

PN-AAV-195

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT 12M-45561
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

SMALL-SCALE PROJECTS FOR LONG-TERM
AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT:
THE FIELD PERSPECTIVE

Report on the Preparatory Meeting for the
Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid's
Meeting in Lome, Togo

March 6, 1986
Department of State
Washington, D.C.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE CORPORATION
Aid Contract No. PDC-0000-C-00-6025-00
1415 11th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.c. 20001

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
INTRODUCTION		1
OPENING ADDRESS		1
E. Morgan Williams, President, ACVFA		
TOPIC I:	<u>REVIEW OF THE COMMITTEE'S PRELIMINARY REFLECTIONS</u>	2
Mr. Thomas McKay, Associate Assistant Administrator Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID		
Mr. Alexander R. Love, Deputy Assistant Administrator Africa Bureau, AID		
Mr. Walter Bollinger, Deputy Assistant Administrator Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID		
1. <u>Umbrella Funding Mechanisms</u> 3		
2. <u>Definition of Small-Scale Projects</u> 4		
3. <u>Countries in Which "Umbrella" Mechanisms Are Appropriate</u> 4		
4. <u>AID Funding Priorities</u> 5		
5. <u>CDSS Coordination</u> 6		
6. <u>P.L. 480</u> 7		
7. <u>Food Aid Distribution</u> 8		
8. <u>Other Program Options</u> 9		
TOPIC II:	<u>DISCUSSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES FOR REGIONAL MEETING</u>	10
Dr. Philip Johnston, Executive Director CARE, ACVFA Member		
Mr. Robert Nicolas, Vice President, DAC Contract Manager Development Assistance Corporation		
TOPIC III:	<u>REVIEW OF DRAFT AGENDA AND IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCES FOR TOGO MEETING</u>	13
Mr. Robert Nicolas, Vice President, DAC, Contract Manager		
Mr. Myron Golden, AID Representative, USAID/Lome, Togo		
1. Managing and Funding Multiple Small-Scale Activities		
2. Operational Concerns Regarding Small-Scale Activities		
3. Program Concerns Regarding Small-Scale Activities		

TOPIC IV:	<u>REPORT ON GRAMM-RUDMAN DEFICIT REDUCTION BILL</u>	17
	Mr. Kelly C. Kammerer, Director Legislative Affairs, AID	
TOPIC V:	<u>REPORT ON PRIVATENESS UPDATE</u>	18
	Ms. Karen Poe, Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID	
TOPIC VI:	<u>REPORT ON AFRICAN FAMINE SUPPLEMENTAL</u>	18
	Ms. Phyllis Dichter, Deputy Director Office of Drought Coordination, Africa Bureau, AID	
TOPIC VII:	<u>BRIEFING UPDATE ON UPCOMING DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE, OECD MEETING ON THE NGO ROLE IN AFRICA</u>	19
	Mr. Thomas McKay, Associate Assistant Administrator Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID	
	APPENDICES	
	1. Preliminary Reflections Formulated at the December 1985 Meeting	20
	2. Preliminary Reflections Revised at the March 1986 Meeting	25
	3. Preliminary Draft Agenda for June Meeting	28
	4. Preparatory Meeting for the Advisory Committee's Meeting in Lome, Togo, June, 1986	34
	5. List of Advisory Committee Members	38

INTRODUCTION

The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid (ACVFA) offers to the Agency for International Development the perspectives on development issues of various private organizations involved in providing technical assistance and disaster relief in AID-assisted countries.

ACVFA was established in 1946 and serves as an official advisory body to the Administrator of the Agency for International Development (AID). It provides a liaison between AID and Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) working in disaster relief, rehabilitation, and increasingly in development. The Committee consists of 20 members who are private citizens with a personal or professional interest in humanitarian and economic assistance. They are appointed by the Administrator of AID and serve without compensation. Administrative support for the Committee is provided by AID's Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance (FVA).

No issue has seized the conscience and claimed the hearts of U.S. development specialists more than the devastating droughts and resultant famine of the African continent over the past 12 years. The ACVFA has discussed the long-term development consequences of drought and famine in Africa to varying degrees in its last three meetings.

In particular the Committee's September 1985 meeting, which focused exclusively on African development, with numerous questions concerning long-term development on the African continent were raised.

At its December 1985 meeting, which was a follow-up to the September meeting, the agenda reflected AID's concern for African development, especially given the resource limitations of AID. The development of the key topic was the Committee's direct response to AID Administrator, M. Peter McPherson's request that ACVFA focus its attention on small-scale, private sector activities in Africa that had, or could potentially, contribute to self-sustaining development on the continent.

After reviewing and assessing the reports, the Committee synthesized their findings into a coherent set of Preliminary Reflections (See Appendix 1). At the close of the December 1985 meeting, it was announced that the Committee would meet in Africa in 1986 in order to have a first-hand, on-site view of the situation. Based on these Reflections, a draft agenda (See Appendix 3) was prepared for the June 1986 Meeting. The March 1986 Meeting (See Appendix 4) was designed to finalize the June agenda.

OPENING ADDRESS

Mr. E. Morgan Williams, President, National Cooperative Business Association and Chairman, ACVFA, called the meeting to order on March 6, 1986 in the Department of State's Loy Henderson International Conference Room in Washington, D.C. In his opening remarks he explained that the purpose of the meeting was to enlist the assistance of Committee

Members, interested PVOs, and others working in the development field, in finalizing the agenda for the upcoming Meeting in Lome, Togo.

The goals of the March Meeting were to review and refine the Preliminary Reflections, and to identify and discuss pertinent issues that would assist the Committee in planning the logistics of the June meeting.

The Chairman explained that this meeting would differ from the previous two held in Jamaica and Haiti by not focusing on a single country, but on Africa as a whole. The Lome meeting would be a discussion among American PVOs, local NGOs, governments and others concerning the present and long-range development situation in Africa. Mr. Williams thanked AID for making the trip possible and expressed appreciation to the Committee Members and the private and voluntary community for their cooperation.

Mr. Williams began his introductions with His Excellency Elom K. Schippius, the Togolese Ambassador to the United States. Ambassador Schippius expressed his pleasure on behalf of the Government of Togo for the Committee's decision to hold the meeting in Togo. He mentioned that the agriculture sector is Togo's priority and that he looks forward to discussing it further with the Committee Members during the meeting. Mr. Williams also introduced Mrs. Judith Fox, Executive Director of the Advisory Committee and advised that she would be leaving for Africa in a week to coordinate the activities for the Togo meeting. Ms. Peggy Sheehan, National Cooperative Business Association, was also introduced.

Mr. Williams then introduced Mr. Jack Burgess, Associate Director of International Operations, Peace Corps/Washington. The Peace Corps will play an integral part in the Togo meeting, with representatives from Washington and the field attending. Other invitees will include representatives from the USAID Missions of Togo, Kenya, Liberia, Zaire, and Niger, U.S. and other donors, PVOs and NGOs. The Chair urged the participants to contribute fully in the planning of this very significant Meeting in Togo.

The March 1986 Meeting was divided into several topics: (1) a review of the eight "Preliminary Reflections" from the December 1985 Meeting, (2) a discussion of the ACVFA objectives of the Togo meeting, (3) a review of the draft agenda, (4) report on Gramm-Rudman Deficit Reduction Bill, (5) a report on Privatness update, and (6) a report on the African Famine Supplemental (See Appendix 4).

TOPIC I: REVIEW OF THE COMMITTEE'S PRELIMINARY REFLECTIONS

Mr. Thomas McKay, Associate Assistant Administrator, Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation, FVA, AID, served as facilitator during the discussion of the Preliminary Recommendations. Joining him were Mr. Walter Bollinger, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID, and Mr. Alexander R. Love, Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Africa Bureau, AID, who responded from the perspectives of their respective bureaus, and addressed AID's thoughts on these preliminary conclusions.

Mr. McKay stressed the fact that the Committee's reflections were intermediate rather than preliminary thoughts, as the Committee is in an ongoing process of looking at how to facilitate a better working relationship between AID and the PVO community. More specifically, the Committee is also addressing the request of the Administrator on how to promote a wider array of small-scale projects in Africa, being cognizant of the administrative constraints that AID faces. He encouraged the audience to review the AID PVO policy paper that the Committee laboriously worked on three years ago. This paper addresses the work of AID with private voluntary organizations.

Mr. McKay's comments were followed by a point-by-point review and discussion of each of the eight Preliminary Reflections. A summary of the discussion follows:

1. Umbrella Funding Mechanisms: The Committee's consensus was that the variety of new funding mechanisms that AID is using is very positive but stressed the importance of not overlooking the existing funding mechanisms. (Please see Appendix 1 for the full text of the Preliminary Reflections.)

