot credibly contend that the successful democratization of the southern Africa region as a whole is assured because democracy responds to broadly shared traditional values or practices.

However, democracy's strength lies in its appeal. The desire of southern Africans to construct democratic societies, even if they have imperfect understanding of the mechanics of democracy, has been widely reported by the media, U.S. diplomats and scholars. It is evident also in the number of recent democratic transformations in the region. Popular pressure has brought an end to authoritarian governments in Zambia and Malawi, and significant liberalization of the governments in Tanzania and Lesotho. Democracy is the goal of the peace processes underway in Mozambique and Angola. Majority rule was achieved in South Africa because all communities in that country eventually agreed that real democracy was the most desirable outcome to the political struggle underway for decades.

Frequently-voiced claims that only a miniscule percentage of the southern African population actually is engaged in the region's political life may have some basis in fact for a Mozambique emerging from almost two decades of war, for an Angola still at war, for a Swaziland which remains a monarchy and for Zimbabwe, where apathy results in very low voter turnout. However, political participation is more widespread and growing in other countries of the region. Press and diplomatic reporting on the recent elections in South Africa highlighted the widespread political consciousness of its people. The urbanization of Zambia, where over 40% of the population lives in cities, draws its citizens into national political life. The high voter turnout for Malawi's referendum and national elections also was inconsistent with claims that few southern Africans are politically active. Even where conflict and disappointment have retarded or eroded interest in democracy, it has energetic champions. Therefore, only in an Angola still at war is the SARDF an impractical vehicle to support democratization.

Elsewhere in the region the SARDF is politically and socially feasible because popular attitudes are favorable and pro-democracy activists are sufficiently well organized and bold to use SARDF grants to achieve project objectives. Even in Zimbabwe, pro-democracy forces are winning significant concessions from government, e.g. greater press freedom and the return to public ownership of state lands given to cabinet ministers. The recent transformation of authoritarian regimes into functioning democracies makes it clear that local constraints to democratization are not absolute impediments but indeed can be rolled back.

Moreover, through several successive administrations U.S. national leaders have made support for democratization a principal foreign policy objective. Even though it may not be possible to demonstrate mathematically that chances of success are equal to those resulting from donor investments in agriculture, physical infrastructure or health care, the instructions of the President and of the Congress are clear: USAID is to invest in democratization wherever the process enjoys the degree of broad-based support evident in southern Africa. Prudent experimentation is encouraged, and the testing of new approaches is not to be restricted to computer screens but is to take place in the field.

The direct beneficiaries of the project will be first and foremost, those organizations and individuals receiving grants or grant-supported training, technical assistance, and commodities to enhance their skills, knowledge and capacity to promote democratic values and processes. Another broader group of beneficiaries are those individuals who are members of assisted organizations, or who will receive information, tools or education which utilizes materials developed by assisted organizations. The indirect beneficiaries of the project will be all of the people of southern Africa, for democratic governments are unlikely to go to war with each other, to abuse their own citizens or to fail to respond to emergencies which threaten the lives or the health of the population. To try to equalize benefits for the various segments of southern African societies, special attention will be given to funding activities or organizations which reach beyond urban centers to rural areas. Activities which target broadly will have priority over those which focus on very particular needs. The print and electronic media will be encouraged to publicize democracy support activities to maximize public awareness of potential individual benefits.

Given the prevalence of discriminatory treatment of women in southern Africa which has constrained their full participation in their nations' political life, the SARDF will make special efforts to address gender concerns, as explained above. The existing networks of women's advocacy groups will be encouraged to extend their range throughout the entire region, and to broaden their membership. The SARDF will be responsive to proposals to organize programs for particular groups of women, e.g. female

legislators. Gender representativeness will be one criteria employed in deciding which proposals will be funded.

Equal access to project benefits by people of various ethnic identities will be among the guidelines for awarding SARDF grants. One way to try to achieve this goal will be to make ethnic inclusiveness a factor in deciding which proposals are to be supported. The secretariat also will be instructed to remain alert to any signs that some minority groups are being further marginalized in the process of democratization. The SARDF will look favorably at proposals to establish "rights awareness" and other special programs for minorities which face discriminatory treatment. The project's focus on spreading knowledge of conflict resolution techniques will be another means of confronting the threat of violence to which some ethnic minorities are exposed.

B. Economic Feasibility

The economic benefits and costs associated with increased democratization are difficult to measure directly. However, there is little doubt that the costs of non-democratic political systems in the region have been considerable. Concentration of political power in the hands of authoritarian rulers and of their supporting elites, and the misguided attempts of some of these leaders to replicate the failed command economies of the former eastern bloc, are among the most widely accepted explanations for the post-colonial decline in living standards in many African states. The pursuit of selfish interests by narrowly based governing groups have led to war, famine, and despair. Finally, the failure of these political systems has led to the diversion of donor funds and national resources from productive investments to expenditures on emergency relief, peacekeeping, and rehabilitation activities.

Experience in Latin America, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union over the past decade indicates that the transition to democracy and a market-based economy could bring significant economic and financial gains to the citizens and countries of the southern Africa region. That same experience indicates that there is no firm guarantee that democratization will automatically and quickly improve either the quality of economic decision making or the economic well-being of a country's citizenry.

In spite of the above caveat, it is generally accepted that for a country to attract domestic and international investment, the national government must create an open and transparent economic system with a legal, regulatory, and judicial framework that clearly spells out the rules of the game for investors. It is here, by helping to improve the enabling environment, that the SARDF can have significant impact: through the creation of a more participatory political process at the local, state, national, and regional levels,

SARDF can play an important role in helping the citizens of southern Africa define with their elected officials and establish the appropriate enabling investment environment. As participation in the political process increases, the demand for more open and transparent transactions at all levels of government should occur in both the political and economic spheres. In the latter case, the increased insistence on clear rules and fair treatment should move a country toward the adoption and/or strengthening of a market-based economic system.

Democratization should produce other benefits for the economic system. Broadening the economic policy-making process to take into consideration the views of those actors most involved in economic activity may produce results more consistent with production and market possibilities. Holding democratically elected officials accountable to their constituents for the officials' decisions may improve the quality of economic policies. Making these officials answerable to the press, to legislative scrutiny, and to the penalties imposed by impartial court systems should help curb theft and export of capital needed for domestic investment. Empowering women will unleash the productive potential of a major segment of the population, without whose participation long-term economic development cannot be sustained.

The benefits to be derived from the SARDF are likely to be significant politically and economically. If one accepts the argument that democracy is a necessary condition in the long-run for a market-based economy, and that the latter is the most efficient form of an economy, the increase in benefits in a traditional cost-benefit analysis, however derived, would likely be extremely large and produce a significant B/C ratio at a high rate of return. Accepting that as the case, it is then necessary to assure that the project employs the least-cost approach to attain the assumed level of benefits. The decision to make the project regional rather than bilateral should ensure that the least-cost approach has been selected given the economies of scale that should result from having consultancies and training workshops that benefit multiple countries, and transferring experience from one country to another. The provisions for the grant (sub-project) selection process will assure that benefits are maximized and the least-cost approach is maintained at the micro level. In addition, as the following paragraphs indicate, the design team considered several management arrangements before arriving at the least-cost one presented in this document.

One option given consideration early in project design was to augment the budgets of bilateral democracy/governance projects, which exist or are planned for seven of the eleven countries of the region. The most obvious drawback of this approach is that it would do nothing to support democratization in four of the countries of the region, including Zimbabwe -- one of the most economically and politically important -- where

there are no bilateral democracy/governance projects operating or planned, or where bilateral missions are scheduled to close out. This option also would have entailed higher administrative costs associated with increased staff and operating expenses required to handle additional grants in each of the bilateral projects. More importantly, it would have frustrated the desire of stakeholders -- as well as the intent of the Administration and the Congress -- to promote regional cooperation through networking, problem-solving, and sharing of experiences by southern Africans since it would be impossible to fund regional or multi-country activities. For all these reasons, this option was soon rejected.

Other options considered for administering the regional Democracy Fund were to contract out the administrative functions to a private firm, or to award a cooperative agreement to a competitively-selected NGO or consortia, as discussed in Section III A. above. Both of these options were determined to be more costly than the option recommended: approximately 30% more for the cooperative agreement and 80-100% more for the private contractor, due primarily to overhead expenses. Perhaps more significant than the cost issue, however, was the fact that these options reduced USAID's direct involvement and control in what may be politically sensitive decisions and relationships with grantees, and inserted an intermediary whose interest may not have been fully compatible with those of USAID. For these reasons, the project team concluded that the least cost option, and the one which allowed the desired degree of management control, was the best option: to administer the project directly through USAID-hired personal services contractors.

C. Institutional Analysis

For most of southern Africa, the shared experience of British colonial rule has created commonalities of political institutions and culture which facilitate regional cooperation. As members of the lusophone community, Mozambique and Angola enjoy similar links. Thus, on either side of a language divide which itself is contracting, schools, courts, legislatures, the press and other basic institutions share overlapping traditions, role models and values. These similarities and associated cultural empathy greatly facilitate regional cooperation. Illustrative of regional cooperation is the fact that representatives of the African National Congress have sought the advice of their anglophone neighbors on how they should handle particular problems of governance in South Africa, e.g. integration of eighteen school systems following the April 1994 elections.

A shared commitment to the struggle against the apartheid regime in South Africa led to the establishment of the Frontline States (FLS) grouping, later expanded to

become what is now the Southern Africa Development Community (SADC). Its members, which include both the anglophone and lusophone countries of the area, have over a decade's successful experience working together on an agenda which recently was expanded to include collaboration in support of human rights and democracy. Although this agenda is still in its infancy, the positive track records of the FLS and SADC indicate that the SARDF has a greater chance for success than regional cooperation initiatives which donors have tried to stimulate elsewhere in Africa without this history of local collaboration on which to build.

There are literally thousands of NGOs in southern Africa. A noticeable difference between southern Africa and other areas of the continent is the degree to which the NGO sector is politically active. This is a direct result of the political conflicts the region has experienced in recent years. During the struggles for independence in Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa, there was little room for apolitical organizations to operate given the regimes' repression and socioeconomic policies. In states where independent minded persons were denied the opportunity for free association and open expression within systems dominated by single parties, many took refuge in civil society groups. While some of these individuals have moved into the political arena following the demise of single party structures, many remain in the NGO community.

Although different experiences have influenced the NGO sector in each country, there is common ground in the influence the region's particular history has had on the definition of what NGOs are and do. Some of the NGOs are local self-help, service delivery groups unlikely to interact on a regional basis. Yet, there also are scores of NGOs which do have the capacity to expand their current national efforts in the democracy and governance arena to address truly regional issues. Their sectors of involvement, individual technical competence, and institutional capabilities are such that their services will be needed as southern Africa goes through enormous changes in the years ahead. SARDF will provide an opportunity for some of these organizations to build their capacity to function as regional institutions of civil society.

The capacities of individual NGOs and of national NGO networks have been strengthened by foreign aid, including that furnished within the context of USAID democracy/governance projects. Many of these groups successfully manage their own projects, and can utilize and account for donor funds. Examples are the Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP) and the NGO Coordinating Committee (NGOCC) in Zambia. The former has 3,000 volunteers engaged in civic education and, thanks to USAID support, has been able to hire six professional staffers. NGOCC is an umbrella organization for 40 NGOs primarily concerned with women's issues in Zambia. It has two professionals on its staff. Leaders of these organizations and of many more like

them throughout southern Africa told ISA design team members that they are anxious to participate in regional workshops, seminars, exchanges, internships, etc.

Professional groups and other institutions already operating on the same regional basis as proposed for the SARDF include trade unions, journalists, broadcasters, legislators and a few Christian churches. While some of these networks are just establishing themselves, the Southern African Trade Union Coordinating Council and the churches have track records which also testify to the feasibility of successful regional cooperation. The Southern Africa Research and Documentation Center has a solid record of achievement undertaking research and publication throughout the area. Several organizations operate successfully in parts of southern Africa, e.g. Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA).

Nascent regional institutions include the Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA), the Southern Africa Broadcasters' Association, and a fledgling grouping of parliamentarians. The expectations of positive benefits from regional cooperation which prompted the establishment of these networks should facilitate formation of the additional regional networks southern African interlocutors suggested that the SARDF support, e.g. one for human rights organizations.

