

**Results Report and Resources Request
Fiscal Year 2001**

**United States Agency for International Development
Bureau for Humanitarian Response**

**Office of Food for Peace - Strategic Objective 2
"Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II
development activities with measurable results related to food
security with a primary focus on household nutrition
and agricultural productivity"**

10 May 1999

**THE ATTACHED RESULTS INFORMATION IS FROM THE FY 1998 RESULTS
REVIEW AND RESOURCES REQUEST (R4) FOR BHR/FFP/DP AND WAS
ASSEMBLED AND ANALYZED BY BHR/FFP/DP.**

Please Note:

The attached FY 2001 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4") was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after Oct. 1, 2001

PART I: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE

A. INTRODUCTION

No concern facing the poorest members of developing countries is of more fundamental importance than attaining food security.¹ The real third world - 840 million hungry people, including 180 million severely underweight children - are the focus of USAID's popular, flexible and well-financed food aid programs.

The United States P.L. 480 Title II development food aid program (i.e. non-emergency food aid) constitutes the single largest source of USAID funding focused on food security. The Office of Food for Peace SO2 team administers Title II non-emergency programs - a \$400 million dollar development portfolio. Programmed in-kind or monetized, food aid is used to provide direct feeding or to generate local currency for development activities. Monetization encourages local and U.S. market development by promoting private sector participation. Title II development food aid, if fully integrated with other USAID resources, enhances the effectiveness of child survival, nutrition education, family planning and community development activities. Food for work (FFW) mobilizes poor people's labor to create income and local agricultural infrastructure necessary for sustainable development.

The Office of Food for Peace SO2 team mission is the Agency's main food aid and food security program, as envisioned by the 1995 USAID food aid strategy policy, issued in 1995. In accordance with this policy paper, approximately 83% of Title II development funding supports activities directed at improving household nutrition (including water and sanitation activities) and agricultural productivity (see table 1). Priority is given to expanding Title II development activities in sub-Saharan Africa and South Asia—chronically food insecure regions of the world.

U.S. food assistance is grounded in American humanitarianism. By design of Congress it also benefits the U.S. economy both directly and indirectly. USAID-administered international food assistance is a mechanism to buy the abundance of American agriculture and channel it of overseas relief and development. Americans benefit directly through the purchase of U.S. goods and services. Millions of dollars worth of agricultural commodities and processed food products, such as wheat flour and corn-soy-blend, are purchased for USAID'S P.L. 480 programs. The processed commodities are packaged in containers that are produced and printed in the U.S. And the majority of commodities are shipped to recipient countries on U.S. flag carriers. When food assistance is used to support development activities it effectively alleviates poverty and promotes local economic growth in recipient countries. As incomes in developing countries rise,

1. Food Security, as defined in the U.S. Position Paper for the World Food Summit (November 1996), "exists when all peoples at all times have physical and economic access to sufficient food to meet their dietary needs for a productive and healthy life. Food security has three dimensions: Availability of sufficient quantities of food of appropriate quality, supplied through domestic production or imports; Access by households and individuals to adequate resources to acquire appropriate foods for a nutritious diet; and Utilization of food through adequate diet, water, sanitation, and health care."

consumption patterns change and imports increase. Aid leads to trade, and Americans exporters benefit.

B. OVERVIEW

The Office of Food for Peace SO2 team supports 67 Cooperating Sponsors (CSs) in NGO-implemented Title II development activities operating in 16 Sub-Saharan Africa countries, 2 countries in South Asia, and 6 countries in Latin America (see appendix table 1). The total FY 1999 approved value² of these activities is \$379.8 million, complemented by \$10.5 million in section 202(e) cash funding for NGO field-related expenses. In addition, \$2.1 million in Institutional Strengthening Agreements (ISA) is granted for strengthening CS headquarters capacities. The 202(e) money is provided to cover the dollar costs associated with field implementation of Title II food aid activities.

Title II development activities support interventions in 6 technical areas, with a focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity (see table 1).