Mr. Love began by complimenting the Committee on the December, 1985 meeting and expressing his regret that he could not attend due to previous commitments. He re-emphasized Mr. McPherson's comments that the Africa Bureau was especially grateful for the cooperation that the PVO community provided with respect to the African drought. Mr. Love stressed the challenge that they face today of finding ways to capitalize on the interest that was generated in the U.S. during the drought and redirect or sustain it for long-term development.

In response to the Committee's recommendation, Mr. Love stated that while supporting the umbrella mechanism, it is not considered to be the sole approach in working with PVOs. It is viewed simply as a vehicle that is particularly useful in larger countries and could have some applicability in medium-sized countries.

He added that the umbrella mechanism was put in place initially because of certain administrative management problems. AID was looking for mechanisms that would allow the PVOs to operate on a more decentralized basis with the overseas missions, and to provide a little more flexibility on the types of activities that could be done, while facing the realities of AID management constraints. He noted that if there are projects outside the context of umbrella mechanisms that have worked in a given country, AID would also be prepared to consider them. He expressed an interest in looking at the South Pacific model and indicated the Bureau is open to a whole variety of methods.

The perspective of the Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, as expressed by Mr. Bollinger, is similar to that of the Africa Bureau. The FVA Bureau is supportive of the umbrella mechanism since it has worked well in Asia and Africa, but stressed that it is only one of many mechanisms. Indonesia and the Philippines were cited as examples of countries that may provide lessons which could prove relevant to the establishment or expansion of umbrella mechanisms in

Africa. There was a consensus that all of the mechanisms are important for PVO delivery systems on a world-wide basis.

2. Definition of Small-Scale Projects: Mr. Bollinger agreed with the ACVFA's proposed definition: "those projects where the individual component is grass-roots oriented, involves local leadership in the design and implementation of human resource development efforts, has a simple evaluation component and ranges in funding from \$50-50,000" (See Appendix 1). However, Mr. Bollinger pointed out that the real issue is how to adjust the present AID system that is based on large technical assistance projects into a new system to fit the accountability requirements for small-scale projects, without simultaneously layering them with burdensome administrative requirements. PVOs have an established track record in administering small-scale projects and the agencies have yet to adjust the system and procedures in a manner that will incorporate the capabilities of those organizations.

Mr. Love agreed with Mr. Bollinger on the definition of small-scale projects, but felt that the real issue is more than the question of procedures for managing a range of smaller projects in a system that had been developed for handling larger scale activities. He felt that attention should be put on mechanisms, such as the umbrella mechanism, that will enable a series of small-scale projects to be done with greater flexibility and particularly with decentralized decision making within the agency and hopefully also within the PVOs.

Mary Keegan, President, Houston Chapter, End Hunger Network, and ACVFA Member, felt that the umbrella mechanism was very exciting from the point of view of women's projects and questioned whether there are existing projects using the umbrella mechanism in Africa. She raised the question as to what role the PVOs themselves might play in terms of possibly working with the indigenous PVOs who might be able to do smaller activities.

Mr. Love responded, noting that umbrella mechanisms have been initiated in Somalia, Kenya, and Zaire. Many of these are in the first year or perhaps in the beginning of the second year of implementation. He volunteered to prepare a detailed profile on what has been accomplished in terms of size of project, the location, and background information on sub-projects, and make it available to the Committee for discussion in Togo.

3. Countries in Which "Umbrella" Funding Mechanisms Are Appropriate: At its December, 1985 Meeting, the Committee expressed the opinion that the size of the AID country program is irrelevant and that the umbrella mechanism should be considered for programs of any size (See Appendix 1). In response to this view, Mr. Love explained that the size of the country was relevant since larger countries were chosen for umbrella programs because they have more available resources. It allows for a wide variety of PVO activities and more funds to put into the umbrella mechanism. However, he did not rule out the idea of the umbrella mechanism in medium and smaller countries but simply felt that it would more likely be used more effectively and extensively in a larger program country. Dr. Marie Gadsden, Director, NAFEO/AID

Cooperative Agreement and ACVFA Member, suggested that the Committee not be limited to American models. Dr. Gadsden explained that the recommendation was made to ensure that the small Missions were not ignored and were afforded the same opportunities or options for participation. She reiterated an earlier suggestion that in a country without a USAID Mission, an umbrella approach could provide an alternative method of establishing an effective U.S. presence.

4. AID Funding Priorities: During the December 1985 Meeting, it was emphasized that agriculture and rural development would continue to be the predominant themes of AID's development strategies (See Appendix 1). It was evident that with the impending cut-back and budget restrictions, maximum coordination between AID missions and PVOs is imperative. ACVFA recognizes that AID funding and support priorities tend to change. However, PVOs have an obligation to their constituents and have competencies in certain programmatic areas that should be taken into account. ACVFA recommends that there be wide interpretation of what can be funded and that a diverse project portfolio be maintained, rather than being limited to certain programmatic areas.

In discussing this issue of great importance to both AID and the PVOs, Mr. Boliinger noted that in its policy paper concerning private and voluntary organizations, AID explicitly recognizes that centrally-funded PVO projects may take place in areas of country priorities but need not necessarily be in the areas of the AID mission priority. He suggested that with the impending budgetary restrictions, maximum coordination between AID Missions and PVOs is imperative. He predicted an evolving situation whereby a potential conflict could exist between what is the stated AID policy and the implication of severe budgetary constraints.

Dr. Philip Johnston, Executive Director of CARE and ACVFA Member, expressed concern with changes in AID priorities. He noted that it was important for the PVOs to be synchronized with their constituents. He felt that in order to match the plethora of funding mechanisms under this umbrella operation, the PVOs efforts would all be directed towards the same target. Most PVOs have a certain competence that they present to their donors, and unless they can have a certain amount of flexibility, or unless AID can fund a variety of programs, they may find themselves in a difficult situation.

Mr. Love acknowledged the importance of PVOs using their own resources but felt that this was an area that could cause some friction if the discussion is not kept open. He pointed out, however, that due to priorities set with the budget from Congress, there are limits to the development of strategies. He emphasized that agriculture and rural development would continue to be the predominant themes of AID's development strategies. Health, education and training were cited as viable concerns, but problems arise when missions are pressured to prioritize and focus their activities due to certain limitations. One of the objectives of the umbrella mechanism is to give the Missions some flexibility in addressing the local situation. If properly designed these mechanisms could allow the Missions to support activities in somewhat broader ranges of sectors than might show up in the primary

program thrusts. This area should be carefully examined by Washington and the field Missions and also by the PVOs.

After some discussion and the Chair's clarification that the issue at hand was the utilization of AID funds by PVOs, and not how the PVOs may spend their own funds, it was jointly agreed that this Preliminary Reflection should be reworked at the Togo Meeting.

5. CDSS Coordination: The Committee's Reflections (See Appendix 1) that U.S. PVO participation in the CDSS process should be mandated rather than optional was challenged by Mr. Bollinger who carefully explained that this is an internal programming process and would be an infringement on the integrity of AID as well as a conflict between the privateness nature of the PVOs and the U.S. Government. He pointed out that it is one piece of AID's internal budgetary mechanism and, in the Africa Bureau, may not be as useful as it might be perceived from the outside. In fact, he added, CDSS preparation has been eliminated as a mandatory requirement in close to 20 countries as a much simpler process is being developed for setting out strategies. He suggested that it might be better if the issues were opened up as to what constitutes the range of mechanisms for interacting between the Agency and the PVO community. This might help to get the kind of dialogue that is needed for the programming process. If the Missions are forced to respond to a mandate it will lessen the chances of effective interfacing between PVOs and the Missions.

Dr. Philip Johnston agreed with most of what had been previously discussed, but added that the PVO community should be diligent in the protection of its independence. He stressed that to mandate participation and require that the PVOs be a part of the governmental process is contradictory to the privateness concept that AID holds and to the welfare of the PVOs in terms of their own independence which they must maintain. The idea intended for this recommendation was that the PVOs should be able to discuss the CDSS and possibly determine whether there is a role for the PVO to play within the priority areas of AID. He agreed it should be recommended, rather than mandated, as this would be useful to both sides.

Dr. Gadsden mentioned that it was not the intention of this Reflection to mandate but, rather, to ensure that the PVOs' expertise in the field would be included in the design of a particular project.