For now, the paramount regional organization in southern Africa is SADC, and it is formally committed to a democratic future for the region. It recently has tried to assert leadership in moving southern Africa in that direction. With substantial USAID support it hosted major regional conferences on democratization and on human rights in 1994. Its secretariat is anxious to work with USAID on all aspects of the ISA. An outstanding problem with SADC, however, is local NGO resentment of its secretariat's proprietary attitude toward regional initiatives. NGO representatives objected strongly to the secretariat's proposal that it play the lead role in coordinating NGO democratization activities when the secretariat advanced that proposition at the democratization conference. Given its charter SADC is almost certain to play a significant coordinating role on democratization once the secretariat and the NGOs reach agreement of the definition of that role.

Few institutional changes will be required for successful implementation of the project. No formal modification of government structures will be sought by the project, which is expected to work primarily with NGOs. Even programs involving government officials probably will be run by NGOs, e.g. workshops for legislators. Governments will have to learn to tolerate a higher level of NGO activity. In some countries, changes are needed in tax codes and other legislation to remove constraints to NGO establishment or growth.

While there inevitably will be disputes between individual governments and some NGOs operating within their boundaries, governments in the area generally are well disposed to NGOs. Compared to the rest of Africa, nations in the southern Africa region are far advanced in the establishment of effective interest groups and a variety of civic and political associations. The universally acknowledged attributes of such groups include alternative paths to train future leaders in the organizational skills needed to solve societal problems, and widespread participation in the political process, making government more open and responsive by giving voice and political empowerment to minority group members and to women. Obviously, the project is unlikely to be able to function in Angola while that nation remains in a state of war. The possibility of conducting project activities in Mozambique will depend on continuation of the ongoing peace process.

While friction inevitably does and will arise between some southern African governments and those groups likely to be receiving SARDF grants, this friction is not likely to make it impossible for grant recipients to achieve their objectives.

D. Environmental Considerations: A Categorical Exclusion exempting the SARDF project from the requirements of an Initial Environmental Examination (IEE) was signed by the Bureau Environmental Officer on March 3, 1995 (see Annex E).

E. Principal Assumptions and Risks

The principal assumption behind the creation of the Democracy Fund is that southern African organizations and leaders have not only the interest, but the motivation and capacity to work regionally to further democratization. There is strong evidence that many organizations have the interest, as witnessed by the views expressed by stakeholders during project design.

Yet, the capacity and motivation of southern African groups to work regionally remains uncertain. A serious impediment to the international aspects of a regional project like SARDF is the weakness of the national structures of many of the organizations which are expected to work in collaboration with their counterparts elsewhere in the region. Human rights organizations, women's advocacy groups, student representatives frequently have no professional staff or offices and sometimes no budget beyond the personal resources of the founder and his or her associates. In literally dozens of interviews, southern African NGO representatives said that their ability to network regionally would not exist unless they received help strengthening their own organizations prior to or simultaneously with efforts to create regional links. For this reason, the SARDF grants provide for both capacity-building activities as well as

networking and other program activities for NGOs, but within a regional context. This assistance is expected to complement that available from other sources. For example, most of USAID's bilateral democracy and governance projects in the region include capacity-building for local NGOs as one of their primary activities, and other donors also provide considerable support for NGO development.

Also, it is still an open question as to how many organizations will come forward with well-conceived proposals for funding under the SARDF. The greatest risk faced by this demand-driven project is, therefore, that there will be an insufficient number of good proposals to fully utilize the Fund. However, this risk is seen to be slight, and the project has been designed to minimize it. Some southern African groups have already discussed ideas for regional activities with project design team members, and a few even handed over copies of proposals. If proposals are not deemed to be adequate, project staff will be able to help organizations refine them. Also, should there be an insufficient number of proposals in any of the three focus areas, the project committee may decide to issue an RFA to encourage pre-proposals. In fact, there is a greater likelihood that more proposals will be submitted than can be funded in any given year.

Another concern is that the lusophone countries -- Angola and Mozambique -- will not participate in SARDF-funded activities due to language differences and to the unsettled political situation in those countries. Special efforts will be made, in conjunction with bilateral mission coordinators, to identify potential participants from the lusophone countries and to encourage their participation in the SARDF.

VI. FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

A. Financial Plan and Method of Financing

Table 1 below provides an illustrative budget for the life of the project. Grants to indigenous organizations (the SARDF) have been budgeted at a level of $10 million, which is expected to fund an estimated 120 grants over five years. Based on the experience of other USAID democracy projects in the region, and knowledge of the types of organizations that are likely to submit proposals, the average grant size is expected to range from $50,000 - $100,000. However, a few grants in the range of $100,000 - $250,000 are expected to be awarded each year. This means that approximately 20-30 grants will be made during each full project year. Costs associated with managing the Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund -- including promotion, assistance with proposal preparation, grant review, monitoring, audits and evaluation -- have been calculated at $3.5 million over five years.

The project will be authorized under the Development Fund for Africa. Funds will be obligated through direct USAID grants and contracts, due to the regional nature of the project and the absence of any appropriate multilateral, governmental or non-governmental organization in the region to which to obligate funds. Grant obligations are estimated to total $10,000,000 under the SARDF. Approximately $3,500,000 will be awarded as contracts for project management costs, monitoring, audits and evaluations.

With social equity and civic participation now considered by Congress to be tied to long term economic development, the SARDF meets the DFA requirements that projects financed with money from the DFA contribute to long-term and sustainable economic development and growth.

TABLE 1

SOUTHERN AFRICAN DEMOCRACY FUND

BUDGET*

	LOP
1. Democracy Fund Grants	$10,000,000
2. Project Management	
Personnel Expenses	1,844,000
Office Expenses	367,000
Travel	365,000
Publicity	5,000
Project Committee	138,000
3. Audits, Evaluations & Financial Reviews	500,000
4. Baseline and Monitoring Studies	125,000
Subtotal	13,144,000
5. Contingency	156,000
TOTAL	**$13,500,000**

* For a more detailed breakdown of operating expenses, see Annex C.

B. Obligation Schedule

Obligations are estimated to be made according to the following schedule:

FY 1995	$1,000,000
FY 1996	$2,500,000
FY 1997	$3,500,000
FY 1998	$3,500,000
FY 1999	$2,500,000
FY 2000	$500,000

The fact that funds must be obligated by either direct grants to recipient organizations or by contracts -- rather than to a single government or international entity -- means that it may be difficult to obligate exactly the amount of funds projected above in any given year. However, the staffing and management arrangements have been planned in such a way as to be able to meet obligation requirements over the life of the project.

C. Audits and Financial Tracking

Two audits of the project have been scheduled: one for year three and the other for the end of the project. In addition to the projet audits of the SARDF as a whole, audits will be required for any grant under the Democracy Fund that exceeds $100,000, per Agency guidance.

Care will be exercised to ensure that all grantees have the capability to manage and account for grant funds. A financial review will be performed of all grantees that have not previously been certified as grantworthy. Arrangements for such reviews will be made with a major accounting firm or firms based in the southern Africa region, preferably through a regional Indefinite Quantity Contract for financial services. Procedures will be put in place, and grant provisions employed, that mandate sound funds management -- including rapid liquidation of any advances and return of unused

funds. Grantees will be required to report on funds utilization. Project management staff will monitor compliance with grant provisions, and together with the Project Officer and Controller staff, maintain current records on all project funds obligated and expended.

VII. PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION

A. The Project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

1. Project Monitoring

As explained above, the monitoring of project and grant activities will be an ongoing process with responsibilities shared by Regional Center staff, project management staff, and the project committee. The USAID project officer, professional project staff, and project committee members will all participate in some grantee activities (workshops, seminars, reading of materials produced, etc.), make site visits, and review progress reports required of all grantees. While project staff will have the most direct and continuing responsibility for monitoring grantees, both the USAID project officer and the project committee will provide oversight of the secretariat staff. The USAID project officer and/or project staff will annually visit each country which has received grants to meet with grant recipients and beneficiaries. In addition, USAID Missions and Embassies in countries where project activities take place, particularly the designated "coordinators," will be encouraged to inform the project officer of any problems and successes encountered or anticipated with a SARDF-funded activity.

The project staff, in their capacity as "secretariat," will also prepare progress reports on a schedule determined by the USAID project officer and the project committee. These reports will include financial data on grants as well as performance information on progress towards achieving project results. These reports will serve as inputs into the Regional Center's semi-annual project implementation reports and Action Plans, which provide the basis for senior Agency management review; and will also be used by the project committee during its annual meetings as a way to track performance.

2. Evaluation Plan

An "assessment" and two evaluations are planned for the SARDF. An assessment will be undertaken following the development of the Regional Center for Southern Africa's long-term strategy -- which is to include a revised democracy and governance

strategy -- to determine whether the SARDF purpose or components should be modified to better facilitate attainment of the strategic objective for the democracy component of the strategy. This assessment, and any changes which it requires, have tentatively been scheduled for completion during the period October - December 1996.

The two evaluations include a mid-term evaluation in mid-1998, and a final evaluation in October 2000. Both evaluations will address issues related to 1) financial and administrative management, as well as 2) substantive progress in achieving project objectives. The mid-term evaluation is expected to focus more on the first set of issues, and the final evaluation on the latter set. Issues in the first category include the effectiveness of the professional staff in managing the SARDF, and in particular the quality of their relationships with the project committee and the bilateral missions in the region; the effectiveness of grantees in developing and administering grants; and the ability of the staff to meet obligation deadlines. Also, the question of how well complementarity with bilateral democracy programs is being assured should be addressed. Issues in the second category include the distribution of grant proposals among the three output areas and whether targets will be achieved. Indicators to be used in assessing performance are those specified in the logical framework (Annex A), and any modifications thereto subsequently approved by the project committee.

In addition, the mid-term evaluation will be asked to explore the question of whether the Democracy Fund should be given a more permanent institutional base to continue beyond the PACD. The scopes of work for these evaluations will be prepared by the project officer, with assistance as needed from the Global Bureau Democracy Center and the REDSO/ESA Democracy/Governance Advisor.

B. Impact Assessment

Project impact will be assessed in a variety of ways under the SARDF. Each grantee will be required to include in its grant proposal the criteria by which success of its activities will be determined, how it will be measured, and then to report on whether success was achieved. Assessments will also be made by project staff and committee members participating in grantee activities. These two types of assessments will be used by the evaluation teams to determine whether the project is having the desired impact by measuring progress in achieving indicators at the purpose level. The final evaluation will also look at unintended or unplanned impacts of grant-funded programs, either positive or negative.

In addition to these periodic assessments of impact, the SARDF plans to establish a semi-permanent structure to track progress against democracy indicators for the regional program at the goal, purpose, and output levels. Two models for this structure are being considered, but it will be left to the project committee to decide which structure to adopt. The first model is to create an democracy assessment sub-committee of the project committee, whose role would be to reach agreement on the key indicators that should be tracked, to collect baseline data on these indicators, and then to collect information each year of the project for analysis of performance against the baseline. This subcommittee would report back to the full project committee each year. As required, appropriate compensation would be provided to members for work on data collection and analysis.

A second model would be to contract out (or provide a grant) to an independent organization or commission responsibility for collecting baseline data and for monitoring progress region-wide against pre-determined democracy indicators. There are several regional groups in existence or in the process of being formed which may have an interest in playing such a role, which could evolve into an independent democracy watch for the region. In either case, the idea is to engage southern Africans in the process of monitoring the progress of democracy in the region. If the individuals involved are respected, independent, and non-partisan, the group could have a voice that is heard beyond the realm of the USAID project, and could thus make its own contribution to strengthening democratic values and processes in the southern Africa region.

If successful, the SARDF will have an impact that extends beyond the realm of democracy groups and individuals. By increasing the participation of all members of society in political life, broadening the range of groups involved in decision-making, and holding elected officials accountable, it will contribute toward achievement of the primary goal of the Initiative for Southern Africa, which is stimulation of equitable, sustainable, economic growth in a democratic southern Africa.