Table 1. FY 1999 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives . FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component. FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component. FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component. FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component. FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component. FY 1998 Title II Development Program Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives - by Food Security Component.		
Food security component	Percent of total commodity volume	Percent of total value (commodity + freight)
Health & Nutrition	35.1	41.1
Water & Sanitation	4.4	4.3
Agriculture	46.0	38.9
Education	10.4	10.4
Micro-Enterprise	2.0	2.9
Non-Emergency Humanitarian Relief	2.1	2.2
Total FY 1999 Title II Development Funding through PVOs and Cooperatives	989,169 MT	\$379 Million

2. Total value includes commodity plus freight.

Title II Development Funding through the World Food Program (approximate 4/26/99)	6,020 MT	\$27 Million
Total FY 1999 Title II Development Funding	995,189 MT	\$406 Million

C. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE

Food Aid and Food Security as an Agency Priority

Last year's R4 presented, for the second year in a row, the critical need for increased staff, OE and DA resources for the SO2 team. The R4 stated clearly that, "The continued scarcity of dollar and human resources to support Title II development programming continues to exert a serious constraint on the ability of the SO2 team to achieve its goal of improving the effectiveness of Title II development activities. While the SO2 team was successful in achieving some FY 1997 targets in certain areas, these successes have come at the cost of increased [partner] dissatisfaction, further erosion in the SO2 team's ability to respond to program needs in a timely manner, increased turnover of FFP staff, and difficulties in meeting the objective of managed growth of the Title II development portfolio."

One conclusion of the FY 2000 R4 review was that the Agency as a whole needed to increase the priority placed on food security in general, and on the efficient and effective management of food aid resources in particular. However, this fundamental issue of Agency priorities was judged to be beyond the scope of the SO2 team's direct influence. The issue was referred to the BBS process and future senior management discussions.

Unfortunately, in the face of resource demands that greatly exceed the current supply of resources, the Agency has been unable to change the relative priority placed on food security and the food aid program. Regional bureaus and Missions have programmed their scarce resources per the guidance they have received. They have not been able to increase the staff devoted to the management of the Title II program, and clearly have many competing priorities for the programming of their scarce DA resources. And the SO2 team still has inadequate staff and OE resources to achieve targeted results.

Mandate management

Note here that the management of the multiple mandates and objectives contained in the P.L. 480 legislation, as amended in April, 1996, is a complex and labor intensive process. Efforts devoted to meeting the objectives of one mandate (e.g. improve the sustainable food security impacts of Title II-funded programs) can undermine the ability of Office of Food for Peace SO2 team and its partners to meet other mandates.³ In an effort to minimize the inherent contradictions among the

³ If, for example, a mandated reduction in monetization to the 15% minimum established in the legislation were implemented, several likely effects would result. One, there would be a decrease in the proportion of total tonnage procured as bulk commodities. Two, this would lead to an increase in the proportion of tonnage procured in the form of processed, value-added, or bagged commodities, thus helping to meet the mandate that 75% of commodities be value-added. Three, this would, however, likely decrease the total amount of resources programmed with concomitant difficulties in meeting the sub-minimum mandate. And four, the CSs would increase the amount of direct feeding and food distribution in their programs, which will decrease the potential for achieving sustainable improvements in food security with the Title II resources. Another

multiplicity of mandates, BHR/FFP engages partners like the NGO CSs, congressional staffers, the wheat trade and USDA in frequent rounds of brokering and consultation. Perhaps more than any other USAID operational activity, the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team engages with the public in its policy planning. Together we craft meaningful and targeted development interventions of which the agency can be proud.

Three of the Farm Bill mandates that are particularly difficult to meet concurrently are:

1. Title II resources will be used to increase food security and decrease malnutrition, particularly among women and children.
2. 75% of programmed Title II resources will be processed, value-added, or bagged.
3. A minimum of 1.55 Million MT (the sub-minimum) of Title II will be programmed for non-emergency activities.