Mr. Markham Bali, Wald, Harkrader & Ross and ACVFA Member, also opposed mandating participation, but felt that there should be some method of using the wisdom of the PVOs. He felt that Mission Directors usually had preconceived ideas and are reluctant to change. He suggested that perhaps there should be some method built into the process that reflects the opinions and expertise of those who have been working in the field and are presumed to have some knowledge of the needs of the country and ideas of the types of programs that could be effective.

The Committee Members were reminded that AID does state, in its guidance to the field CDSS development and in the PVO Policy Paper, that PVO consultation should occur.

It was agreed that this recommendation should be discussed further at the June meeting and revised prior to being presented to the Administrator of AID (See Appendix 2).

6. P.L. 480: The Preliminary Reflections (See Appendix 1) made five recommendations: a) Special Agent; b) Collaborative Efforts; c) Legislative Change; d) Other Donor Resources; and e) Additional Funds.

Mr. Love opened the discussion by commenting that the Agency was very sensitive to the limited resources of the PVOs working in drought relief, particularly the resources of the organizations recently involved in countries like the Sudan and in related relief efforts. He did not take issue with the fact that participation in these emergency efforts has depleted the existing resources which has cut into the ability of these agencies to carry on with the rehabilitation-type activities. Nevertheless, he felt that the Agency could not support a request for additional funds for Africa at this time. He added that the Agency could make it through the remaining phases of the drought without a supplemental allocation and that it was exploring various ways of using some of the existing program resources as a vehicle to address the remaining rehabilitation needs of the drought regions.

Mr. Walter Bollinger joined the discussion by explaining how anxious the Agency was in assisting PVOs new to Africa to become involved in the drought emergency programs and to assist them in converting from emergency program involvement to longer term food-based development programs. He added that the special agent suggestion was a very good one and Mr. Tom Reese, Director, Food for Peace Program, FVA Bureau, AID, had assumed that task. He has the backing of the FVA Bureau resources and they are fully prepared to provide technical assistance to PVOs showing an interest in food aid programs in Africa. However, Mr. Bollinger did not feel that a request for USG funds to cover inland food transportation costs was a feasible one. He emphasized that there was no legal basis for such a request for non-emergency food programs. He continued by explaining that in the past such costs have been borne by the PVOs, by contributions from host-country governments, and in some cases, by the recipients of the food aid. He suggested that if there was a way for the Agency to assist in identifying resources needed to fund internal transportation, it would gladly do so.

Mr. Bollinger also addressed the issue of a proposed legislative change. He pointed out that last year the Congress gave USAID authority to pay internal transportation costs for emergency programs. However, the Agency decided to establish a policy to contribute 50 percent of internal transportation for emergency programs. In light of current budget restrictions faced by the Agency, Mr. Bollinger did not feel that a proposal to make a change which will have expansionary budget implications was advisable.

Mr. Bollinger strongly supported the proposition that PVOs be encouraged to utilize food aid from other donors. He cited the example of Sudan where AID was successful in identifying various types of resources to assist in defraying the costs of internal transportation.

There were several comments from the Committee Members and from the audience. It was pointed out that the PVOs already working in the field could also be an important source of technical assistance and that there were already several collaborative efforts currently underway in Africa among PVOs. Dr. Philip Johnston agreed that although 100 percent payment by AID for inland transportation would be desirable, there would still be very difficult problems to be surmounted by PVOs coming to the food aid program for the first time. He was particularly disturbed by many of the requirements of Handbook 9, which calls for data from the PVOs which the Agency must obtain in order to prepare various legislatively mandated reports to Congress. He also added that the Auditor General had received and denied several requests to review, or revise the requirements of this Handbook. It was also pointed out that the 1985 Farm Bill will bring about some small changes in Handbook 9, but that the latter is a far cry from the relief being called for by both AID and the PVOs which must labor under these regulations.

Mr. Kenneth M. Smith, President, International Management and Development Group, Ltd., and ACVFA Member, recommended that the issue of additional funds be discussed in greater depth during the Togo Meeting. The discussion closed with the suggestion that this Preliminary Reflection be reviewed thoroughly in Togo.

7. Food Aid Distribution: The Preliminary Reflections recommended that a survey be made of the experiences of small and large PVOs to ascertain their most creative approach to Food Aid Distribution and enlist their suggestions and expressions of interest in participating in Food Aid Distribution. The request for such a survey was motivated by the widespread perception that a few agencies hold monopolies on P.L. 480 (See Appendix 1).

Mr. Bollinger opened the discussion by commenting that another survey would not be likely to provide the desired data. He added that the FVA Bureau had an excellent evaluation staff which had conducted, over the last seven or eight years, a number of excellent evaluations of a variety of food programs. It might be more fruitful to summarize the conclusions of these evaluations and share them with the PVO community. He also added that although there were very few PVOs actively engaged in PL 480 food assistance activities, this fact did not represent any monopolistic intent. Until recently, few PVOs had taken the initiative to seek to become engaged in these programs. He sought the support of the PVO community in increasing the number of entities participating in food aid programs. He promised to assist such PVOs to the fullest extent of his ability in their effort to join the food aid program in Africa.

Both of Mr. Bollinger's points were strongly supported by comments from the audience and by the Committee Members. The general consensus reflected the opinion that Preliminary Reflection Number 7 should be

rewritten; to define the meaning of "creative" and also to eliminate the connotation that there was some impediment to having more PVOs participate in AID's food aid programs (See Appendix 2).

8. Other Program Options: The Preliminary Reflections made five recommendations which included the following (See Appendix 1):

a) Through special negotiations with the appropriate Congressional Committee, set up an experimental program which would operate on the basis of highly reduced administrative procedures in one or two AID country programs.

b) Review the CIDA model.

c) Incorporate indigenous involvement and the private sector and parastatal roles in the criteria for funding of new starts.

d) Continue to encourage cooperation between the Peace Corps, AID, and PVOs.

e) Decentralize authority within PVOs.

Mr. Bollinger led the discussion of the topic. On the first item above, he observed that administrative procedures are U.S. Government-wide procedures. He illustrated his point by giving the example of contracting procedures which are in the Federal Regulations and are applicable to all government agencies. He added that from his personal point of view, the efforts which would be required to obtain the kind of exemptions which are being alluded to would be very difficult and the results may not be worth such an investment of resources. Mr. Love commented that before looking at streamlining the regulations, the real cause or source of the problem should be examined. It should be determined whether the cause of the problem is an internal administrative regulation or if it is the result of legislation. In case of the former, AID does have some flexibility for modifications and such matters are perhaps better left in the hands of the Agency and not brought to the Congress. Mr. Love also mentioned that AID had undertaken some experimental programs. He cited as an example the use of American ORT Federation in Zaire for management of an umbrella project, and added that the Africa Bureau had worked with other PVOs in specific countries putting the primary responsibility of running a multi-year program in their hands.

On the CIDA model as an alternative to the U.S. foreign assistance program, Mr. Bollinger explained that CIDA and AID are very different types of organizations. CIDA has flexibilities in terms of its basic mandate but does not operate in a decentralized field mission mode and has little responsibility in terms of end-use audit and accountability. He did not feel that the CIDA model had much relevance to AID.

Mr. Love joined the discussion on the issue of new starts. He briefly mentioned the budgetary constraints faced by the Africa Bureau. He added that the Bureau was attempting to provide greater opportunities for the PVOs to participate in activities through the umbrella

mechanism. Also, he agreed that on some types of activities the Missions should be encouraged to look to PVOs as an implementing mechanism for some of the larger projects, particularly where the PVOs have some familiarity with the Mission and its local situation.

However, Mr. Love took issue with the recommendation that parastatals be involved in the process. He pointed out that the term "parastatal" conjures up many connotations in the Agency. He also added that current policy does not seek to encourage a stronger role for these entities and that they are currently seen as one of the African Continent's serious problems. To the extent that the recommendation is to seek to privatize these parastatals, then he would agree. He indicated that there was a meaningful role for the PVOs to interface with the parastatals in countries where the Agency has promoted the dissolution of marketing boards and other government parastatals in favor of smaller private organizations to handle the distribution of inputs to the farms, to help the farmers with marketing organizations, cooperatives and other similar support groups. Mr. Bollinger felt that the Reflection on parastatals should be more clearly stated to prevent any indication of direct support for the parastatals, since the latter was contradictory to current policy and would be received with limited enthusiasm.

Mr. Love agreed with the Reflection that there be continued cooperation with the Peace Corps. He emphasized that this was an accepted policy in the Agency, and that there was a continuous effort to find new mechanisms to reinforce this cooperation.