LIST OF ANNEXES

A. Logical Framework

B. Grant Guidelines

C. Financial Plan

D. Bilateral D/G Projects in the Region

E. Initial Environmental Examination

F. Statutory Checklist

G. List of People Interviewed

H. Background Document

I. Scope of Work for Project Managers

Annex A

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Result	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
Subgoal: Create a cluster of well-functioning democracies in the southern Africa region.	- Free and fair periodic local, subnational, and national elections held in all countries - Citizens have rights respected and protected - A diverse and active civic society - A functioning system of checks and balances among branches of government	- Embassy political reporting - Annual Human Rights Report - NGO reports (e.g. Freedom House)	- Absence of interstate or intrastate armed conflict - Countries' laws do not inhibit freedom of association and expression - All countries have or are establishing tripartite systems of government
Purpose: Enhance the skills, knowledge base and capacity of individuals and organizations working to strengthen democratic values and processes.	- Increased number of organizations able to play effective roles in promoting democratic processes and values, as measured by the average number of citizens reached and the quality and utility of the information provided[1] - Assisted organizations reporting an increase in the number and/or scope of civic action programs and individual participation therein	- Reports by grantees - Site visits, interviews, and surveys conducted by project staff as summarized in periodic reports - Reports by "assessment subcommittee" on impact of assistance	- No restrictions on intra-regional travel and communications between countries
Outputs: 1. Enhanced skills of southern African legislators which enable them to improve the management and efficiency of legislative processes.	1. Number of legislators employing the skills or techniques transmitted through project-supported activities (Target: 250 of 500 trained)	- Grantee reports - Observation by project staff, USAID project officer, and Embassy staff - Site visits, surveys, and interviews conducted by project staff - Evaluation reports (including qualitative assessments by experts)	

[1]A study will be undertaken during the first year of the project to provide a baseline against which progress can be measured, and to assist the project committee in establishing appropriate targets.

Result	Indicators	Means of Verification	Assumptions
2. Improved capacity of civil society groups to develop, use and disseminate information and tools essential to informed citizen participation in a democracy. 3. Women and women's organizations empowered to participate more fully in the democratic political process.	2a. Number of organizations which improve and/or increase their civic education activities (Target: 50) 2b. Number of organizations which engage in development and dissemination of democracy-building information for first time as a result of the project (Target: 20) 2c. Number of organizations employing new or improved approaches for increasing citizen participation in elected government (Target: 25 among 5 countries) 3a. Number of assisted women's groups/networks which undertake new advocacy programs (Target: 10 among 5 countries) 3b. Number of women employing the skills or techniques learned through project-funded activities (Target: 100 in 5 countries)	- Grantee reports - Observation by project staff, USAID project officer, and Embassy staff - Site visits, surveys, and interviews conducted by project staff - Evaluation reports (including qualitative assessments by experts) - Project "assessment subcommittee" reports	- Cultural mores in southern African countries will not prohibit women from playing a more active political role.
Inputs: $10 million Democracy Fund grants to southern African organizations $2.9 million project administration $375,000 monitoring and evaluation	- 20-30 grants per year, and 120 total for LOP - contracts signed for project staff, office facilities, project committee meetings and audits; grants for honoraria - contracts for studies	- Reports by Project Staff - Annual Project Implementation Reports - Project Files - Reports by audit/evaluation teams, baseline survey	- USAID resources are available when needed.

ANNEX B

GRANT GUIDELINES

To be eligible for SADF funding, grant proposals must comply with the following guidelines:

Eligibility

1. The proposal must originate with a southern African NGO, government, or with a southern African regional organization. American organizations or firms may participate as collaborators at the behest of southern African organizations, but they may not be grantees.

2. The activity to be financed must be of a regional nature, i.e. its beneficiaries must be from two or more southern African states.

3. The proposed activity must contribute toward achieving one of the three objectives or "results" specified in the project paper, namely:

- enhance the skills of southern African legislators with the aim of improving the management and effectiveness of legislative processes

- improve the capacity of civil society groups to develop, use and disseminate information and tools essential to informed citizen participation in a democracy

- women's organizations empowered to participate more fully in the democratic political process.

4. Eligible activities include, but are not limited to: training -- in the form of workshops, courses, exchanges, internships; conferences and seminars; technical assistance; research; development, testing, and dissemination of educational materials, including pamphlets, books, videos, radio and television programs; identification and dissemination of tools and techniques for involving citizens in political processes; and commodities.

Proposals must include the following:

1. The purpose of the proposed activity must be clearly stated and must address one of the targets identified in the project paper.

2. The proposal must clearly describe what activities will be undertaken, and who will benefit -- the target groups, and number of people by country. Concern for gender equity should be reflected in proposals, and efforts made to ensure that no less than 30% of the beneficiaries of any activity are women.

3. The proposal must identify anticipated accomplishments, quantified insofar as practical, and how achievement of the objectives will be measured and reported. If workshops or training are provided, provision must be made for participant evaluations, and a mechanism outlined for tracking whether skills are utilized upon return to participants' home organization.

4. The proposal must specify how the activity will be managed, and the division of roles and responsibilities between participating partners. Implementation must be within the management capability of the organization designated to undertake any activity.

5. Proposals must detail the principal costs involved, and those for transportation, lodging, honoraria, etc. should be modest by local standards. Requests for funds to purchase equipment should indicate what maintenance facilities are available locally as well as the availability of funds for maintenance and repair. Costs for equipment or other commodities should not as a general rule exceed $10,000.

6. Proposals should indicate what other funding sources have been asked to provide or are already providing resources for the activity, including contributions made by the grantee organization itself and its partners.

7. As a general rule, the total amount of funding requested should not exceed $250,000 per proposal.

8. Applicants for grants must agree to provide all financial and other records required by USAID and auditors. Grants of more than $100,000 must include an audit plan.

Restrictions

1. Travel out of the southern African region will be authorized only for technical assistance personnel coming from outside the region.

2. Qualified southern Africans will be employed in technical assistance and consulting roles whenever available.

3. Funds will not be available for the purchase or construction of buildings or other facilities.

4. Funds will not be available for the purchase of vehicles.

5. Any assistance to political parties must be available to all democratic political parties operating within the area covered by the proposal.

6. No assistance shall be granted for the purpose of influencing the outcome of an election.

The project committee may wish to give consideration to the following additional factors in considering whether to approve grants:

A. In the event that insufficient funding is available in any one year to fund all proposals, the project committee may want to establish an order of preference for awarding grants. For example, priority may be given to those proposals which: 1) have a higher number of beneficiaries, 2) involve more countries, 3) benefit rural as well as urban populations, 4) benefit groups that have not previously received SARDF funding, 5) have a greater potential for sustainability following the end of USAID funding, and 6) benefit groups that are undertaking democratization activities for the first time.

B. Care must be taken to avoid establishing a pattern of approvals which could provoke accusations of favoring particular ethnic or religious groups.

C. No more than 30% of the grants made annually shall be for applicants from a single southern African country, and no more than 25% of total grants over the life of the project shall benefit any one country in the region.

D. Concern for gender equity shall be evident in the award of grants to women's advocacy groups and to groups in which women occupy significant leadership positions. Proposals

E. Before awarding any grant, the committee must ensure that the recipient organization is grantworthy. If necessary, the project will make arrangements for a financial review of the organization to be carried out.

ANNEX C

FINANCIAL PLAN – OPERATING EXPENSES

% of FY'95	0.417									
Inflation rate	4.00%									
% last year	0.67	Unit Cost ($000)	Units	FY 95 ($000)	FY 96 ($000)	FY 97 ($000)	FY 98 ($000)	FY 99 ($000)	FY 2000 ($000)	Total Row
Personnel Professionals										
U.S. Citizen PSC										
Salary		60,000	5	25,000	62,400	64,896	67,492	70,192	48,666	338,645
Benefits		15,000	5	6,250	15,600	16,224	16,873	17,548	12,167	84,661
Allowances		60,000	5	25,000	62,400	64,896	67,492	70,192	48,666	338,645
Relocation		19,500	2	19,500	–	–	–	–	22,000	41,500
African PSC										
Salary		60,000	5	25,000	62,400	64,896	67,492	70,192	48,666	338,645
Benefits		13,800	5	5,750	14,352	14,926	15,523	16,144	11,193	77,888
Allowances		50,000	5	20,833	52,000	54,080	56,243	58,493	40,555	282,205
Relocation		10,000	2	10,000	–	–	–	–	10,417	20,417
Other Personnel										
Driver: Salary & Benefits		5,600	5	2,333	5,824	6,000	6,200	6,400	3,300	30,057
Secretary: Salary & Ben.		13,200	5	5,500	13,728	14,200	14,800	15,400	8,000	71,628
Commission Members										
Honoraria				1,500	4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	2,500	20,000
Total Personnel Expenses				146,667	292,704	304,118	316,115	328,559	256,131	1,644,293
Travel										
Airfare in region		1,000	130 trips	7,000	28,080	29,203	30,371	31,586	18,250	144,491
Per Diem		120	910 nights	6,000	23,587	24,531	25,512	26,532	15,330	121,492
Local Travel & Misc.		100	910 days	5,000	19,656	20,442	21,260	22,110	8	88,476
Total Travel Expenses				18,000	71,323	74,176	77,143	80,229	33,588	354,459
Office Operations										
Rent		2,000	60 months	10,000	24,960	25,958	26,997	28,077	19,466	135,458
Telephone/Fax		1,200	60 months	6,000	14,976	15,575	16,198	16,846	11,680	81,275
Insurance		200	60 months	1,200	2,496	2,596	2,700	2,808	1,947	13,746
Utilities		100	60 months	600	1,248	1,298	1,350	1,404	973	6,873
Office Supplies		200	60 months	1,200	2,496	2,596	2,700	2,808	1,947	13,746
Security		200	60 months	1,200	2,496	2,596	2,700	2,808	1,947	13,746
Equipment Purchases		20,000	1	20,000	–	–	–	–	–	20,000
Equipment M&R		100	60 months	600	1,248	1,298	1,350	1,404	973	6,873
Vehicle Purchases		35,000	1	35,000	–	–	–	–	–	35,000
Vehicle O&M		500	60 months	2,500	6,240	6,490	6,749	7,019	4,867	33,865
Advertising/Printing				1,500	1,500	1,000	500	250	250	5,000
Total Office Expenses				79,800	57,660	59,406	61,243	63,422	44,050	365,581
Other										
Audits		25,000	2	–	–	25,000	–	25,000	–	50,000
Evaluations		50,000	3	–	50,000	–	50,000	–	50,000	150,000
Financial Assessments		5,000	60	–	75,000	75,000	75,000	60,000	15,000	300,000
Studies				–	75,000	12,500	12,500	12,500	12,500	125,000
Project Meetings		18,000	6	28,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	118,000
Total Other Expenses				28,000	218,000	130,500	155,500	115,500	95,500	743,000
Sub–Total Operating Expenses				272,467	639,687	568,201	610,001	587,711	429,268	3,107,333
Contingency @ 5%				13,623	31,984	28,410	30,500	29,386	21,463	155,367
Total Project Operating Expenses				286,090	671,672	596,611	640,501	617,096	450,731	3,262,700

Notes

1. Figures for benefits, allowances, relocation costs, local salaries and office expenses are based on data obtained from USAID Gaborone.
2. An inflation factor of 4% per annum has been employed for personnel, travel and office expenses.