For the past 5 years, BHR/FFP has dedicated considerable time and efforts to develop a strategy for using Title II resources to maximize impacts on food security. The Food Aid and Food Security policy places emphasis on the importance of thorough problem assessment and analysis in order to identify and implement actions that will lead to sustainable impacts on household and individual food security in the poorest countries. Food Aid and Food Security policy encourages program focus on agricultural productivity and household nutrition. It recognizes the need for flexibility in programming and encourages responses to food security constraints in a given context.

In most countries, food insecurity is the result of a complex set of factors. Analysis of the causes of food insecurity, and increased focus on achieving sustainable results in food security improvement, have led many CSs to implement programs that rely less on the direct distribution of food as rations or in on-site feeding programs. The accepted strategy for reducing food insecurity is to concentrate on activities that increase the capacity of the poor household to meet ITS own food security needs. This has led to CS activities that place stress on agricultural development, education and training, tactics that are aimed at widening access to financial resources needed to purchase food. This in turn leads to a trend towards a larger proportion of Title II commodities that are monetized, converted into cash, and the concomitant increase in demand for bulk commodities for monetization.

This increase in the monetization of bulk commodities has resulted in difficulties in meeting the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team's mandate of 75 % processed, value-added, or bagged commodities procurement, a matter demanding a lot of Office Management attention in FY 1998. The providers of bagged, processed and fortified commodities and the millers expressed concern through their congressional delegations. Commercial interests as a group expressed concern that the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team's CS partners' monetization of Title II non-emergency commodities was creating unfair competition with U.S. commercial interests in recipient

example of how the mandates conflict may be found in the fact that, as the CSs have focused on improving in quality and impacts of their programs, the total size of many programs have decreased, and there has been a reduction in direct feeding (and thus demand for value added commodities, and increase in the demand for bulk commodities for monetization.

countries. Although CS monetizations of USAID P.L. 480 commodities represents less than one fifth of one percent of US grain exports, the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team paid careful heed to commercial concerns.

A working group was formed to develop recommendations for appropriate monetization strategies. The FY 2000 Development Program (DAP/PAA) Guidelines contain criteria developed to prioritize the use of Title II resources for monetization (see appendix 2). The criteria emphasize a programmatic focus on agricultural productivity and household nutrition, encourage the use of value-added, processed and bagged commodities where possible, and discourage third-country monetization.

Programmatic guidelines have been developed to address concerns about the impact of monetization on U.S. commercial interests (see appendix 3.) These guidelines reflect discussions between USAID/BHR, USDA, U.S. food export and processing industry representatives, NGO Cooperating Sponsors, and congressional representatives. The guidelines will be used on a pilot basis for up to two years to determine their effectiveness. The above mentioned parties, and BHR/FFP will then decide on their long-term use.

The team stresses that Title II programs can not be implemented without some level of monetization (see Box 1.) Even if the Title II development program were not trying to sustainably improve food security in recipient households, there are logistic and administrative costs associated with the physical distribution of commodities that must be covered. One alternative for covering administrative and logistics costs are the section 202(e) dollar funds made available to USAID through USDA's Farm Bill. However, these funds are not available in sufficient quantity to cover current needs (i.e. procurement of external technical assistance and equipment), much less expanded local currency costs of food distribution. Another option is to introduce a cost-share requirement for Title II non-emergency programs.

Box 1. Monetization delays affect results in Ethiopia

CARE Ethiopia's program provides an example of how matters beyond the control of USAID present constraints. "Much like FY '97, FY '98 was marred by continued concerns surrounding revenue earned from monetization ...the five implementing projects made erratic progress towards achieving their overall objectives. The year was characterized by stop-start implementation which seriously affected staff morale and the pace at which activities were achieved...large rural infrastructure projects were put on hold and the rural projects concentrated on smaller, cheaper activities...the financial crisis was so alarming at the beginning of June 1998 that many of the field staff were given the option of taking their quit claims from CARE or going on leave without pay and thus the projects were virtually shut down for nearly four months of FY '98."