On the question of decentralization, Mr. Love strongly recommended that the PVOs find ways to do so. He indicated that decentralized field decision making power was an important facet of the umbrella mechanism. He agreed that the decentralization process was not an easy one, but perhaps some of the U.S. PVOs could assist each other in achieving the level of decentralization which small-scale projects will require to be implemented effectively.

The session was closed by Mr. McKay who reminded the participants that these issues would be discussed in greater detail during the Togo meeting (See Appendix 2).

The Chair acknowledged the presence of Mrs. Frances Howard, the sister of the late Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, who was a great friend of PVOs and supporter of development assistance. Mr. Myron Golden, AID Representative in Togo, joined the meeting to assist in finalizing the June agenda.

TOPIC II: DISCUSSION OF THE COMMITTEE'S PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES FOR REGIONAL MEETING

Dr. Philip Johnston chaired this session. He introduced Mr. Robert Nicolas, Vice President, Development Assistance Corporation, Contract Manager of the Meeting, and Mr. Jack Burgess, Associate Director of International Operations, Peace Corps/Washington, as facilitators for this session. Dr. Johnston opened the discussion with

the purpose of the meeting: "To bring a field perspective to bear on program and management issues in order to make better recommendations to the Administrator".

Dr. Johnston stated that for those who might not have been familiar with the function of this Committee, it is to provide a mechanism for an outreach to the various constituencies that make up the American spectrum and to filter their ideas in some coherent form for presentation to M. Peter McPherson, Administrator of the Agency for International Development. He noted that pursuing this charge, it is felt that it is appropriate for the Committee to understand what is happening in a variety of third world countries where American foreign aid is being delivered.

The agreed upon objectives of the Togo meeting are as follows:

Objective 1: To make site visits to local small-scale projects and hold discussions with local representatives in order to learn as much as possible from them. The Committee deemed it advisable and beneficial to actually see on-the-ground implementation of projects. These projects could be American financed or co-financed, funded exclusively by the Togolese or funded by a combination of European, Far East, African, or other sources. The Committee intends to examine the best products and to determine what makes them successful and if they were not successful, to determine why the project did not work. Mr. Kenneth Smith commented that he would like to be sure that there is adequate time for dialogue with people and to see the projects. In essence, he wanted to be sure that the overall objective of interacting with others was covered. The Committee Members were firm in their suggestion that they wanted the site visits to include not only a visual understanding of the project but also time to adequately discuss with the people involved the intricacies of the situation. They also wanted to be sure that the visits included a mixture of local PVOs and U.S. PVOs.

Mr. Peter Davies of InterAction suggested that small groups visit a number of projects and subsequently discuss their visits in detail and pool their findings.

Mr. Paul Rippey of Partnership for Productivity invited the Committee Members to include his program as it would be an example of the type of site visit that had been suggested by the previous speakers.

Mr. Markham Ball felt that it is important for the Committee to have an overview of the Togolese development situation and an explanation of the various donors' contribution to Togolese development. He suggested that documents such as the CDSS for Togo would be helpful to the members if they could have it in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Kenneth Smith voiced his concern that the Committee meet with the highest level of government officials who can address policy level questions.

Mr. Myron Golden, USAID Representative, Togo, pointed out that the Togolese Government has a very good perspective on the role of the PVOs

in their development planning processes. They have made efforts to reinforce this concept by publishing a document relevant to the issues and forming an in-country donor coordinating group consisting of indigenous and international PVOs. The Togolese Minister of Plan plays a leading role in this effort as he articulates the role of PVOs.

Objective 2: To exchange views with local third world PVOs and American PVOs. In the discussion, Dr. Johnston indicated that it was incumbent upon the Committee Members to use the time and monies of the American public who are "footing the bill" to gain the widest perspective by talking to as many different people as possible and learn from the many systems that exist in Togo.

Objective 3: To consult with AID field and other U.S. officials and third world country representatives. The objective was endorsed as presented.

Objective 4: Meet with Togolese officials to get their perspective regarding the value of small-scale projects and long-term Togolese development. This objective was also endorsed as presented.

Objective 5: To become more aware of the role that NGOs play in development projects including privatization and the delivery of social services. The objective was endorsed.

Objective 6: Discuss with donors, in field visits, their experiences in implementing small-scale projects. This objective was endorsed.

After a brief discussion of these objectives among the Committee Members, a number of suggestions were made:

- a) Make the site visits more relevant by providing the opportunity to pose questions and have discussions during the visit.
- b) Visit a CIDA-funded project or one implemented by a European development agency.
- c) Include local PVOs and U.S. PVOs in each site visit.
- d) Meet with CIDA, UNIDA, and representatives from Holland or Germany to learn of their mechanisms, points of view, and philosophies.
- e) Plan small group site visits and provide an opportunity for the participants to share information and address questions among themselves.
- f) To the extent possible, relate the site visits to the discussion topics that take place throughout the week.

Mr. Martin Decavett, representing World Rehabilitation Fund, asked about the availability of a list of ongoing projects in Togo and their sponsors.

Mr. Nicolas explained that one of the tasks for the pre-planning team going to Togo would be to prepare a list of projects that would be available to visit.

Mr. Williams suggested that it would be useful if some of the NGOs could prepare a list of recommendations that would indicate a consensus of what their recommendations would be as to how to be more effective and how to improve the programs.

Mr. Golden assured the group that the indigenous PVOs and their representative associations would be available to meet with the Committee. It was suggested that the indigenous and foreign PVOs should meet in advance on the topics and be ready to discuss their recommendations with the Committee.

Ms. Phyllis Dobyms, Save the Children Federation, suggested that the recommendations from NGOs might have more meaning for the Committee if site visits could be representative of topics covered in the preceding day's discussions. Otherwise field visits can become overwhelming and perhaps distracting since they might not be related to the overall theme. The objectives were passed as amended and the meeting was turned over to Mr. Nicolas.

TOPIC III: REVIEW OF DRAFT AGENDA AND IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCES FOR TOGO MEETING

This session was chaired by Mr. Nicolas. Mr. Golden and Mr. Burgess assisted Mr. Nicolas with specific issues related to the discussion.

Mr. Nicolas opened the discussion by explaining that the purpose of this session was to obtain comments and suggestions from the Committee Members and other participants on the agenda topics as drafted to date. He added that the draft agenda topics (See Appendix 3) were based on the Preliminary Reflections prepared at the December 1985 meeting of the Committee and that the speakers and presenters for the various sessions of the Meeting would be identified during and after the advance trip to Togo. He proceeded to review each one of the proposed agenda items (See Appendix 3). The items and suggestions received during the discussion are noted below:

Mechanisms for Managing/Funding Multiple Small-Scale Activities

A. Given AID's experience to date with mechanisms such as co-financing (umbrellas), matching grants, and PVO components of larger bilateral projects, what are the advantages and constraints of these funding methods and what would improve their effectiveness?

Suggestions:

1. The Kenya experience should be reviewed because it would be useful for the Committee.
2. Other donor experiences such as The World Bank and the African Development Bank should be included in this discussion.
3. The emphasis should not be limited to management and process issues, but also include substantive areas such as health care, literacy, food production, and other similar areas. Specific examples of PVO activities in these substantive areas should be examined.
4. Include in the discussion the view of the host-country government. How does the latter view its role after the PVO has made its contribution? For example does the Government of Togo encourage PVOs to develop models or take the initiative? If so, does the Government allow the PVO to commence its activities and later accept the recurring costs once the PVO leaves?
5. How does the host-country define its relationship to the PVOs?
6. Include a discussion of a mechanism which has been very successful and some which have not been effective.
7. How do we measure and report on the impact of PVO projects? Is there a system for assessing what is working and what is not and to what extent?
8. The Togo model of cross ministry cooperation should be looked at closely for its impact on project accomplishment.
9. In item 7, on page 2 of the proposed agenda (See Appendix 3) topics, the focus should not be solely on U.S. PVOs. It should be broadened to discuss opportunities for collaboration, including indigenous institutions. Alternatively, the word "projects" should be changed to "mechanisms" in that sentence.

B. What is the Peace Corps experience?

Mr. Burgess opened the discussion of this topic by outlining the extent of Peace Corps' involvement in Togo and its overall emphasis on small-scale projects. He offered to put Peace Corps' resources at the disposal of the Committee. He added that there were about 100 volunteers in Togo including those working on some eight projects involving PVOs.

Suggestions:

1. Peace Corps Directors from countries neighboring Togo who have been involved in various types of Peace Corps/AID and Peace Corps/PVO collaborative efforts can be sent to the Lome Meeting.

Directors could come from Mali, Sierra Leone, Cameroon, and possibly other West African countries.