Stauffer:afr/sa:5/31/95;O:\sapub\123data\finplan

ANNEX D

LIST OF BILATERAL DEMOCRACY/GOVERNANCE PROJECTS

COUNTRY	PROJECT SUMMARY	STATUS
Angola	In support of a new strategic objective of "promoting Angola's transition from a wartime footing to a stable, peaceful and democratic society," a new project is planned that would provide assistance in the following areas: training of trainers on the basic tenets of democracy, grass-roots governance, and the functioning of free market economic systems; support for the National Assembly, including technical assistance and training to enhance the policy analysis and legislative skills of parliamentarians and to develop effective parliamentary committees; technical assistance to enhance the independence and professionalism of the judiciary; training for indigenous NGOs working to promote human rights and legal reform; creation of a human rights ombudsman network; establishment of locally-based conflict resolution bodies; expert advice on legal and regulatory system reform; and support for NGO education and legal aid projects that enhance the status of women.	Planned FY 96
Malawi	USAID/Malawi focuses resources throughout its portfolio on increasing the participation of Malawians in both transparent and accountable political institutions and economic opportunities. Through 1994, efforts were directed at supporting the Electoral Commission in developing procedures and rules for new electoral laws, strengthening the ability of political parties to compete in the 1994 national elections, broadening the nascent human rights movement to monitor human rights practices, and nurturing NGOs seeking to promote a democratic culture. Since the successful outcome of the 1994 multi-party elections, assistance has moved beyond electoral support to judicial and constitutional reform, political party development, and fostering of civic and human rights educational organizations.	Ongoing

Mozambique	In 1993-94, the majority of USAID resources were devoted to the critical elections for president and national assembly. These elections were rated free and fair, with 90% of the registered voters going to the polls. Additional assistance was provided to decentralization, and an assessment of the roles and limitations of each level of government. Principal ongoing activities remain support for the Government's decentralization initiatives, including the municipal elections scheduled for 1996; providing focused technical assistance to the Ministry of State Administration; and strengthening voluntary associations -- including the independent media -- for self-governance and citizen advocacy.	Ongoing
Namibia	In support of a new strategic objective "to expand political participation of Namibians in human rights, democracy and governance activities," USAID/Namibia is designing a new project which will strengthen the capacity and skills of parliamentarians to represent their constituents. Assistance will be provided to both houses of the bicameral parliament to research and develop legislative initiatives, develop and use legislative processes effectively, and to conduct ethical and transparent relations with constituents and constituent groups. In addition, the legislative reference library will be strengthened.	Planned
Zambia	The Zambian democracy and governance program was designed to promote market-oriented, sustainable, and broad-based economic growth, in part by encouraging economic and political pluralism. The program consists of several mutually reinforcing initiatives, including the stengthening of civil society by increasing civic awareness of rights and responsibilities; reinforcing an independent media; institutionalizing democratic elections; improving public governance by improving the capability of central government agencies to create better policies and to more effectively supervise and evaluate implementation; encouraging a meaningful policy dialogue between state officials and organized social interests within Zambia; strengthening the performance of the legislature; and building legitimacy for economic and political reform measures.	Ongoing

South Africa	The strategic objective of the South African Democracy and Governance program is "to support fuller participation by the majority population in the political development and governance of a democratic, human rights-based South Africa." USAID assistance is focused on three areas: the transition to democracy, violence mitigation, and public administration and governance. USAID has funded voter education and other elections-related activities, including training for elections monitoring, training of South African political organizations, and technical assistance to South Africans working on the legal framework of the electoral system. In the area of violence mitigation, USAID is providing support for organizations involved in dispute resolution and other activities intended to reduce the level of violence and promote a culture of tolerance. In the area of public administration and governance, through 1994 USAID concentrated funding on training programs to help prepare black South Africans for full and effective participation in the post-apartheid government. New post-election activities include technical assistance and training in support of policy analysis, formulation and implementation for national, regional and local governments, and in administration of justice. USAID will continue to work with NGOs in the areas of institutional development, civic education, mitigation of violence, conflict resolution, human rights, and workers' rights.	Ongoing
Tanzania	In January 1995 Tanzania added a new strategic objective to its program strategy, which is "to strengthen basic institutions of democratic governance." A project now being designed will strengthen civil society in support of the transition to democratic governance in Tanzania by improving the administration of the national court system, improving the quality of media reporting, strengthening women's legal rights NGOs, and assisting in the development of civic education curricula for schools.	Planned

ANNEX E

INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EXAMINATION
OR
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

PROGRAM/PROJECT DATA:

Project Number: 690-0284

Country/Region: Southern Africa Regional

Program/Project Title: Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund

Funding Begin: FY 1995 **Funding End:** FY 1999 **LOP Amount:** $12,500,000
Sub-Activity Amount: $_____

IEE Prepared By: James K. Bishop, AFR/SA/ISA **Date:** August 1994

ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION RECOMMENDED: (Place X where applicable)
Categorical Exclusion: X Negative Determination: ____
Positive Determination: ____ Deferral: ____

ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS: (Place X where applicable)
EMEMP: _____ CONDITIONS: _____ PVO/NGO: _____

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS:

This activity meets the criteria for Categorical Exclusion in accordance with Reg 16 (Section 22 CFR 216.2(c)(1)(i) and 22 CFR 216.2 (c)(2)(i) and (iii) and is therefore excluded from further environmental review.

The project will support the strengthening of democratic institutions and processes in the southern African region. A Democracy Fund will be established to provide grants to southern African public and private institutions for such activities as training, internships, exchanges, workshops, conferences, seminars, short-term technical assistance, policy studies, publication of materials, and limited purchases of commodities such as computers and photocopiers. The project has no component which would directly affect the environment.

APPROVAL OF ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION RECOMMENDED: (Type Name Under Signature Line)

CLEARANCE:
Mission Director: _____ Date: _____

CONCURRENCE:
Bureau Environmental Officer: _____ Date: 2/28/95
John J. Gaudet
Approved: ✓
Disapproved: _____

CLEARANCE:
General Counsel (Africa Bureau) _____ Date: 3/3/95

56

ANNEX F

STATUTORY CHECKLIST

determined that this government has engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights? If so, can it be demonstrated that contemplated assistance will directly benefit the needy?

C. COUNTRY ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA APPLICABLE ONLY TO ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS ("ESF")

Human Rights Violations (FAA Sec. 502B): Has it been determined that the country has engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights? If so, has the President found that the country made such significant improvement in its human rights record that furnishing such assistance is in the U.S. national interest?

5C(2) - ASSISTANCE CHECKLIST

Listed below are statutory criteria applicable to the assistance resources themselves, rather than to the eligibility of a country to receive assistance. This section is divided into three parts. Part A includes criteria applicable to both Development Assistance and Economic Support Fund resources. Part B includes criteria applicable only to Development Assistance resources. Part C includes criteria applicable only to Economic Support Funds.

CROSS REFERENCE: IS COUNTRY CHECKLIST UP TO DATE?

A. CRITERIA APPLICABLE TO BOTH DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AND ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS

1. **Host Country Development Efforts** (FAA Sec. 601(a)): Information and conclusions on whether assistance will encourage efforts of the country to: (a) increase the flow of international trade; (b) foster private initiative and competition; (c) encourage development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and

Successful democratization will increase investors' confidence in political stability, prompting greater investment and foreign trade. Strengthening local NGOs probably will encourage

savings and loan associations; (d) discourage monopolistic practices; (e) improve technical efficiency of industry, agriculture, and commerce; and (f) strengthen free labor unions.

private initiatives and competition. It also will encourage the growth of NGO activity in the economic sector which should counter monopolistic practices and improve efficiency. Trade unions will be direct beneficiaries of the project.

2. **U.S. Private Trade and Investment** (FAA Sec. 601(b)): Information and conclusions on how assistance will encourage U.S. private trade and investment abroad and encourage private U.S. participation in foreign assistance programs (including use of private trade channels and the services of U.S. private enterprise).

American investor interest in the regional market will grow in direct relation to political stability, one of the objectives of democratization.

3. **Congressional Notification**

a. **General requirement** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 515; FAA Sec. 634A): If money is to be obligated for an activity not previously justified to Congress, or for an amount in excess of amount previously justified to Congress, has Congress been properly notified (unless the Appropriations Act notification requirement has been waived because of substantial risk to human health or welfare)?

Yes.

b. **Special notification requirement** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 520): Are all activities proposed for obligation subject to prior congressional notification?

?

c. **Notice of account transfer** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 509): If funds are being obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated, has the President consulted with and provided a written justification to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and has such obligation been subject to regular notification procedures?

N/A
DFA funds

c. **Cash transfers and nonproject sector assistance** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 537(b)(3)): If funds are to be made available in the form of cash transfer or nonproject sector

N/A
Project assistance

59

assistance, has the Congressional notice included a detailed description of how the funds will be used, with a discussion of U.S. interests to be served and a description of any economic policy reforms to be promoted?

4. **Engineering and Financial Plans** (FAA Sec. 611(a)): Prior to an obligation in excess of $500,000, will there be: (a) engineering, financial or other plans necessary to carry out the assistance; and (b) a reasonably firm estimate of the cost to the U.S. of the assistance?

(a) Yes
(b) Yes

5. **Legislative Action** (FAA Sec. 611(a)(2)): If legislative action is required within recipient country with respect to an obligation in excess of $500,000, what is the basis for a reasonable expectation that such action will be completed in time to permit orderly accomplishment of the purpose of the assistance?

No legislative action required.

6. **Water Resources** (FAA Sec. 611(b)): If project is for water or water-related land resource construction, have benefits and costs been computed to the extent practicable in accordance with the principles, standards, and procedures established pursuant to the Water Resources Planning Act (42 U.S.C. 1962, et seq.)? (See A.I.D. Handbook 3 for guidelines.)

Not for water or water related.

7. **Cash Transfer/Nonproject Sector Assistance Requirements** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 537). If assistance is in the form of a cash transfer or nonproject sector assistance:

N/A. Project does not have cash transfer assistance.

a. **Separate account:** Are all such cash payments to be maintained by the country in a separate account and not commingled with any other funds (unless such requirements are waived by Congressional notice for nonproject sector assistance)?

N/A

60

b. **Local currencies:** If assistance is furnished to a foreign government under arrangements which result in the generation of local currencies:

(1) Has A.I.D. (a) required that local currencies be deposited in a separate account established by the recipient government, (b) entered into an agreement with that government providing the amount of local currencies to be generated and the terms and conditions under which the currencies so deposited may be utilized, and (c) established by agreement the responsibilities of A.I.D. and that government to monitor and account for deposits into and disbursements from the separate account? **N/A. No local currency generation.**

(2) Will such local currencies, or an equivalent amount of local currencies, be used only to carry out the purposes of the DA or ESF chapters of the FAA (depending on which chapter is the source of the assistance) or for the administrative requirements of the United States Government? **N/A**

(3) Has A.I.D. taken all appropriate steps to ensure that the equivalent of local currencies disbursed from the separate account are used for the agreed purposes? **N/A**

(4) If assistance is terminated to a country, will any unencumbered balances of funds remaining in a separate account be disposed of for purposes agreed to by the recipient government and the United States Government? **N/A**

8. **Capital Assistance** (FAA Sec. 611(e)): If project is capital assistance (e.g., construction), and total U.S. assistance for it will exceed $1 million, has Mission Director certified and Regional Assistant Administrator taken into consideration the country's capability to maintain and utilize the project effectively? **N/A. Project does not provide capital assistance.**

61

9. **Multiple Country Objectives** (FAA Sec. 601(a)): Information and conclusions on whether projects will encourage efforts of the country to: (a) increase the flow of international trade; (b) foster private initiative and competition; (c) encourage development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations; (d) discourage monopolistic practices; (e) improve technical efficiency of industry, agriculture and commerce; and (f) strengthen free labor unions.

See number 1.

10. **U.S. Private Trade** (FAA Sec. 601(b)): Information and conclusions on how project will encourage U.S. private trade and investment abroad and encourage private U.S. participation in foreign assistance programs (including use of private trade channels and the services of U.S. private enterprise).

See number 2.

11. **Local Currencies**

a. **Recipient Contributions** (FAA Secs. 612(b), 636(h)): Describe steps taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, the country is contributing local currencies to meet the cost of contractual and other services, and foreign currencies owned by the U.S. are utilized in lieu of dollars.

N/A. Regional Project

b. **U.S.-Owned Currency** (FAA Sec. 612(d)): Does the U.S. own excess foreign currency of the country and, if so, what arrangements have been made for its release?

No excess U.S. owned local currency.

12. **Trade Restrictions**

a. **Surplus Commodities** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 513(a)): If assistance is for the production of any commodity for export, is the commodity likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity becomes operative, and is such assistance likely to cause substantial injury to U.S. producers of the same, similar or competing commodity?

N/A. Project is not for production of any commodity for export.

67

b. **Textiles (Lautenberg Amendment)** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 513(c)): Will the assistance (except for programs in Caribbean Basin Initiative countries under U.S. Tariff Schedule "Section 807," which allows reduced tariffs on articles assembled abroad from U.S.-made components) be used directly to procure feasibility studies, prefeasibility studies, or project profiles of potential investment in, or to assist the establishment of facilities specifically designed for, the manufacture for export to the United States or to third country markets in direct competition with U.S. exports, of textiles, apparel, footwear, handbags, flat goods (such as wallets or coin purses worn on the person), work gloves or leather wearing apparel? No.