Understaffing

The Office of Food for Peace successfully implements an \$840 million per annum high profile program with one-tenth the proportional staffing of other USAID operational offices and bureaus. The resultant stress caused a FY 1998 turnover in the majority of office Country Backstop Officers (CBOs) during the fiscal year. Much of the turnover occurred during the critical DAP/PAA program review cycle in the spring and fall of the year. Though new CBOs successfully faced the need to rapidly get up to speed on the team's proposal review procedures, the crippling turnover continues. four key/key staffers in the small FFP office are leaving in June (1999) alone – a big hit in a staff of only 31 people.

In an effort to remedy these concerns, FFP is converting at least two (2) of the Foreign Service CBO positions to GS cadre in the hopes that a greater degree of continuity will be maintained, albeit at the expense of USAID field experience. Additionally, so as to familiarize CBOs with their role and responsibilities, introductory and refresher trainings remain ongoing.

However, the heavy work load and management concerns are often cited as reasons for leaving by out-going staff. These will continue to be issues, given current staff levels and configuration, and the lack of Agency response to requests for increased resources and support. To the extent possible given current resource levels, Regional Bureaus and Missions need to take on increased responsibility for managing their food aid programs, by insuring that Mission staff understand and implement the policies, procedures and regulations that pertain to the program; by improving the supervision of FSN and PSC food aid monitors; and by putting in place regional FFP officers with support responsibilities for both emergency and non-emergency Title II programs.

THE SO2 team is often required to augment FFP's emergency division in an increasing number of humanitarian crises, reducing even more the staff time available for the implementation of the non-emergency Title II program. USG-administered food aid resource levels have in one year doubled over previous record levels. No additional staff was assigned in USDA, in USAID/FFP, or in US overseas Missions to address the increased demands for implementation, management and coordination.

Change in Strategic Plan needed

While the team proposes some modifications to the performance monitoring plan for the current Strategic Objective (see below,) we believe this will not address overall planning requirements. The Office of Food for Peace SO2 team has identified the limitations of the present strategy for implementing the Strategic Plan.

Given the lack of success in getting increased staff, OE and DA resources, reflecting the relative priority placed by the Agency on its \$850 million dollar food security and food aid programs, the Office of Food for Peace SO2 team faces challenges just to move the commodities and complete and process the paper work. This is compounded by external influences outlined above (the tensions between the food security impact mandate and the 75% value-added mandate, and the

desire to decrease the proportion of resources monetized.) The team nevertheless is still game to augment and otherwise directly impact Mission and CSs capacity to effectively implement food security programs with sustainable impacts on food security.

During FY 2000, the SO2 team proposes to reformulate Strategic Objective 2 (SO2) to more clearly focus on getting the right food to the right people in the right place at the right time, and to more clearly focus on what is within the management capacity of FFP to accomplish. The revision to this kind of SO is necessitated by the multiplicity of interests of partners well as of Congress, and the relative priority placed by the Agency on more penetrating innovations to achieve food security objectives.

Performance monitoring plan

The SO2 Team relies on feedback from the Missions and CSs (the SO2 team's partners) to assess how well the team is meeting their needs for support in a range of areas. The team relies in large part on assessments from the field Missions to determine levels of capacity of the CSs in implementation and integration of the CSs activities. The Team has not been fully successful in motivating partners to provide the required feedback.

In the process of preparing the FY 2000 R4, the team identified a number of SO2 indicators that were not sensitive measures of the results the team was trying to achieve. During FY 1998, the team was unable to identify good substitutes for these indicators that did not rely on additional surveys of our customers. As mentioned above, solicitation of survey responses from our customers has not been a successful strategy for quantifying indicators. Therefore, given the difficulties in both defining and quantifying, the team is proposing to drop a number of performance indicators (see next section.) In addition to dropping a number of indicators, BHR/FFP may, in the future, include survey responses as part of Mission DAP/PAA submission requirements.

Performance monitoring plan revisions

Until the Strategic Objective is revised, and due to difficulties in collecting reliable, timely data, the following indicators in the current performance monitoring plan (PMP) are not useful to management, and will be dropped from the PMP. All of the indicators being dropped are at the Intermediate Result level.