2. The Committee should have contact with Peace Corps volunteers working with legally chartered Togolese PVOs.

3. The conference should make use of the various Togolese regional activities.

C. What is the African Development Bank experience?

Suggestions:

1. This topic should be broadened to include other donors.

2. The World Bank experience should be included. Mr. Victor Masoni at the World Bank is in charge of interaction between PVOs and the World Bank.

3. The African Development Foundation experience should be included.

D. What is the current and potential role for consortia and in-country coordinating councils with regard to multiple small-scale activities and what would improve their effectiveness?

Suggestions:

1. Mr. Akpalo Kouassivi, Executive Director of CONGAT should be contacted.

2. The Government of Togo has put together a coordinating mechanism for PVOs and should be contacted.

E. What are some new ideas regarding funding/management of multiple small-scale activities?

Suggestions:

1. The topic of integrated women's programs should be covered.

2. Can projects be visited which involve integration of income generation, family planning, health and nutrition? There is a quasi-private sector organization for Togolese welfare to contact about this type of program, it is called the ABATW.

F. Operational Concerns Regarding Small-Scale Activities

Suggestions:

1. The entire agenda should be "de-Americanized".

2. The meeting should focus on what is occurring in Togo and the region development and not what is taking place in "bureaucratic" structures.

3. This question should be framed in terms of a development model, so we can get a sense of what constitutes the economy of a small West African country, what constitutes its development choices and, therefore, what the role of the PVO should be.

4. Non-U.S. participants should have an important role in this discussion.

5. The meeting should focus on small-scale, but it should not do so in an isolated manner. It should also discuss small-scale health, business, agricultural or other projects.

6. The discussion of small-scale should include an understanding of the value and importance of the complete environment in which these projects are being implemented.

7. The agenda should make clear what conclusions or results are expected from the meeting.

Program Concerns Regarding Small-Scale Activities

Suggestions:

1. A possible speaker for this topic is Mr. Kuyembeh. He is the former Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Development of Sierra Leone. Mr. Kuyembeh is now the Permanent Secretary of Finance. He has had a long association with PVOs and with the Peace Corps, and is from a country which has not done well in the development process.

2. Presenters on this topic should include Mr. Golden and the Peace Corps' country director, since they could address the actual mechanisms in place for their collaboration at their local level.

3. The order in which the topics appear needs to follow a more logical sequence, i.e., the Committee should be given the opportunity to discuss funding small-scale activities (item 3) before discussing what these small-scale activities are (item 5).

4. A proposed sequence for the topics might be as follows: a) hear from the non-U.S. participants regarding their needs; b) discuss the types of programs which respond to these needs through the implementation of small-scale activities; c) discuss funding mechanisms needed to support these activities; d) discuss the management and operational concern associated with these small-scale activities.

5. The Committee should have an opportunity to listen to the Togolese and other Africans to ascertain their needs and hear how they view the role and relationship of foreign and indigenous PVOs.

Increasing PVO Participation in P.L. 480 Development Programs

Suggestions:

1. Should P.L. 480 be on this agenda?
2. Representatives from other donors and food recipient countries should be included in this discussion.

Other Donor Activities in Small-Scale Projects for Long-Term African Development

Suggestions:

1. Include in this discussion the experience of other donors in preventing the overconcentration or uneven distribution of development activities in one area.
2. The agenda may be too ambitious for the time allotted. The Committee and the other participants should have time for unstructured contacts and discussions.

Special Interest Closed Meetings for Committee Members

Suggestions:

1. The Committee's time should not be scheduled from "dawn to dusk".
2. The Committee should not be made to listen to a long series of speeches, with little opportunity for questions and discussion.
3. The agenda needs additional emphasis on women's activities and their role in the development process.
4. The Togolese Government should not misunderstand the purpose of the visit by the Committee. It should be made clear that the Conference will not be bringing any new projects.

TOPIC IV: REPORT ON GRAMM-RUDMAN DEFICIT REDUCTION BILL

The afternoon session, chaired by Dr. Gadsden, opened with a discussion of the Gramm-Rudman Deficit Reduction Bill. The Chair introduced Mr. Kelly C. Kammerer, Director, Legislative Affairs, AID. He shared the following insights on the Gramm-Rudman Deficit Reduction Bill.

Although the Gramm-Rudman Bill was enacted December, 1985 it does not go into effect until October 1986. On February 25, 1986, when the House Foreign Affairs Committee reported to the House Budget Committee its budget estimates for FY 1987, its level was \$2.35 billion below the President's request for Fiscal Year 1987 and \$476 million below the baseline. The Chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee plans to bring before the House floor prior to June 30th a total budget of \$7

billion, less than 50 percent of the requested \$15 billion. The President has submitted a budget that comes within the target deficit budget of \$144 billion as required by Gramm-Rudman for FY 1987. After a very detailed presentation, Mr. Kammerer summarized by saying that the mark-up on the appropriations bill in late April or early May will be a shock to those PVOs who are dealing with AID in terms of trying to determine what types of aid will be available or supportive of PVO programs next year. He believes the programs will be funded below the FY 86 levels, that is, the baseline of the FY 86 Appropriations minus the 4.3 percent sequester. Overall, a very bleak picture was predicted.

TOPIC V: REPORT ON PRIVATENESS UPDATE

Ms. Karen Poe, Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation, FVA Bureau, AID, presented the report on Privatness Update. She began by summarizing the legislation. "Effective January 1, 1986, the U.S. PVO must receive at least 20 percent of its total annual funding of international activities from sources other than the U.S. Government in order to be eligible for development assistance funding that was made available to the Agency under the FY 1986 appropriations bill." In order to answer some of the questions that PVOs have posed and to explain the impact of the 20 percent legislation, there will be a workshop offered to clarify any misunderstandings. PVOs will be notified of the date of the workshop in about four or five weeks. The immediate impact of the 20 percent rule is that 11 of the 176 registered PVOs are no longer eligible to receive development assistance funds in FY 1986. Ms. Poe pointed out that although the listed PVOs cannot receive development assistance funds, they are still eligible for other kinds of assistance such as disaster assistance, refugee assistance, funding from the Economic Support Fund and funding from the FY 1985 Africa Supplemental and contracts from AID. Ongoing programs for which the Congress had already been notified in the FY 1985 presentation will not be interrupted if an organization fails to receive the 20 percent resource test. Ms. Poe urged the participants to read the report which answers most of their questions. She indicated that if there were further questions from those organizations that appeared on the list, their cases could be re-examined by updating the data provided on Form 1550-2 prior to the workshop on the 20 percent legislation.

TOPIC VI: REPORT ON AFRICAN FAMINE SUPPLEMENTAL

In the absence of Mr. Ted Morse, Director, Office of Drought Coordination, Africa Bureau, AID, the Deputy Director, Ms. Phyllis Dichter, gave a report on the African Famine Supplemental. She began by explaining how the \$800 million that Congress provided for the African drought has been dispensed; \$400 million was provided to Title II in an emergency food program, \$225 million was put into a presidential reserve for emergencies and transportation; \$135 million was for non-food assistance; \$37.5 million was for refugee assistance and \$2.5 million was for operating expenses. By March 31, 1986, when the supplemental ended, all but the \$225 million in the presidential reserve was spent. Of the total allocated, \$400 million has been spent, with \$100 million going for transportation. It is felt that the emergency is now under

control, although the pockets of famine and drought that remain are now the major concern. This is not to say that all the recovery needs of Africa will be met, but for the moment it is believed that the funding presently available will cover the problems over the next year.

TOPIC VII: BRIEFING UPDATE ON UPCOMING DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE, OECD MEETING ON THE NGO ROLE IN AFRICA

The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization of European Cooperation and Development is holding a seminar in Paris on June 3 and 4, 1986 to discuss the non-governmental organization role in Africa and rural development in Sub-Saharan Africa. The DAC is a coordinating body for donors and consists of various European members, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States. This meeting will be held at essentially the same time that the ACVFA will be meeting in Togo and will be discussing the same topics.

Dr. Gadsden adjourned the meeting at 4:00 p.m.

APPENDIX 1
PRELIMINARY REFLECTIONS FORMULATED AT THE
DECEMBER 1985 MEETING

1. UMBRELLA MECHANISMS

The Committee is pleased with the AID interest in and commitment to small-scale programs. They view the variety of new funding mechanisms as a positive effort to promote indigenous PVO development, U.S./PVO and local PVO cooperation and to facilitate AID administrative oversight. These mechanisms represent an opportunity to foster local PVO consortia and to encourage U.S. PVOs to provide technical assistance to local agencies.