13. **Tropical Forests** (FY 1991 Appropriations Act Sec. 533(c)(3)(as referenced in section 532(d) of the FY 1993 Appropriations Act): Will funds be used for any program, project or activity which would (a) result in any significant loss of tropical forests, or (b) involve industrial timber extraction in primary tropical forest areas? No.

14. **PVO Assistance**

a. **Auditing and registration** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 568): If assistance is being made available to a PVO, has that organization provided upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of A.I.D., and is the PVO registered with A.I.D.? ?

b. **Funding sources** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act, Title II, under heading "Private and Voluntary Organizations"): If assistance is to be made to a United States PVO (other than a cooperative development organization), does it obtain at least 20 percent of its total annual funding for international activities from sources other than the United States Government? ?

63

15. **Project Agreement Documentation** (State Authorization Sec. 139 (as interpreted by conference report)): Has confirmation of the date of signing of the project agreement, including the amount involved, been cabled to State L/T and A.I.D. LEG within 60 days of the agreement's entry into force with respect to the United States, and has the full text of the agreement been pouched to those same offices? (See Handbook 3, Appendix 6G for agreements covered by this provision).

Confirmation will be cabled.

16. **Metric System** (Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 Sec. 5164, as interpreted by conference report, amending Metric Conversion Act of 1975 Sec. 2, and as implemented through A.I.D. policy): Does the assistance activity use the metric system of measurement in its procurements, grants, and other business-related activities, except to the extent that such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms? Are bulk purchases usually to be made in metric, and are components, subassemblies, and semi-fabricated materials to be specified in metric units when economically available and technically adequate? Will A.I.D. specifications use metric units of measure from the earliest programmatic stages, and from the earliest documentation of the assistance processes (for example, project papers) involving quantifiable measurements (length, area, volume, capacity, mass and weight), through the implementation stage?

N/A. Project will not include significant purchases of commodities.

17. **Abortions** (FAA Sec. 104(f); FY 1994 Appropriations Act, Title II, under heading "Population, DA," and Sec. 518):

a. Are any of the funds to be used for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions?

No.

64.

b. Are any of the funds to be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations?	No.
c. Are any of the funds to be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization?	No.
d. Will funds be made available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services? (As a legal matter, DA only.)	N/A. No funding of family planning projects.
e. In awarding grants for natural family planning, will any applicant be discriminated against because of such applicant's religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning? (As a legal matter, DA only.)	N/A. See above.
f. Are any of the funds to be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates, in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning?	No.
g. Are any of the funds to be made available to any organization if the President certifies that the use of these funds by such organization would violate any of the above provisions related to abortions and involuntary sterilization?	No.
18. Cooperatives (FAA Sec. 111): Will assistance help develop cooperatives, especially by technical assistance, to assist rural and urban poor to help themselves toward a better life?	Cooperatives might participate in training programs for NGOs.

65

19. **U.S.-Owned Foreign Currencies**

a. **Use of currencies** (FAA Secs. 612(b), 636(h); FY 1994 Appropriations Act Secs. 503, 505): Are steps being taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, foreign currencies owned by the U.S. are utilized in lieu of dollars to meet the cost of contractual and other services.

Yes.

b. **Release of currencies** (FAA Sec. 612(d)): Does the U.S. own excess foreign currency of the country and, if so, what arrangements have been made for its release?

U.S. owns no excess local currency.

20. **Procurement**

a. **Small business** (FAA Sec. 602(a)): Are there arrangements to permit U.S. small business to participate equitably in the furnishing of commodities and services financed?

Yes.

b. **U.S. procurement** (FAA Sec. 604(a): Will all procurement be from the U.S., the recipient country, or developing countries except as otherwise determined in accordance with the criteria of this section?

Yes.

c. **Marine insurance** (FAA Sec. 604(d)): If the cooperating country discriminates against marine insurance companies authorized to do business in the U.S., will commodities be insured in the United States against marine risk with such a company?

? check on RSA

d. **Non-U.S. agricultural procurement** (FAA Sec. 604(e)): If non-U.S. procurement of agricultural commodity or product thereof is to be financed, is there provision against such procurement when the domestic price of such commodity is less than parity? (Exception where commodity financed could not reasonably be procured in U.S.)

N/A. No non-U.S. procurement of agricultural products or commodities.

No.

66

e. Construction or engineering services (FAA Sec. 604(g)): Will construction or engineering services be procured from firms of advanced developing countries which are otherwise eligible under Code 941 and which have attained a competitive capability in international markets in one of these areas? (Exception for those countries which receive direct economic assistance under the FAA and permit United States firms to compete for construction or engineering services financed from assistance programs of these countries.)	N/A. No shipping.
f. Cargo preference shipping (FAA Sec. 603)): Is the shipping excluded from compliance with the requirement in section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities (computed separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liners, and tankers) financed shall be transported on privately owned U.S. flag commercial vessels to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates?	Yes.
g. Technical assistance (FAA Sec. 621(a)): If technical assistance is financed, will such assistance be furnished by private enterprise on a contract basis to the fullest extent practicable? Will the facilities and resources of other Federal agencies be utilized, when they are particularly suitable, not competitive with private enterprise, and made available without undue interference with domestic programs?	Yes. Yes.
h. U.S. air carriers (International Air Transportation Fair Competitive Practices Act, 1974): If air transportation of persons or property is financed on grant basis, will U.S. carriers be used to the extent such service is available?	Yes.

67

i. **Consulting services** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 567): If assistance is for consulting service through procurement contract pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, are contract expenditures a matter of public record and available for public inspection (unless otherwise provided by law or Executive order)? **Yes.**

j. **Metric conversion** (Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988, as interpreted by conference report, amending Metric Conversion Act of 1975 Sec. 2, and as implemented through A.I.D. policy): Does the assistance program use the metric system of measurement in its procurements, grants, and other business-related activities, except to the extent that such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms? Are bulk purchases usually to be made in metric, and are components, subassemblies, and semi-fabricated materials to be specified in metric units when economically available and technically adequate? Will A.I.D. specifications use metric units of measure from the earliest programmatic stages, and from the earliest documentation of the assistance processes (for example, project papers) involving quantifiable measurements (length, area, volume, capacity, mass and weight), through the implementation stage? **See number 16.**

k. **Competitive Selection Procedures** (FAA Sec. 601(e)): Will the assistance utilize competitive selection procedures for the awarding of contracts, except where applicable procurement rules allow otherwise? **Yes.**

l. **Chemical Weapons** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 569): Will the assistance be used to finance the procurement of chemicals that may be used for chemical weapons production? **No.**

21. **Construction** **N/A. Not a capital project.**

68

a. **Capital project** (FAA Sec. 601(d)): If capital (e.g., construction) project, will U.S. engineering and professional services be used?	N/A. Not a capital project.
b. **Construction contract** (FAA Sec. 611(c)): If contracts for construction are to be financed, will they be let on a competitive basis to maximum extent practicable?	N/A. No construction contracts anticipated.
c. **Large projects, Congressional approval** (FAA Sec. 620(k)): If for construction of productive enterprise, will aggregate value of assistance to be furnished by the U.S. not exceed $100 million (except for productive enterprises in Egypt that were described in the Congressional Presentation), or does assistance have the express approval of Congress?	N/A. Project will not reach $100 million.
22. **U.S. Audit Rights** (FAA Sec. 301(d)): If fund is established solely by U.S. contributions and administered by an international organization, does Comptroller General have audit rights?	Yes.
23. **Communist Assistance** (FAA Sec. 620(h). Do arrangements exist to insure that United States foreign aid is not used in a manner which, contrary to the best interests of the United States, promotes or assists the foreign aid projects or activities of the Communist-bloc countries?	Yes.
24. **Narcotics**	
a. **Cash reimbursements** (FAA Sec. 483): Will arrangements preclude use of financing to make reimbursements, in the form of cash payments, to persons whose illicit drug crops are eradicated?	Yes.
b. **Assistance to narcotics traffickers** (FAA Sec. 487): Will arrangements take "all reasonable steps" to preclude use of financing to or through individuals or entities which we know or have reason to believe have either: (1) been convicted of a violation of any law	Yes.

69

or regulation of the United States or a foreign country relating to narcotics (or other controlled substances); or (2) been an illicit trafficker in, or otherwise involved in the illicit trafficking of, any such controlled substance?

25. **Expropriation and Land Reform** (FAA Sec. 620(g)): Will assistance preclude use of financing to compensate owners for expropriated or nationalized property, except to compensate foreign nationals in accordance with a land reform program certified by the President? **Yes.**

26. **Police and Prisons** (FAA Sec. 660): Will assistance preclude use of financing to provide training, advice, or any financial support for police, prisons, or other law enforcement forces, except for narcotics programs? **Yes.**

27. **CIA Activities** (FAA Sec. 662): Will assistance preclude use of financing for CIA activities? **Yes.**

28. **Motor Vehicles** (FAA Sec. 636(i)): Will assistance preclude use of financing for purchase, sale, long-term lease, exchange or guaranty of the sale of motor vehicles manufactured outside U.S., unless a waiver is obtained? **Yes.**

29. **Export of Nuclear Resources** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 506): Will assistance preclude use of financing to finance--except for purposes of nuclear safety--the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology? **Yes.**

30. **Publicity or Propaganda** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 557): Will assistance be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress, to influence in any way the outcome of a political election in the United States, or for any publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by Congress? **No. No. No.**

19

31. **Marine Insurance** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 531): Will any A.I.D. contract and solicitation, and subcontract entered into under such contract, include a clause requiring that U.S. marine insurance companies have a fair opportunity to bid for marine insurance when such insurance is necessary or appropriate? No.

32. **Exchange for Prohibited Act** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 533): Will any assistance be provided to any foreign government (including any instrumentality or agency thereof), foreign person, or United States person in exchange for that foreign government or person undertaking any action which is, if carried out by the United States Government, a United States official or employee, expressly prohibited by a provision of United States law? No.

33. **Commitment of Funds** (FAA Sec. 635(h)): Does a contract or agreement entail a commitment for the expenditure of funds during a period in excess of 5 years from the date of the contract or agreement? No.

34. **Impact on U.S. Jobs** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act, Sec. 547):

a. Will any financial incentive be provided to a business located in the U.S. for the purpose of inducing that business to relocate outside the U.S. in a manner that would likely reduce the number of U.S. employees of that business? No.

b. Will assistance be provided for the purpose of establishing or developing an export processing zone or designated area in which the country's tax, tariff, labor, environment, and safety laws do not apply? If so, has the President determined and certified that such assistance is not likely to cause a loss of jobs within the U.S.? No.

11

c. Will assistance be provided for a project or activity that contributes to the violation of internationally recognized workers rights, as defined in section 502(a)(4) of the Trade Act of 1974, of workers in the recipient country, or will assistance be for the informal sector, micro or small-scale enterprise, or smallholder agriculture?

No.

No.

B. CRITERIA APPLICABLE TO DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE ONLY

1. **Agricultural Exports (Bumpers Amendment)** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 513(b), as interpreted by conference report for original enactment): If assistance is for agricultural development activities (specifically, any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training), are such activities: (1) specifically and principally designed to increase agricultural exports by the host country to a country other than the United States, where the export would lead to direct competition in that third country with exports of a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States, and can the activities reasonably be expected to cause substantial injury to U.S. exporters of a similar agricultural commodity; or (2) in support of research that is intended primarily to benefit U.S. producers?

N/A. Project not for agricultural development.

2. **Tied Aid Credits** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act, Title II, under heading "Economic Support Fund"): Will DA funds be used for tied aid credits?

No.

3. **Appropriate Technology** (FAA Sec. 107): Is special emphasis placed on use of appropriate technology (defined as relatively smaller, cost-saving, labor-using technologies that are generally most appropriate for the small farms, small businesses, and small incomes of the poor)?

Yes.