- IR2.1.1b. Percentage of PAAs for which Missions assess that PVOs have adequate technical capacity for implementing and monitoring programs.
- IR2.1.2a. Percentage of Missions satisfying 75% of guidelines in annual FAMP submissions.
- IR2.1.3a. Percentage of scores 3 or above by PVOs on surveys of DAP guidance quality.
- IR2.1.3b. Percentage of scores of “good” or “excellent” by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.
- IR2.2.1a. Percentage of PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO has coordinated its activities with other PVO, host country, private sector and IO activities to great extent or better.
- IR2.2.2a. Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess that PVO activities contribute to Mission objectives to a great extent or better
- IR2.2.2b. Percentage of DAPs/PAAs in which Missions assess M&E activities/indicators meet Mission results reporting needs to great extent or better.

Thus, until it is revised, Strategic Objective 2 will be monitored using results framework outlined in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Strategic Support Objective 2 Revised Results Framework Summary

<p>Goal: Improved household nutrition and agricultural productivity among targeted vulnerable groups.</p>	
<p>Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Increased effectiveness of FFP’s partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity</p>	
<p>SSO2 Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 Percentage of new approved DAPs that identify objectively measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance. 2.2 Percentage of partner’s activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively measurable indicators within first year of implementation. 2.3 Percentage of partner’s annual targets demonstrated to be achieved, based on objectively measured indicators. 	
<p>Intermediate Result 2.1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support programs.</p>	<p>Intermediate Result 2.2: Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.</p>
<p>IR 2.1. Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Percentage of DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better. b. Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for re delegating Title II program authority. 	<p>IR 2.2. Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Number of countries in which 2 or more PVOs have joint or coordinated M&E activities. b. Number of countries in which joint US-EU food security strategies are developed. a. Number of countries in which PVOs and WFP develop joint food security strategies.

PART II. RESULTS REVIEW

Strategic Objective 2 (SO2): Increased effectiveness of FFP's partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security, with a primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity

Strategic Objective 2 and its associated indicators are not defined in terms of specific people-level impact targets, but rather in terms of the degree to which FFP's partners are able to achieve and measure the people-level targets that *they* set. This approach follows directly from the *Food Aid and Food Security Policy Paper*, which recommends that responsibility for the *managing-for-results* system fall primarily on the CSs and USAID Missions, and in turn, that these field managers will be given flexibility to propose activities they believe will have the greatest food security impacts. The three SO2 indicators are thus designed to measure the results of SO2 team efforts to improve the capacity of FFP's partners to implement food security activities and to manage and report on the results of those activities. The three indicators measure the capacity of the CSs to (1) design food security M&E systems, (2) implement food security M&E systems, and (3) **achieve food security results**.

Overall, the SO2 team did not meet its targets for FY 1998. While targets for continued improvements in the ability of the CSs to define and lay the basis for reporting on performance monitoring plans were met, critical targets for results achievement by CSs, quality of DAP submissions, and redelegation of PAA approval authority were not met.

The CSs continued to demonstrate improved capacity to lay the basis for performance monitoring. Three-quarters of approved DAPs identified objectively-measurable, program-linked performance indicators, as defined in FFP guidance. Information received to-date shows continued improvement in CS ability to establish baseline data and targets for performance within one year of activity approval (see Performance Data Table 1.) And, in a clear improvement over FY 1997, 75% of CSs annual results reports received to date contained performance reporting data that compared results achieved against targets. This increase in the proportion of CSs demonstrating the capacity for results-based management, by developing and using a performance reporting plan, is a clear advance and success of SO2.

The increased CS capacity for results-based management has been important not only for improving the completeness and value of the results the CSs monitor and report. The improved information collected has positive impacts on the beneficiary communities, as well (see box 2.)

Box 2. Program strengthening through improved information

CRS Benin has developed a Management Information System that does more than provide input to program managers. Some communities have begun using the MIS to provide feedback to community members, local authorities, and Ministry of Health (MOH) officials about the health situation in their area. A number of communities have indicated that vaccination information from the MIS has been useful in encouraging MOH vaccination agents to come to villages or schedule health education days to vaccinate children, effectively improving vaccination coverage.