At the same time, however, we feel it is important to maintain a strong matching grant program and other mechanisms such as OPGs because they:

- allow a sustained partnership with U.S. PVOs over the long-term with local agencies;
- maintain opportunities for U.S. PVOs to work directly with AID Missions outside of umbrella arrangements;
- retain financial flexibility for U.S. PVOs to take new initiatives in currently under-served countries.

We urge that AID continue to emphasize (and fund) a variety of funding channels, and that PVC be tasked by you to monitor mission umbrella efforts to ensure that these funding mechanisms are not the singular way U.S. PVOs can work in a country on programs using USG funds. In addition, the ACVFA recommends that AID examine the South Pacific model which has been effective in utilizing PVOs to enhance programming as primary implementors where a smaller USAID Mission had limited capacity.

2. DEFINITION OF SMALL SCALE PROJECTS

We offer the following definition: "Small-scale projects are those where the individual project component is grassroots oriented, involves local leadership in the design and implementation of human resource development efforts, has a simple evaluation component, and ranges in funding from \$50-\$50,000." A single agency under this definition could simultaneously operate several small-scale projects, but each of the component projects should meet the definition. In addition, ACVFA strongly believes that "small-scale" has significant impact on women in Africa, e.g., in obtaining small loans. The definition, with a range of \$50-\$50,000, covers these women's groups.

With regard to sustainability and replicability, we believe the standards of performance set for PVOs should not be more stringent than the major large-scale bilateral projects.

In fact, the independent evaluation of each small project is not as important as the general trends toward self-sufficiency and the overall capacity building of local agencies over the long-term. Where umbrella projects support similar development objectives, the collective progress toward measurable goals is the important aspect of evaluation -- not the success of every single component. The overall assessments should be able to identify ingredients of projects which enhance sustainability and those which detract from it. Collaboration from all PVOs working together in such assessments will enhance information exchange, cooperation, and improve prospects for replication. It is also important to note that African PVOs or private organizations should include parastatals, e.g., select host government owned businesses or companies, in some of their project initiatives and help them make the transition to privatization.

3. COUNTRIES IN WHICH "UMBRELLA" FUNDING MECHANISMS ARE APPROPRIATE

To date, it is our understanding that "umbrella" funding mechanisms have been instituted in countries where there are major AID programs. We have been asked to comment on the advisability of these mechanisms in medium and small-sized AID program locations. After considering this issue, it is our opinion that the size of a country-AID plan/program is irrelevant. Multiple small-scale programs established by local or U.S. PVOs are useful in any African country. In countries where there is minimal AID staff presence, umbrella funding mechanisms can enhance the U.S. development objectives. With regard to this point, we offer the example of the several countries where PVOs funded by AID are the only U.S. presence -- surely this is a cost-effective way of maintaining good ties. In this context, umbrella funding or the use of matching grant funds for small-scale efforts should be considered.

4. AID FUNDING PRIORITIES

During the course of our meeting several speakers stated that AID's priority in Africa is agricultural development and that the PVOs should seek compatibility in their program thrusts with this priority. ACVFA recognizes that AID funding priorities change and there is a tendency for AID support to shift to a new priority. In addition this is further exacerbated by the normal staff rotation process which inhibits continuity of program oversight and follow through of objectives. However, development is multi-faceted and long-term and ACVFA believes a diverse project portfolio is desirable in any nation. Therefore, ACVFA recommends that funding for PVOs with diverse projects be maintained.

5. CDSS COORDINATION

One of the major concerns of the Meeting is CDSS coordination with PVOs in a given country. ACVFA recommends that U.S. PVO participation in the CDSS process should be mandated from the beginning rather than optional. Measures should be institutionalized to allow AID to benefit from the capabilities, experiences, and information available from these organizations. Efforts should also be made to gain the experience of local and international PVOs as well as for CDSS input, although their involvement does not have to be formalized.

In addition, a less formalized mechanism should be encouraged for communicating with local PVOs and international PVOs. Perhaps a multi-national consortia could be funded through PACT, InterAction or ICVA as vehicles to promote these consortia. It is possible that informal consortia will emerge from participating agencies involved in "umbrella" projects, particularly if the programs funded through these mechanisms are sectoral or geographic-specific. In the course of providing communication, coordination, and technical assistance, the managers of the umbrella project could serve as catalysts for such consortia.

6. P.L. 480

We support AID's interest in encouraging more PVOs to become involved in the P.L. 480 programs. To accomplish this goal, AID should aggressively seek new PVO entries in the Program through creative programs and staff support. The following formats are suggested:

a) Special Agent. Assign a special agent to provide technical assistance to PVOs interested in entering the P.L. 480 program for the first time.

b) Collaborative Efforts. For new entities willing to establish collaborative efforts with large existing PVOs, it is proposed that AID provide grants to cover all inland costs for both organizations as an effective "carrot". This approach would recognize that all PVOs need to supplement the food with additional resources (i.e., tools, training and extension work, livestock, etc.) but would provide the PVOs with resources to cover the huge expense of inland transportation.

c) Legislative Change. Consider a legislative change which would allow 100 percent funding to cover Title II inland transportation costs which would give AID the flexibility to entice new agencies to initiate food programs and ensure that existing agencies can sustain their programs.

d) Other Donor Resources. Encourage PVOs and assist them in utilizing food from other donor countries and agencies.

e) Additional Funds. Contrary to popular belief, the PVOs are not flushed with money. Most of the famine contributions focus on "emergency" aid and are country specific. If the goal is to engender developmental aspects of food aid, PVOs and AID need to promote this understanding through public education and solicitations for funding. With regard to Federal funding, ACVFA supports the InterAction proposal that there be a supplemental allocation of \$300 million for African food. Current allocations would provide less than one-third of the projected food requirements in the next year, thus a supplemental is essential to save lives. If such an amount is not feasible because of extreme budget constraints, AID should consider reprogramming existing food from countries which have attained or are approaching self-reliance.

7. FOOD AID DISTRIBUTION

It would be extremely useful to have a survey of the experiences of both small and large PVOs to ascertain their most creative programs. Some of the smaller agencies may be able to offer suggestions on various methods of enhancing small-scale projects with small amounts of food, if these are made available in-country, without the Agency having to mount a full-scale food program (including freight forwarding, port receipt, storage, inland transportation, etc.). There is a widespread perception that a few agencies hold monopolies on P.L. 480. Such a survey could mitigate this perception if the findings are that many agencies, in fact, are involved. If the facts prove otherwise, agencies wishing to participate could use the survey as an opportunity to express their interest to take part creatively in the program.

8. OTHER PROGRAM OPTIONS

The pervasive problem of administrative complexity in program accountability has plagued many of the AID programs. To begin to look at this problem in depth, the following suggestions are offered for discussion.

a) Experimentation. Negotiate with the appropriate Congressional Committee to be allowed, on an experimental basis, to take one or two countries where the Administrator would be given broad executive flexibility in implementing an agreed-upon five-year plan with specific goals and objectives. Once this plan was approved, the Agency would reduce its contracting, granting, administrative burdens to a bare minimum and report annually on progress toward those goals. With creative programming, and multi-national program cooperation, one of the results which could be anticipated would be a demonstration of the advantages of reducing administrative burdens for achieving long-term (five years) policy and program goals.

b) CIDA Model. Review the Canadian (CIDA) model for non-governmental organizations (NGO) collaboration in third world development. CIDA funds flexible programming by NGOs for both large and small scale programs with a minimum of administrative oversight. According to reports from various participants during the ACVFA meeting, CIDA has been pleased with the creativity and variety of programs it has been able to support through its foreign assistance approach. The Committee will review CIDA documentation over the next few months to identify any specific concepts which may be useful in reviewing the current AID approach.

c) New Starts. It was stated that only a few "new" starts will be funded by the Africa Bureau this year in support of major sectoral programs. The Committee strongly urges that each "new" start incorporate indigenous involvement, private sector and parastatal roles in the criteria for funding. Without such a mandate, it is possible that small-scale components of any initiative would be overlooked.

d) Cooperation. The Committee recognizes and continues to encourage expanded Peace Corps, AID and PVO cooperation and remains available to further this process with the Administrator's guidance.

e) Decentralized Authority. The Committee recommends that PVOs increasingly decentralize authority to the field in much the same way that AID has done to facilitate implementation and management.

APPENDIX 2
PRELIMINARY REFLECTIONS
REVISED AT THE MARCH 1986 MEETING

1. UMBRELLA FUNDING MECHANISM

The discussions on Reflection #1 during the March 1986 Meeting were not sufficiently conclusive to warrant specific changes.