12

4. **Indigenous Needs and Resources** (FAA Sec. 281(b)): Describe extent to which the activity recognizes the particular needs, desires, and capacities of the people of the country; utilizes the country's intellectual resources to encourage institutional development; and supports civic education and training in skills required for effective participation in governmental and political processes essential to self-government.	Project based on southern African requests for assistance, will insist on use of southern Africans as technical assistance providers, and emphasizes civic education.
5. **Economic Development** (FAA Sec. 101(a)): Does the activity give reasonable promise of contributing to the development of economic resources, or to the increase of productive capacities and self-sustaining economic growth?	Yes.
6. **Special Development Emphases** (FAA Secs. 102(b), 113, 281(a)): Describe extent to which activity will: (a) effectively involve the poor in development by extending access to economy at local level, increasing labor-intensive production and the use of appropriate technology, dispersing investment from cities to small towns and rural areas, and insuring wide participation of the poor in the benefits of development on a sustained basis, using appropriate U.S. institutions; (b) encourage democratic private and local governmental institutions; (c) support the self-help efforts of developing countries; (d) promote the participation of women in the national economies of developing countries and the improvement of women's status; and (e) utilize and encourage regional cooperation by developing countries.	6. (a) through support for NGOs will facilitate greater participation of all groups, including poor, is economic policy determinations (b) project directly assists NGOs and local government officials (c) support for NGOs is support for self-help. (d) project will support women's advocacy groups (e) project's primary objective is support for regional cooperation
7. **Recipient Country Contribution** (FAA Secs. 110, 124(d)): Will the recipient country provide at least 25 percent of the costs of the program, project, or activity with respect to which the assistance is to be furnished (or is the latter cost-sharing requirement being waived for a "relatively least developed" country)?	N/A. Regional project.

13

8. **Benefit to Poor Majority** (FAA Sec. 128(b)): If the activity attempts to increase the institutional capabilities of private organizations or the government of the country, or if it attempts to stimulate scientific and technological research, has it been designed and will it be monitored to ensure that the ultimate beneficiaries are the poor majority?	Yes.
9. **Contract Awards** (FAA Sec. 601(e)): Will the project utilize competitive selection procedures for the awarding of contracts, except where applicable procurement rules allow otherwise?	Yes.
10. **Disadvantaged Enterprises** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 558): What portion of the funds will be available only for activities of economically and socially disadvantaged enterprises, historically black colleges and universities, colleges and universities having a student body in which more than 40 percent of the students are Hispanic Americans, and private and voluntary organizations which are controlled by individuals who are black Americans, Hispanic Americans, or Native Americans, or who are economically or socially disadvantaged (including women)?	?
11. **Biological Diversity** (FAA Sec. 119(g): Will the assistance: (a) support training and education efforts which improve the capacity of recipient countries to prevent loss of biological diversity; (b) be provided under a long-term agreement in which the recipient country agrees to protect ecosystems or other wildlife habitats; (c) support efforts to identify and survey ecosystems in recipient countries worthy of protection; or (d) by any direct or indirect means significantly degrade national parks or similar protected areas or introduce exotic plants or animals into such areas?	11. (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (d) No.

12. **Tropical Forests** (FAA Sec. 118; FY 1991 Appropriations Act Sec. 533(c) as referenced in section 532(d) of the FY 1993 Appropriations Act):

a. **A.I.D. Regulation 16:** Does the assistance comply with the environmental procedures set forth in A.I.D. Regulation 16? ?

b. **Conservation:** Does the assistance place a high priority on conservation and sustainable management of tropical forests? Specifically, does the assistance, to the fullest extent feasible: (1) stress the importance of conserving and sustainably managing forest resources; (2) support activities which offer employment and income alternatives to those who otherwise would cause destruction and loss of forests, and help countries identify and implement alternatives to colonizing forested areas; (3) support training programs, educational efforts, and the establishment or strengthening of institutions to improve forest management; (4) help end destructive slash-and-burn agriculture by supporting stable and productive farming practices; (5) help conserve forests which have not yet been degraded by helping to increase production on lands already cleared or degraded; (6) conserve forested watersheds and rehabilitate those which have been deforested; (7) support training, research, and other actions which lead to sustainable and more environmentally sound practices for timber harvesting, removal, and processing; (8) support research to expand knowledge of tropical forests and identify alternatives which will prevent forest destruction, loss, or degradation; (9) conserve biological diversity in forest areas by supporting efforts to identify, establish, and maintain a representative network of protected tropical forest ecosystems on a worldwide basis, by making the establishment of protected areas a condition of support for activities involving forest clearance or degradation, and by helping to identify tropical forest No.

15

ecosystems and species in need of protection and establish and maintain appropriate protected areas; (10) seek to increase the awareness of U.S. Government agencies and other donors of the immediate and long-term value of tropical forests; (11) utilize the resources and abilities of all relevant U.S. government agencies; (12) be based upon careful analysis of the alternatives available to achieve the best sustainable use of the land; and (13) take full account of the environmental impacts of the proposed activities on biological diversity?

c. **Forest degradation:** Will assistance be used for: (1) the procurement or use of logging equipment, unless an environmental assessment indicates that all timber harvesting operations involved will be conducted in an environmentally sound manner and that the proposed activity will produce positive economic benefits and sustainable forest management systems; (2) actions which will significantly degrade national parks or similar protected areas which contain tropical forests, or introduce exotic plants or animals into such areas; (3) activities which would result in the conversion of forest lands to the rearing of livestock; (4) the construction, upgrading, or maintenance of roads (including temporary haul roads for logging or other extractive industries) which pass through relatively undergraded forest lands; (5) the colonization of forest lands; or (6) the construction of dams or other water control structures which flood relatively undergraded forest lands, unless with respect to each such activity an environmental assessment indicates that the activity will contribute significantly and directly to improving the livelihood of the rural poor and will be conducted in an environmentally sound manner which supports sustainable development?

(1) No.
(2) No.
(3) No.
(4) No.
(5) No.
(6) No.

76

d. Sustainable forestry: If assistance relates to tropical forests, will project assist countries in developing a systematic analysis of the appropriate use of their total tropical forest resources, with the goal of developing a national program for sustainable forestry?	N/A
e. Environmental impact statements: Will funds be made available in accordance with provisions of FAA Section 117(c) and applicable A.I.D. regulations requiring an environmental impact statement for activities significantly affecting the environment?	N/A
13. **Energy** (FY 1991 Appropriations Act Sec. 533(c) as referenced in section 532(d) of the FY 1993 Appropriations Act): If assistance relates to energy, will such assistance focus on: (a) end-use energy efficiency, least-cost energy planning, and renewable energy resources, and (b) the key countries where assistance would have the greatest impact on reducing emissions from greenhouse gases?	N/A
14. **Debt-for-Nature Exchange** (FAA Sec. 463): If project will finance a debt-for-nature exchange, describe how the exchange will support protection of: (a) the world's oceans and atmosphere, (b) animal and plant species, and (c) parks and reserves; or describe how the exchange will promote: (d) natural resource management, (e) local conservation programs, (f) conservation training programs, (g) public commitment to conservation, (h) land and ecosystem management, and (i) regenerative approaches in farming, forestry, fishing, and watershed management.	N/A
15. **Deobligation/Reobligation** (FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 510): If deob/reob authority is sought to be exercised in the provision of DA assistance, are the funds being obligated for the same general purpose, and for countries within the same region as originally obligated, and have the House	N/A. No deob/reob authority is sought.

11

and Senate Appropriations Committees been properly notified?

16. **Loans**

a. **Repayment capacity** (FAA Sec. 122(b)): Information and conclusion on capacity of the country to repay the loan at a reasonable rate of interest. N/A. Not a loan.

b. **Long-range plans** (FAA Sec. 122(b)): Does the activity give reasonable promise of assisting long-range plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities? N/A. Not a loan.

c. **Interest rate** (FAA Sec. 122(b)): If development loan is repayable in dollars, is interest rate at least 2 percent per annum during a grace period which is not to exceed ten years, and at least 3 percent per annum thereafter? N/A. Not a loan.

d. **Exports to United States** (FAA Sec. 620(d)): If assistance is for any productive enterprise which will compete with U.S. enterprises, is there an agreement by the recipient country to prevent export to the U.S. of more than 20 percent of the enterprise's annual production during the life of the loan, or has the requirement to enter into such an agreement been waived by the President because of a national security interest? N/A. Not a loan.

17. **Development Objectives** (FAA Secs. 102(a), 111, 113, 281(a)): Extent to which activity will: (1) effectively involve the poor in development, by expanding access to economy at local level, increasing labor-intensive production and the use of appropriate technology, spreading investment out from cities to small towns and rural areas, and insuring wide participation of the poor in the benefits of development on a sustained basis, using the appropriate U.S. institutions; (2) help develop cooperatives, especially by technical assistance, to assist rural and urban poor to help themselves toward better life, and Yes. See 6.

18

otherwise encourage democratic private and local governmental institutions; (3) support the self-help efforts of developing countries; (4) promote the participation of women in the national economies of developing countries and the improvement of women's status; and (5) utilize and encourage regional cooperation by developing countries?

18. **Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition, and Agricultural Research** (FAA Secs. 103 and 103A):

a. **Rural poor and small farmers:** If assistance is being made available for agriculture, rural development or nutrition, describe extent to which activity is specifically designed to increase productivity and income of rural poor; or if assistance is being made available for agricultural research, has account been taken of the needs of small farmers, and extensive use of field testing to adapt basic research to local conditions shall be made.

N/A. Project does not assist agriculture.

b. **Nutrition:** Describe extent to which assistance is used in coordination with efforts carried out under FAA Section 104 (Population and Health) to help improve nutrition of the people of developing countries through encouragement of increased production of crops with greater nutritional value; improvement of planning, research, and education with respect to nutrition, particularly with reference to improvement and expanded use of indigenously produced foodstuffs; and the undertaking of pilot or demonstration programs explicitly addressing the problem of malnutrition of poor and vulnerable people.

Project will not work on the development of foodstuffs or nutrition regimes.

c. **Food security:** Describe extent to which activity increases national food security by improving food policies and management and by strengthening national food reserves, with particular concern for the needs of the poor, through measures encouraging domestic production, building national

Project will not work in the areas of food security.

food reserves, expanding available storage facilities, reducing post harvest food losses, and improving food distribution.

19. **Population and Health** (FAA Secs. 104(b) and (c)): If assistance is being made available for population or health activities, describe extent to which activity emphasizes low-cost, integrated delivery systems for health, nutrition and family planning for the poorest people, with particular attention to the needs of mothers and young children, using paramedical and auxiliary medical personnel, clinics and health posts, commercial distribution systems, and other modes of community outreach.

N/A.

20. **Education and Human Resources Development** (FAA Sec. 105): If assistance is being made available for education, public administration, or human resource development, describe (a) extent to which activity strengthens nonformal education, makes formal education more relevant, especially for rural families and urban poor, and strengthens management capability of institutions enabling the poor to participate in development; and (b) extent to which assistance provides advanced education and training of people of developing countries in such disciplines as are required for planning and implementation of public and private development activities.

(a) Project will encourage civic education in schools and adult education programs well as via the mass media. NGOs with rural outreach will receive special consideration.

(b) N/A

21. **Energy, Private Voluntary Organizations, and Selected Development Activities** (FAA Sec. 106): If assistance is being made available for energy, private voluntary organizations, and selected development problems, describe extent to which activity is:

a. concerned with data collection and analysis, the training of skilled personnel, research on and development of suitable energy sources, and pilot projects to test new methods of energy production; and facilitative of research on and development and use of small-scale, decentralized, renewable

(a) Project does not address energy but will train NGO and selected government officials

80

energy sources for rural areas, emphasizing development of energy resources which are environmentally acceptable and require minimum capital investment;

b. concerned with technical cooperation and development, especially with U.S. private and voluntary, or regional and international development, organizations;

(b) Project will support relations between U.S. and southern Africas NGOs.

c. research into, and evaluation of, economic development processes and techniques;

(c) Project does not address.

d. reconstruction after natural or manmade disaster and programs of disaster preparedness;

(d) Project does not address.

e. for special development problems, and to enable proper utilization of infrastructure and related projects funded with earlier U.S. assistance;

(e) Project does not address.

f. for urban development, especially small, labor-intensive enterprises, marketing systems for small producers, and financial or other institutions to help urban poor participate in economic and social development.

(f) Project does not address.

22. **Capital Projects** (Jobs Through Export Act of 1992, Secs. 303 and 306(d)): **If assistance is being provided for a capital project, is the project developmentally sound and will the project measurably alleviate the worst manifestations of poverty or directly promote environmental safety and sustainability at the community level?**

N/A. Not a capital project.

C. CRITERIA APPLICABLE TO ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDS ONLY

1. **Economic and Political Stability** (FAA Sec. 531(a)): **Will this assistance promote economic and political stability? To the maximum extent feasible, is this assistance consistent with the policy**

N/A

81

directions, purposes, and programs of Part I of the FAA?