However, the FY 1998 target for the SO2 Indicator 3 – percent of targets achieved - was not met (see Performance Data Table 2.) CSs achieved 67% of the targets they set for FY 1998, compared with the target level of 75%. The El Niño weather phenomenon played an important role in preventing many CSs from reaching targets set for health and, especially, agricultural activities. However, while some FY 1998 targets of increased yield or production were not met, Title II development activities have been able to increase the resilience of the production systems they are working with, and decrease risk (see box 3.)

While the average percentage of results achieved did not meet the FY 1998 target, the CSs were able to demonstrate some important impacts on the food security and nutrition of Title II project beneficiaries. The CSs' FY 1998 Results Reports documented a range of success stories in increasing agricultural productivity, household income and nutrition (see box 4.)

Box 3. Title II development programs lower risk to small, vulnerable farmers

FHI/Mozambique reports that "the Agriculture Program had much success despite widespread flooding in the wet season and much drier conditions than normal thereafter. While maize production province-wide was poor, farmers that adopted FHI/M practices produced nearly 50% more per hectare than non-assisted farmers." (FHI/Mozambique FY 1998 Results Report) In Bolivia, despite severe effects of El Niño on agricultural production, farmers participating in Title II CS programs were able to achieve significant increase in volume of production of crops in comparison to non-participant farmers. For example farmers in FHI programs produced 4,285 kg of selected crops in comparison to 1,863 of non-participants. Families participating in PCI Bolivia's agriculture program produced an average of 4.7 MT. during FY 1998, 24% less than the average production measured during the 1996 baseline survey. This decrease in average production is due to the drought caused by El Niño. However, in areas where PCI did not implement its program, average production was only 2 MT per family, and in some cases, the entire harvest was lost. In addition, although production of basic grains suffered, PCI participant farmers were still able to increase the value of their net income from agriculture, compared with the 1996 baseline figures, because PCI's irrigation projects permit farmers to diversify into crops that have a higher value in the market.

Box 4. Title II-funded successes during FY 1998.

Significant reductions in the percent of Peruvian children malnourished

The objective of CARE Peru's NIÑOS project is to improve the nutritional status of children under five, with emphasis on those under three, through intensive training of their mothers in nutrition and maternal-child health and the implementation of a nutrition and health surveillance system in the community. NIÑOS is currently being implemented in 180 rural Peruvian communities and benefited 6,450 children under 5 during FY 1998.

NIÑOS monitoring data demonstrate impressive improvements in nutritional status among participant children in just 13 months of project implementation. In the particularly vulnerable group of children under 3, acute malnutrition (as measured by weight-for-height) has decreased by 75% while chronic malnutrition (as measured by height-for-age) has decreased by 11%. The decrease in chronic malnutrition is especially noteworthy since this reduction occurred despite problems resulting from the El Niño phenomenon which had a negative impact on child health.

Child growth improves in Mozambique

Africare Mozambique completed a pilot program using the "HEARTH" methodology to target and improve under-weight children using volunteer mothers. This program is being expanded to each of the communities included in Africare's outreach. The results of the activity were very positive; 75% of the participating children gained weight during a 28-day period. More importantly, the participating mothers had a graphic demonstration of the link between better eating, weight gain and improved health status of their children.

Mozambican mothers provide appropriate care during diarrhea episodes

The results of the FHI/Mozambique diarrhea intervention are already apparent. For example, the percentage of children with diarrhea being given appropriate liquids increased from 49% at baseline to 86% at the monitoring session in June (1 year.) Anecdotal evidence was also telling. Some of the mother's report their amazement when their children with diarrhea continue to be alert and playful rather than listless as used to be the norm before oral rehydration therapy was used.

Box. 4. Title II-funded successes during FY 1998 cont.

Rural income increases in Ghana

The overall goal of TNS/Ghana's DAP is to assist small-scale farmers and food processors in Ghana to live more secure and productive lives, by improving agricultural productivity, and increasing rural incomes and employment. TNS/Ghana believes that once farmers are able to meet their own immediate food security needs they will increase production, adopt post-harvest technologies and practices, and add value to their local produce only when they can make a reasonable profit in doing so. Through training and technical support services provided by TNS, farmers learn to treat their agricultural activities as a business – improving local productivity and profitability.