2. DEFINITION OF SMALL-SCALE

The discussions on Reflection #2 during the March 1985 Meeting were not sufficiently conclusive to warrant specific changes.

3. COUNTRIES IN WHICH UMBRELLA FUNDING MECHANISMS ARE APPROPRIATE

The discussions on Reflection #3 during the March 1986 Meeting were not sufficiently conclusive to warrant specific changes.

4. AID FUNDING PRIORITIES

The discussions on Reflection #4 during the March 1986 Meeting were controversial. No specific new wording was agreed upon. However, it was agreed that it should be carefully reviewed and examined during the Lomé Meeting.

5. CDSS COORDINATION

CDSS coordination with PVOs is one of the major concerns of the Committee. ACVFA recommends that the PVOs should participate in the process during the initial planning stages to allow AID the maximum benefit from their capabilities, experiences and information. This should apply to local as well as international PVOs in an informal manner.

In addition, a less formalized mechanism should be encouraged for communicating with local PVOs and international PVOs. Perhaps a multi-national consortia could be funded through PACT, InterAction or ICVA as vehicles to promote these consortia. It is possible that informal consortia will emerge from participating agencies involved in "umbrella" projects, particularly if the programs funded through these mechanisms are sectoral or geographic-specific. In the course of providing communication, coordination, and technical assistance, the managers of the umbrella project could serve as catalysts for such consortia.

6. P.L. 480

The discussions on Reflection #6 during the March 1986 Meeting were not sufficiently conclusive to warrant specific changes. However, it was recommended that it be discussed thoroughly in Togo.

7. FOOD AID DISTRIBUTION

It was decided to:

- review and summarize in a report the experiences of both small and large PVOs with Food Aid Distribution, as reflected in AID's extensive file of evaluations of such programs.
- poll the PVO community to ascertain its member's desire and available resources to undertake Food Aid Distribution programs.
- organize a working group to assist interested PVOs engaging in Food Aid Distribution for the first time.

8. OTHER PROGRAM OPTIONS

This section includes the suggestions made by Mr. Love and by Mr. Bollinger during their discussion of these Reflections during the March 6 meeting.

The pervasive problem of administrative complexity in program accountability has plagued many of the AID programs. To begin to look at this problem in depth, the following suggestions are offered for discussion.

a) Experimentation. The true nature (administrative regulations or legislative) of the administrative constraints and impediments brought about by program accountability should be determined. Negotiations with the appropriate Congressional Committee and within the Agency, could be allowed on an experimental basis, e.g. consider one or two countries where the Administrator would be given broad executive flexibility in implementing an agreed-upon five-year plan with specific goals and objectives. Once this plan was approved, the Agency would reduce its contracting, granting, and administrative burdens to a bare minimum and report annually on progress toward those goals. With creative programming, and multi-national program cooperation, one of the results which could be anticipated would be a demonstration of the advantages of reducing administrative burdens for achieving long-term (five year) policy and program goals

b) CIDA Model. A review of the Canadian (CIDA) model for non-governmental organization (NGO) collaboration in Third World development could be made. CIDA funds flexible programming by NGOs for both large and small-scale programs with a minimum of administrative oversight. According to reports from various participants during the ACVFA meeting, CIDA has been pleased with the creativity and variety of programs it has been able to support through its foreign assistance approach. The Committee will review CIDA documentation over the next few months to identify any specific concept which may be useful in reviewing the current AID approach.

c) New Starts. It was stated that only a few "new" starts will be funded by the Africa Bureau this year in support of major sectoral programs. The Committee urges strongly that each "new" start incorporate indigenous involvement, private sector and parastatal roles in the criteria for funding. Without such a mandate, it is possible that small-scale components of any initiative would be overlooked. Reference to parastatals does not imply that they should be encouraged, but rather, that their existence be acknowledged within the local economic reality.

d) Cooperation. The Committee recommends that PVOs increasingly decentralize authority to the field in much the same way that AID has done to facilitate implementation and management.

APPENDIX 3

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

Preliminary Agenda for June Meeting
(for discussion)

The Field Perspective, Small-Scale Projects
for Long Term African Development

1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

- E. Morgan Williams, Chairman, Advisory Committee (opening remarks)
- Brief opening remarks by Myron Golden, USAID Representative
- Brief opening remarks by Owen W. Roberts, U.S. Ambassador
- Brief opening remarks by Julia C Bloch - AA/FVA Bureau, AID

2. SPEECH BY HIGH LEVEL TOGOLESE OFFICIAL

Name _____

3. MECHANISMS FOR MANAGING/FUNDING MULTIPLE SMALL-SCALE ACTIVITIES

- A. Given our experience to date with mechanisms such as co-financing (umbrellas), matching grants, and PVO components of larger bilateral projects, what are the advantages and constraints of these funding methods and what would improve their effectiveness?
(Experimental Programs to be discussed also)
- 1) Definition of OPG's, matching grants and small-scale/umbrella projects (possible hand out Ross Bigelow's paper), including the agency's experience with these projects (Women in development issue also included).
 - 2) Are such projects suitable for small as well as large USAID missions?
 - 3) Do small missions have the programming flexibility to do such projects?
 - 4) Discussion of the optimal modes of host country participation in such projects.
 - 5) Are such projects a viable method of reaching the host country's PVO's and other NGO's?

6) Examine specific cases of such projects (possibly Chad, Zaire, Somalia, Kenya, and Senegal).

7) What advantages and disadvantages do these projects offer to U.S. PVOs?

8) What are the key relevant host country factors to consider in deciding to use these mechanisms?

B. What is the Peace Corps experience?

C. What is the African Development Bank experience?

D. What is the current and potential role for consortia and in-country coordinating councils with regard to multiple small-scale activities and what would improve their effectiveness?

E. What are some new ideas regarding funding/management of multiple small-scale activities?

Presenters _____

Rapporteurs/Resource Persons _____

4. OPERATIONAL CONCERNS REGARDING SMALL-SCALE ACTIVITIES

A. Small-scale project concerns:

1) USAID management issues, e.g. limited mission staff time for PVO project design, negotiation, start-up, monitoring and logistical support (other AID operational concerns i.e. contractual and procurement issues).

2) Absorptive capacity of PVOs.

3) Country distribution of PVOs.

4) Decentralization of U.S. PVO headquarter's authority to PVO field representatives.

- 5) Qualifications of professional PVO staff in the field, e.g., technical, managerial, and language.
 - 6) Adequacy of PVO headquarters and field-based project backstopping.
 - 7) Replicability.
 - 8) Sustainability. (recurrent costs)
- B. Is the size of the AID country program relevant to its ability to establish a funding mechanism for small scale activities?
- C. What improvements can PVOs suggest regarding AID support of PVO programs?
- D. Peace Corps, AID & PVO collaboration.

Presenters _____

Rapporteurs/Resource Persons _____

5. PROGRAM CONCERNS REGARDING SMALL-SCALE ACTIVITIES

- A. Host country priorities:
- 1) What kind of projects do host countries want?
 - 2) Are host countries interested in small-scale projects?
- B. Coordination in planning program priorities:
- 1) It is AID policy that PVO activities funded by the Mission be consistent with the Mission CDSS. What steps can be taken to better coordinate PVO activities submitted for Mission funding with the CDSS priorities?
 - 2) What are the constraints to mandatory formal participation by PVO's in the CDSS process?

C. Communication:

- 1) How can we improve the four-way communication flow among AID/Washington, U.S. PVO headquarters, AID missions, and field-based U.S. PVO representatives?

D. Forging and Strengthening Links Between U.S. PVOs and African NGOs.:

- 1) In the context of AID funding of U.S. PVO activities, what is the role of local PVOs? What can be done by AID and U.S. PVOs to promote and strengthen indigenous, self-sustaining capacity? What do indigenous PVOs need from U.S. PVOs?

Presenters _____

Rapporteurs/Resource Persons _____

6. INCREASING PVO PARTICIPATION IN P.L. 480 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

A. Creating new opportunities:

- 1) How do we capitalize on an opportunity to move PVO's emergency food aid programs into more development-oriented food activities?
- 2) What new initiatives are needed to get totally new PVOs involved in P.L. 480?

B. Operational concerns, constraints and initiatives:

- 1) What new opportunities and/or constraints to increased PVO involvement are presented by the P.L. 480 legislation?
- 2) What are the best mechanisms to coordinate food aid efforts with the host country and other donors so as prevent disincentives to local, self-sustaining production?
- 3) What resources do PVOs need to undertake P.L. 480 programs? For instance what are the appropriate levels of PVO contributions and USAID funding? How should the cost of internal transport, associated development projects, etc., be covered?