2. **Military Purposes** (FAA Sec. 531(e)): Will this assistance be used for military or paramilitary purposes? N/A

3. **Commodity Grants/Separate Accounts** (FAA Sec. 609): If commodities are to be granted so that sale proceeds will accrue to the recipient country, have Special Account (counterpart) arrangements been made? (For FY 1994, this provision is superseded by the separate account requirements of FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 537(a), see Sec. 537(a)(5).) N/A

4. **Generation and Use of Local Currencies** (FAA Sec. 531(d)): Will ESF funds made available for commodity import programs or other program assistance be used to generate local currencies? If so, will at least 50 percent of such local currencies be available to support activities consistent with the objectives of FAA sections 103 through 106? (For FY 1994, this provision is superseded by the separate account requirements of FY 1994 Appropriations Act Sec. 537(a), see Sec. 537(a)(5).) N/A

5. **Capital Projects** (Jobs Through Exports Act of 1992, Sec. 306, FY 1993 Appropriations Act, Sec. 595): If assistance is being provided for a capital project, will the project be developmentally-sound and sustainable, i.e., one that is (a) environmentally sustainable, (b) within the financial capacity of the government or recipient to maintain from its own resources, and (c) responsive to a significant development priority initiated by the country to which assistance is being provided. (Please note the definition of "capital project" contained in section 595 of the FY 1993 Appropriations Act. Note, as well, that although a comparable provision does not appear in the FY 94 Appropriations Act, the FY 93 provision applies to, among other things, 2-year ESF funds which could be obligated in FY 94.) N/A

82

ANNEX G

INITIATIVE FOR SOUTHERN AFRICA
LIST OF COUNTRIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS
VISITED by TASK FORCE MEMBERS in FEB-MARCH 1994

COUNTRY	ORGANIZATION	PERSON/Title
ANGOLA (NO INTERVIEWS)		
BOTSWANA	Babegi Legal Defense Fund, Mmegi Publishing	Methetsile Leepile, Managing Editor of the Mmegi Reporter
	Botswana Confederation of Commerce and Industry (BOCCIM)	Millard Arnold, Policy Analyst P.D. Siwawa-Ndai, Policy Analyst
	Dithshwanelo (Botswana Human Rights Center)	Alice Mogwe, Administrator and Lawyer
	Emang Basadi Womens' Association	Athaliah Molokomme, President/Lawyers Ntombi Sethwaelo, Publicity Secretary
	University of Botswana Democracy Research Project	Balefi Tsic Brian Mukopakgosi Themba Mgadla Mpho Molomo
	Women and Law in Southern Africa	Pamela Mhalanga, Program Officer/Lawyer
LESOTHO	Lesotho Human Rights Alert Group (interviewed in Maputo)	Edward Haae Phoofolo, Head
	Women's Rights in Lesotho	Nthomeng Majara, Magistrate and Women's Rights Activist
MALAWI	Journalists Association of Malawi	Al Osman, Editor
	Law Society of Malawi	James G. Naphando, Chair Temwa C. Nyiremda Madashi Mashiha
	Legal Resources Center	Vera Chirwa
	National Commission on Women in Development (NCWID), Ministry of Women and Children's Affairs	Esnah Kalyati, Permanent Secretary and Chairperson Linley Katengeni, Controller Chrissie Sinota, Community Development Officer
	The Nation	Ken Lipenga, Editor in Chief Alfred Ntonga, Editor

MALAWI	US Embassy	Ambassador Pistor Gregory Engle, DCM Econ Officer POL Officer Chip Barclay, PAO Tom Lofgren, Acting Deputy Director Stephanie Funk, USAID/PDO
MOZAMBIQUE	Associated Press	Sean Kelly, Stringer and NDI Consultant
	Center for International and Strategic Relations	Miguel de Brito
	Kulmina (Organism Para Desenvolvimento Socio-Economico Integrado)	Domenico Liuzzi, Director
	Ministry of Justice	Abdul Corimo Issa, Election and Judicial Reform Advisor
	Mozambique International Relations Student Association	Manuel de Araujo, President
	Mozambique Workers Organization	Horacio Ernesto, International Exec Secretary Jose Albino, Sec General, National Union of Construction, Timber, and Mine Workers Alberto Nhapossa, Sec General, Tourism Workers Union Horacio Mula, Sec General, National Road, Transport Workers Union
	National Democratic Institute	Pat Keefer, Sr. Program Officer Katherine Koch, Sr. Program Officer
	National Election Commission	Ismail Valigy, Commission Member
	NGOs in Mozambique Women's Rights Activa Professional Women African American Institute LINK	 Lucinda Abreau Maria Castanheira, President Palmira Pedro Francisco, Vice President Celia Diniz Paul Neese
	Savanna Newspaper	Kok Nam, Editor
	US Embassy	Ambassador Dennis Jett
	USAID/Maputo	John Miller, Dep Director Michael Turner, Proj Dir
NAMIBIA	Elections	Gerhard Totemeyer, Director

NAMIBIA	Legal Officials -Government -Ministry of Justice -Legal Assistance Center	 Hartmut Ruppel, Attorney General Vekuii Rukoro, Deputy Minister of Justice Andrew Corbett
	Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA)	Gwen Lister, Editor of the Namibian
	Ministry of Regional and Local Government	Libertine Amathila, Minister
	Namibia Broadcasting Company	Naham Gorelick, General Director
	Namibian NGOs -Namibia Institute for Democracy -The Foundation for Education	 Theunis Keulder Danie Botes
	Namibian National Women's Organization (NANOW)	Netumbo Ndaitwah, Head of NANOW and Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs
	National Council	Kandy Nehova, Chairman Lazarus Sheefeni Uaandja, Special Assistant
	National Democratic Institute	Nicholas van Slyck, Regional Representative
	National Union of Namibian Workers (NUNW)	Bernard Esau, Executive Secretary, NUNW John Shaetonhodi, President, Mineworkers Union
	Parliament	Andrew Matjila, DTA
	SWAPO	Moses Garoeb, Secretary General and Chief Whip
	US Embassy and Country Team	Ambassador McCallie Kathy Peterson, DCM Cynthia Olson, Embassy Carl Troy, Political Officer Philippi Drouin, Economic Officer Helen Piccard, PAO Edward Spriggs, USAID Director
SOUTH AFRICA	African National Congress (ANC)	Abbie Sacks, Council Member
	Center for Southern African Studies, University of Western Cape	Peter Vale, Co-Director
	Community Law Center, University of Western Cape	Dullah Omar, Advocate
	Foundation for Contemporary Research	Kam Chetty, Director
	Legal Aid Clinic, University of Western Cape	Gadija Khan, Director Beverly-Ann Franks, Asst Director
	Black Lawyers Association	Mojnku Gumbi, Director/Lawyer Oensy Tlakula, Education Officer
	Center for Applied Legal Studies (CALS), Univ of Wits	Dennis Davis, Professor

SOUTH AFRICA	Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies (JCPES)	Paul Oosburg, JCPES Representative
	Independent Mediation Service of South Africa (IMSSA)	David Douglas, Regional Director
	Institute for the Advancement of Journalism	Hugh Lewin, Head of Print Division John Schumann, Administrative Executive
	Institute for Contextual Theology	Fr. Mkhatshwa, Director
	Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa (IDASA)	Paul Graham, Director
	International Republican Institute	Kathi Walther, Sr. Program Officer
	National Association of Democratic Lawyers (NADEL)	Nomazizi Ramaposa, Director
	National Democratic Institute (NDI)	Anna Wang, NDI Project Officer
	The Family Institute	Saths Cooper, Director
	The Ford Foundation	John Gerhart, Representative
	South African Institute for Race Relations	J. S. Kane-Berman, Executive Director
	US Embassy	Ambassador Princeton Lyman
SWAZILAND	An Opposition View	Maxwell Lukhele
	Human Rights Association of Swaziland (HUMARAS)	Vika Khumalo, Vice President
	Swaziland Action Group Against Abuse	Nomoebo Manzini, Founder
	Times Group of Newspapers	Jabu Matsebula, Managing Editor
	USG Democracy Committee	Phil Jones, DCM Mary Gudjonsson, POL/ECON Brooks Robinson, PAO Margaret Alexander, USAID RLA
TANZANIA (NO INTERVIEWS)		
ZAMBIA	Center for Democracy and Human Rights	Harriet Sikasote, Director/Lawyer
	Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP)	Christine Ng'ambi, Vice President
	Law Association of Zambia	Sakwida Sikota, President Paul Kapongo, Advocate Michael Mundashi, Advocate and Secretary
	National Democratic Institute	Sarah Malm
	National Women's Lobby Group	Gladys Mutukwa, Director

86

ZAMBIA	NGO Coordinating Council	Alice Munalula, Exec Sec
	Press -Weekly Post -Profit Magazine -Sun Newspaper -ZAMCOM	 Fred M'Membe, Editor Theo Bull, Board of Directors John Musukuma, Managing Director Mike Daka
	Univ of Zambia Computer Center	Mark Bennett
	YWCA	Mary Kazunga, Exec Director
	Zambia Civic Education Association (ZCEA)	Lucy Banda Sichone, Executive Chairperson Chibemebe D. Nyalugwe, Director Dr. Stone Simonde, Board of Directors
	Bilateral Donors Coordination Meeting -Dev Corp, Finland -Aid, Netherlands -Royal Norwegian Embassy -Embassy of Sweden	 Ms. Turo, Program Officer J. J. Teunissen, Director Thorbjorn Gaustadsaether, Sr Program Officer Elizabeth Dahlin, First Sec
	USG -USAID -State -USIS	 Jim Polhemus, D/G Adv Don Gatto, State Pol Amb Roland Kuchel Stedman Howard, PAO Lincoln Dahl
ZIMBABWE	Catholic Commission for Peace and Justice in Zimbabwe	Michael Auret, Commission Member
	Daily Gazzette (part of Modus Publications)	Eric Kahari, Chairman of Board of Directors Brenda Kahari, Lawyer
	High Court of Zimbabwe	Justice Mohamed Ali Adam, Judge
	International Republican Institute (IRI)	Edward Stewart, Regional Program Dir for Africa, Asia, and Middle East
	University of Zimbabwe	Kempton Makamura, Political Activist and Academic
	University of Zimbabwe	Caiphas Nzaramasanga
	Southern Africa Political Economic Series (SAPES)	Ibbo Mandaza, Executive Director

87

ZIMBABWE	Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA)	Alice Armstrong, Regional Coordinator (Outgoing) Sarah Mvududu, Regional Coordinator Elizabeth Gwanunza, National Coordinator Constance Mugedeza, Action Wing Coordinator Diane Mandaza, Board Victor Nkimane, Dean, Faculty of Law Susan Wilkinson, UNIFEM Anne Jensen, NORAD Jetti Kapijumpanga, DANIDA Ewa Westman, First Secretary, SIDA Heather Cameron, CIDA Gudrun Landvoe, NORAD
	Zimrights	Reginald Matchebe Hove, Chairman
	US Embassy	Virginia Palmer, Political Officer
UNITED STATES	AAI	Stony Cooks, AAI Representative
	Africa-American Labor Center	David Brombart, AALC Deputy Executive Director Michael Lescault, Regional Dir for S and E Africa Michael O'Farrell, Regional Rep
	Asia Foundation	Catharin Dalpino, Former Field Representative
	Eurasia Foundation	Jim Cashel
	International Republican Institute	Edward Stewart, Rep for Asia, Africa, Middle East Lee Johnson, South Africa Program Officer Michael Miller, Zimbabwe Program Officer
	National Democratic Institute	Ken Wollack, President Ned McMahon, Francophone Africa Eric Bjornlund, Southern Africa Maura Donlon, Southern Africa
	National Endowment for Democracy	Learned Dees, Africa Staff
	State/NIS	Rosemary DiCarlo, Office of the Coordinator
	USIA	Neal Walsh, Acting Director for Africa Stephen Taylor, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs Daniel Whitman, Cultural Coordinator, Bureau of African Affairs John Dickson, Country Affairs Officer for Southern Africa
	USAID/Eastern Europe USAID/NIS USAID/PPC	Gerald Hyman, Chief, Democratic Pluralism Paul Holmes Larry Garber, PPC Democracy Staffer

88

ANNEX H

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

A.I.D. Policy Papers

- A.I.D. Policy Guidelines for the Promotion of Civil and Political Rights.
- Democracy Implementation Guidelines, 1994.
- Project Development Interim Directive, November 18, 1994.
- Strategies for Sustainable Development, March 1994.
- USAID Democracy Programs: FY '96; Global Bureau, 1994.

A.I.D. Africa Bureau Documents

- Africa Bureau's D/G Program Approach
- Africa Regional Electoral Assistance Fund (AREAF) Project, Cable 02 July 1992, Reference State 210786
- AFR Strategy on Democratization, Cable 08 January 1991, Reference State 331899
- The Concept of Governance and Its Implications for A.I.D.'s Development Assistance Program in Africa, June 1992 (Dr. Robert Charlick, ARD)
- Concepts and Options for an Initiative for Southern Africa: Influencing the future and breaking with our past. Draft Document. July 1993.
- The Democracy and Human Rights Fund for Africa: Institutional Impact and Lessons from the Field, (Melanie Bixby for USAID/Nairobi), November 15, 1993.
- Field Manual for Democracy and Human Rights Fund
- Guidelines for A.I.D.-funded Democracy/Governance Activities in Africa, Cable 18 May 1992, Reference State 164030
- Initiative for Southern Africa: Democratization; Draft Report No. 2, March 1994.

- Participatory Regional Strategy Formulation: Southern African Stakeholders in Democratic Initiatives. (Maria Beebe for ISA Task Force). June 27, 1994.

- Reshaping the U.S.A.I.D. Regional Program Strategy for the Southern Africa Region: Study Agendas on the Implications of a Post-Apartheid South Africa for Regional Economic Cooperation, (Consultant: W. Haven North), December 1991.

Other A.I.D. Documents

- Networking in Southern Africa: Implications for International Development and the Design of a Global Bureau Project Based on visits to South Africa, Swaziland, and Zambia in October 1993. Unofficial Working Paper (James Beebe). November 11, 1993.

Department of State

- Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1993.

Articles

- Barkan, Joel and Marina Ottaway. Background Paper: Democratization and Civil Society. Prepared for the Democracy Roundtable, Overseas Development Council, Washington, D.C., May 24, 1994.

- Bratton, Michael and Beatrice Liatto-Katundu. Political Culture in Zambia: A Pilot Survey. Working Paper No. 7. MSU Working Papers on Political Reform in Africa. January 1994.

- Carothers, Thomas. Democracy and Human Rights: Policy Allies or Rivals? The Washington Quarterly, 17:3, pp. 109-20.

- Carothers, Thomas. The NED at 10. Foreign Policy, No. 95, Summer 1994: 123-138.

- Democracy and Development: The Future Challenge. The Prodder Newsletter. Volume 6, No. 1. March 1994. South Africa.

- Ekeh, Peter P. Historical and Cross-Cultural Contexts of Civil Society in Africa. Presented at USAID workshop on "Civil Society, Democracy and Development in Africa: The Implications of Organization," Washington, D.C. December 9-10, 1993.

- Golub, Stephen. Assessing and Enhancing the Impact of Democratic Development Projects: A Practitioner's Perspective. Studies in Comparative International Development, Spring 1993, Vol. 28, No. 1, 54-70.

- Gordon, David and Carol Lancaster. The Implications of Political Change in Africa for SPA Donors. Presented at workshop, April 15, 1993.

- Imagining Democracy: A Report on a Series of Focus Groups in Mozambique on Democracy and Voter Education. The National Democratic Institute for International Affairs and Louis Harris & Associates, Inc., 1993.

- Martin, Guy. Democratization and Governance in Africa: General Trends and Typology. Presented at USAID workshop on Civil Society, Democracy and Development in Africa, Washington, D.C. June 9-10, 1994.

- Newbury, Catharine. Introduction: Paradoxes of Democratization in Africa. African Studies Review, Vol. 37, No. 1, April 1994, 1-8.

- O'Malley, Padraig. Uneven Paths: Advancing Democracy in Southern Africa. National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, 1993.

- Sen, Amartya. Freedoms and Needs. The New Republic, January 10 & 17, 1994, 31-38.

- Wunsch, James S. African Political Reform and International Assistance: What Can and Should Be Done? Presented at Midwest Political Science Assn. Annual Meeting, April 9, 1992.

ANNEX I

SCOPE OF WORK

PSC Democracy Advisor

1. OBJECTIVE

The Senior Democracy Advisor/Project Manager will be contracted to assist with all aspects of managing a $10 million Southern Africa Regional Democracy Fund established to finance regional activities which will strengthen democratic processes and institutions in southern Africa. These management responsibilities are spelled out in detail below, and include establishing criteria and procedures for reviewing and awarding grants, conducting outreach and publicity on the existence of the grant fund, assisting potential grantees with the revision of grant proposals as needed, monitoring grantee performance, and assessing progress toward achievement of the project purpose. This advisor will be one of two hired for the project, one an American citizen, and one a citizen of a southern African state. The more experienced of the two will be designated as senior project manager, and will supervise the work of the other advisor and any support staff. Services of the advisor are required for a period of five years beginning in June 1995.

2. BACKGROUND

A wave of democratization is sweeping across southern Africa, transforming authoritarian regimes into fledgling democracies. The new democracies as well as some of those longer established, have weak roots, and there is a danger that they may topple as increasingly politically active populaces become disgruntled by the continuing failure of new governments to reverse economic decline. The culture of democracy is poorly understood in a region where politics traditionally has been viewed as a zero sum game. Many regional NGOs devoted to the creation and stabilization of civic society have very limited capacities. The executive branches of regional governments tend to be much more powerful than southern African legislatures and judicial systems, resulting in a weak system of checks and balances and a risk of backsliding to authoritarian rule. The press enjoys growing freedom, but officials unaccustomed to its barbs react angrily to them. In several states the military establishments influence budget allocations and may set limits to democratization.

Southern Africa has the best chance of any region of Africa of achieving sustained development because it has the most generous natural resource endowment, the most sophisticated physical infrastructure, and the most highly educated population. The U.S.

government's global foreign aid objectives are sustainable development and democratization. USAID's assistance portfolios for five of the nations of southern Africa include democracy/governance objectives, and seven of these portfolios will contain democracy/governance projects by 1996. The SARDF will supplement the bilateral democracy/governance projects by assisting democratization on a regional basis. It will take advantage of the varied experiences of the countries within the region by channeling expertise from democratization "have" to "have not" countries through financing of exchanges, internships and scholarships. Cross fertilization also will be encouraged through workshops, seminars and conferences which will assemble regional audiences to discuss democratization problems and opportunities. Further, the SARDF will help strengthen regional networks among organizations of similar purpose.

3. STATEMENT OF WORK

The senior Democracy Advisor/project manager will have the following responsibilities, which he/she will share with the deputy project manager:

Project Promotion:

The project manager will be responsible for preparing promotional materials which explain the purpose of the Fund and the procedures for applying for grants. These promotional materials will include the grant criteria and guidelines which have been approved by the project committee. S/he will advertise or issue RFA's for grant applications as instructed by the project committee. Project staff members will play a leading role in promoting the Democracy Fund to appropriate groups within the region. Thus, the project manager will travel frequently to meet with organizations which have applied or may want to apply for grants.

Assistance to Grantees:

The democracy advisor/project manager will advise grantees on the preparation of grant applications, and will assist groups in making contacts with potential collaborators within the region. As needed, these individuals may also assist organizations in identifying appropriate U.S. organizations or institutions which could provide specific technical assistance or training.

Development of Grant Procedures:

The project manager will recommend appropriate grant criteria and guidelines to the project committee, and once finalized, will publish these criteria and guidelines. Project

93

staff will prepare standard forms for reviewing and scoring grant proposals, and will train project committee members on the use of these forms as needed.

Processing of Grant Applications:

The project manager will direct the grant review process developed by the project committee, as detailed in the project paper Section III B. S/he will carry out a preliminary screening of all grant proposals for compliance with guidelines and criteria, and will have the authority to recommend approval of small grants. The project manager will also have responsibility for communicating with grantees, as delegated by the USAID project officer. S/he will prepare materials needed to negotiate grants as required by the USAID grants officer, as well as make arrangements for financial assessments of grantees which have not yet been certified to receive USAID grants. This will include preparation of project implementation orders (PIO/T's). (Note: it is anticipated that a standing contract (an IQC) will be established by the Regional Center with one or more accounting firms in the region to facilitate carrying out of financial reviews/audits of potential grant recipients. The project manager will be responsible for preparing documentation needed to access the IQC.) It is estimated that the secretariat will process 20-30 grants per year over the five year life of the project, or approximately 120 total over five years.

Monitoring and Assessment of Grantee and SARDF Project Performance:

The project manager will also play a key role in monitoring grant performance, and progress toward achieving the overall purpose of the SARDF. With respect to grant performance, he/she will work closely with project committee members to assure adequate site visits and monitoring of grantees. The project manager will travel in the region to maintain contact with target groups, and to attend some of the conferences, workshops, etc. financed by the Fund. S/he will ensure that bilateral mission "coordinators" receive information on the project, and will maintain contact with these coordinators during any visits to their countries. Staff will propose a monitoring and evaluation plan to the project committee, and will collaborate with the assessment subcommittee of the project committee on the implementation of this plan. In collaboration with the USAID project officer, the manager will oversee the collection of both baseline data and performance data which measure progress toward meeting project indicators.

Organization of Project Committee Meetings/Liaison with Committee Members:

GH

The project manager will make arrangements for the annual meetings of the project committee. The project staff will serve as the "secretariat" of the project committee in implementing decisions made by the committee; they will maintain regular communications with project committee members, tracking work performed and recommending payments of honoraria for committee members. The project manager will ensure that adequate records are kept to document services rendered by each project committee members, and that paperwork is processed to enable members to participate and to compensate them for their services.

Reporting:

The project manager will also be responsible for compiling information needed in the preparation of annual progress reports on the project, as well as for any special interim monitoring/evualation reports.

Supervision/Administration:

The project manager will have responsibility for the preparation of an annual workplan, which in years 2-5 follows decisions taken during the annual project committee meetings. Travel plans for the subsequent twelve months will be included in the workplans submitted to the SARDF project officer.

The project manager will also be responsible for supervising and directing the work of the assistant project manager and the administrative assistant, as well as any other temporary project staff. He/she will conduct periodic performance reviews for this staff, and advise the USAID project officer of any needed changes in staffing.

The manager will plan for, and prepare paperwork needed to obtain (e.g. purchase orders), any office equipment or supplies required to manage the SARDF.

Other: The project secretariat's role will be reassessed at the time of the mid-term evaluation, to determine whether its functions could be expanded. Since staff will travel frequently in the region, and maintain contact both with a diversity of southern African organizations and USAID/Embassy inter-agency democracy committees, the secretariat will gather a wealth of information about ongoing democracy/governance programs in the region. There may be value in having the secretariat serve as an information clearing house and coordination center. It could -- in collaboration with bilateral missions -- organize workshops, exchanges, and internships among institutions in southern Africa. Utilizing an expanding data base reflecting acquired experience and lessons learned, the

95

secretariat could identify and encourage replication of successful approaches to democratization in the region.

4. QUALIFICATIONS

The project manager shall have a minimum of two years' previous experience working on democratization or democracy promotion in Africa, and a minimum of ten years of relevant professional experience. S/he also shall have prior supervisory experience, and have been responsible for managing funds. A minimum of a bachelor's degree in one of the social sciences, business or public administration is required, and a graduate degree in one of these fields is desirable. S/he shall be competent in the use of a microcomputer, and be fluent in english. Competence in Portuguese is desirable but not required.
The project manager must be able to travel a minimum of two weeks out of every month throughout the eleven countries which are members of the Southern African Development Community.

5. ESTIMATED TIMING AND LEVEL OF EFFORT

The contract is expected to be signed in May 1995, and the project manager should start work within six weeks. The SARDF will operate for five years. The project manager's contract will be for an initial period of two years, renewable for an additional three years based upon satisfactory performance.

6. RELATIONSHIPS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The project manager will report to the designated USAID project officer for the SARDF, and will supervise the other project employees. S/he also will be the primary secretariat contact with project committee members and U.S. bilateral mission coordinators in the region.

gb