- 4) What skills do PVOs need to design and manage development projects using P.L. 480 commodities? Where can they be acquired? Can the Peace Corps play a role?
- C. What is the appropriate role for PVO integration with other food aid programs?

7. OTHER DONOR ACTIVITIES IN SMALL-SCALE PROJECTS FOR LONG TERM AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT

- A. Other donor's activities will be reviewed and a list of presenters will be finalized, comprised of regional organizations, NGO's and various bilateral donors.
- B. U.S. PVO input and collaboration with other donors.

Presenters _____

Rapporteurs/Resource Persons _____

8. SPECIAL INTEREST CLOSED MEETINGS FOR COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Upon polling the ACVFA members for their needs and interests, special interest meetings will be arranged to discuss the above topics in greater depth with various resource persons in Lome. Members could chair the individual meeting.

Suggested Meetings _____

9. FIELD TRIPS

(Visits to specific projects within a 2-hour driving distance of Lome). This could afford opportunities for small group meetings with local organizations.

Suggested Sites: PFP
 OIC (NOTSE)
 ATAKPAME-Petite Ruminer and animal
 traction
 CUNA (World Council of credit Unions)

Suggestion: All day trip to Ganvie, Benin

FVA/ACVFA:JFox/LWH:2/21/86:0460B

APPENDIX 4

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

THE FIELD PERSPECTIVE, SMALL-SCALE PROJECTS FOR LONG-TERM
AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT, PREPARATORY SESSION

FOCUS: Preparatory Meeting for the Advisory Committee's
meeting in Lome, Togo, June, 1986

WHEN: Thursday, March 6, 1986

WHERE: DEPARTMENT OF STATE (Use C Street entrance)
Loy Henderson International Conference Room
Washington, D.C. 20523

REGISTRATION:

This meeting is free and open to the public. However,
PRE-REGISTRATION BY MARCH 1, 1986 THROUGH ADVISORY COMMITTEE
HEADQUARTERS IS REQUIRED BY THE STATE DEPARTMENT FOR SECURITY
REASONS. On-site registration and coffee service for
pre-registered participants will begin at 8:30 a.m.

PRELIMINARY AGENDA:

9:00 - 9:15 a.m. -

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

E. Morgan Williams, Chairman, Advisory Committee

9:15 - 10:15a.m.

TOPIC I

Review of Committee's preliminary recommendations
from the December meeting

Mr. Alexander R. Love, Deputy Assistant
Administrator, Africa Bureau, AID

Mr. Walter Bollinger, Deputy Assistant
Administrator, Bureau for Food for Peace
and Voluntary Assistance, AID

Question and Answer Period

10:15 - 10:45 a.m.

TOPIC II Discussion of ACVFA objectives for Africa meeting

Dr. Philip Johnston, Executive
Director, Care, ACVFA Member

Mr. Robert Nicholas,
Development Assistance
Corporation, Contract Manager

10:45 - 11:00 a.m. Coffee break

11:00 - 12:15 p.m.

TOPIC III Review of draft agenda and identification
of resources e.g., speakers, organizational
contacts, site visits, etc., for Africa meeting

Mr. Robert Nicholas,
Development Assistance
Corporation, Contract Manager

Mr. Myron Golden, AID Representative,
US/AID, Lome, Togo

12:15 - 2:00 p.m. Lunch

2:00 - 2:30 p.m.

TOPIC IV Report on Gramm-Rudman

Mr. Kelly C. Kammerer, Director
Legislative Affairs, AID

2:30 - 3:15 p.m.

TOPIC V Report on Privatness update

Ms. Karen Poe, Office of Private Voluntary
Cooperation, FVA Bureau, AID

TOPIC VI Report to Congress on NGO effectiveness
Highlights in relation to Africa meeting
Recommendations regarding future areas that
PVOs and/or AID should be tracking

Ms. Karen Poe, Office of Private Voluntary
Cooperation, FVA Bureau, AID

3:15 - 3:30 p.m.

TOPIC VII Report on African Famine Supplemental

Mr. Ted Morse, Director, Office of
Drought Coordination, Africa Bureau,
AID

3:30 - 3:45 p.m. Coffee Break

3:45 - 4:00 p.m.

TOPIC VIII Briefing update on upcoming DAC meeting on NGO
role in Africa

Mr. Austin Heyman, Deputy Director,
Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation,

FVA Bureau, AID

Mr. Peter Davies, President and Chief
Executive Officer, InterAction

4:00 - 4:30 p.m.

Final review of agenda and logistics for Africa meeting

Facilitator: Mr. Robert Nicholas,
Development Assistance Corporation,
Contract Manager

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CALL OR WRITE

The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid
Agency for International Development

227 SA-8

Washington, D.C. 20523

(703) 235-2708

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

PRE-REGISTRATION FORM

for the quarterly meeting of the

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

"THE FIELD PERSPECTIVE - SMALL SCALE PROJECTS FOR LONG-
TERM AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT"

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1986

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
Loy Henderson International Conference Room
Washington, D.C. 20523

Please submit one pre-registration form for each registrant;
return the forms by MARCH 1, 1986 to:

The Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid
Agency for International Development
Room 227, SA-8
Washington, D.C. 20523

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

Name _____

Position/Title _____

Organization _____

Mailing Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Daytime Telephone (____) _____

APPENDIX 5

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

Mr. E. Morgan WILLIAMS
Chairman, ACVFA
President, National Cooperative
Business Association
1401 New York Avenue, N.W. - Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 638-6222 (o)
(703) 250-5772 (h)

Mr. Ted Connolly
Chairman of the Board/Chief Executive
Officer
Connolly Development, Inc.
P. O. Box 1558
Oakland, CA 94604
(415) 444-8858 (o)

Dr. Robert J. Marshall
Vice Chariman, ACVFA
Lutheran Southern Theological Seminary
4201 North Main Street
Columbia, SC 29203
(803) 786-5150 x 230 (o)
(803) 786-9378 (h)

Dr. Walter Phillip Falcon
Food Research Institute
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
(415) 723-3652 (o)

Mr. Markham Ball
Wald, Harkrader & Ross
1300 Nineteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 828-1515 (o)

Dr. LaVern A. Freeh
Vice President, International
Development and Governmental Affairs
Land O'Lakes, Inc.
Box 116
Minneapolis, MN 55440
(612) 481-2506 (o)

Mr. Enso V. Bighinatti
Advisor to the President
American Red Cross
17th & D Streets, NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 639-3235 (o)

Dr. Marie Davis Gadsden
4617 Blagden Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20011
(202) 722-1055 (h)

Mrs. Alice Green Burnette
Director of Development
Howard University
2900 Van Ness Street, NW
Washington, DC 20008
(202) 686-6606 (o)

Mr. David L. Guyer
President, Save the Children
54 Wilton Road
Westport, CT 06880
(203) 226-7272 (o)

Willie Campbell
President, Overseas Education
Fund, International
2101 L Street, NW - Suite 916
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 466-3430 (o)
(213) 626-7976 (o)

Dr. Philip Johnston
Executive Director, CARE
660 First Avenue
New York, NY 10016
(212) 686-3110 (o)

Mrs. Anna Chennault
President, TAC International
Investment Building
1511 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 347-0516 (o)

Mary Barden Keegan
President, Houston Chapter, End
Hunger Network, National Board Member
1770 St. James Place - Suite 608
Houston, TX 77056
(713) 963-0099 (o)
(713) 681-6691 (h)

Mrs. Mary M. McDonald
Member, Cook County Board of Commissioners
118 N Clark Street, Room 567
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 443-4393 (o)

Mr. John W. Sewell
President, Overseas Development Council
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW - Suite 501
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 234-8701 (o)

Mr. Kenneth M. Smith
President, Int'l Management & Development
Group, Ltd.
1250 Eye Street, NW - Suite 303
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 842-4190 (o)

Mr. Martin Sorkin
Economic Consultant
2700 Virginia Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 333-0377 (o)

Mr. Steven F. Stockmeyer
President, Stockmeyer & Company
1317 F Street, NW - Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 638-2121 (o)

William B. Walsh, M.D.
President & Chief Executive Officer
Project HOPE
HOPE Center
Millwood, VA 22646
(703) 837-2100 (VA office)
(301) 656-7401 (MD office)

COMMITTEE STAFF

Judith B. Fox, Executive Director
Lillian Halter, Administrative
Operations Assistant
Advisory Committee on Voluntary
Foreign Aid (ACVFA)
Room 260, SA-8
1400 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 235-2708 and 3336