During FY 1998, with funding from Title II monetization proceeds, TNS/Ghana assisted a total of 78,350 direct beneficiaries, over half of whom are women, through the support of 222 community-based enterprises. The farmer-owners of these enterprises invested the equivalent of approximately \$20,000 of their own capital and leveraged the equivalent of an additional \$752,000 of credit. As a result, TNS-assisted farmers generated the equivalent of \$1.36 million in rural income via the sales of local agricultural products and services.

Peruvian small farmers received more value-added for their products

Small producers of alpaca fiber in Puno, recently organized in legally recognized marketing enterprises, and for the first time participated in direct negotiations with Internacional de Comercio Inc., a private sector company based in the city of Arequipa, for the sale of alpaca fiber. This has been the first sale of fiber by these newly formed project enterprises, and has been profitable.

With credit on commercial terms provided by TNS, these marketing enterprises of small producers bought fiber from other small producers living in remote communities; for the first time utilizing a typical commercial classification system, which allows the producers to be paid based on the quality of the fiber. The producer's are able to capture more value-added for their products, as opposed to selling "as a single-bundle", without classification and at lower prices.

Better roads lead to better lives

CARE Bangladesh's Integrated Food for Development (IFFD) Project is a five-year rural infrastructure development project funded primarily by USAID. In FY 1998 IFFD utilized 120,000 Mts. of P.L. 480 wheat to carry out its activities in rehabilitation of rural roads, flood proofing and mitigation, disaster management and preparedness, tree plantation and slope protection along selected roads, and local capacity building. During FY 1998, post-intervention data demonstrated impacts at the household level, attributed to the road improvements, which included a 16% increase in crop production value and a 17% increase in household income. Environmental monitoring demonstrated a 17% increase in fish catch due to improved water flow, a 6% decrease in fallow land due to early recession of flood waters, and a large increase in the numbers of roadside trees planted by private landholders and local organizations after road improvements.

Intermediate results

The Strategic Objective of increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's partners is supported by activities under two intermediate results: Strengthened capacities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities; and Improved integration of activities with other in-country activities, with Mission objectives, and with other donor strategies.

IR1: Strengthened capacities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP

The focus of the SO2 team's strategic plan continues to be capacity strengthening of our partners. Capacity strengthening occurs through discrete technical assistance activities supported by the SO2 team, as well as integration of capacity strengthening and training into program management and backstopping functions. The FY 2000 Results Report and Resource Request identified several technical areas where further and/or additional technical focus was needed in order to continue progress towards improved capacity of the SO2 team itself, and of its partners. The team has pulled together a number of sources and types of technical support that will, assuming that adequate resources are made available to the team, allow the institutionalization of the advances made to date, and improvements in areas where weaknesses have been identified.

The SO2 team contributes directly to improved capacity of its Mission and CS partners (Intermediate Results 1) through the backstopping provided by the CBOs. The SO2 team has developed a list of ten Mission management criteria to assist in 1) assessing the strengths and weaknesses of Mission Title II program management; 2) identifying capacity needs and developing appropriate training responses, where possible; and 3) evaluating Mission capacity for redelegation of certain management and PAA approval responsibilities. During FY 1999, SO2 team members, assisted by the Health and Child Survival Fellow and staff from G/PHN's Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANta) project, will conduct informal reviews of each Title II country program visited during the FY 2000 program review cycle.

The CBOs ability to provide quality backstopping is greatly enhanced by the activities of the Team's institutional support contractors, Mendez-England & Associates, and ARTI. These institutional contractors provide assistance in a number of administrative and information services, including commodity and logistics tracking, information system management, assistance in administering grant programs and organizing program reviews, and organization of conferences and training workshops such as the Food Aid Managers Course offered annually for USAID Washington and field staff.

Food for Peace has secured the services of a Health and Child Survival Fellow (HCSF), starting in FY 1999. The HCSF will provide support to the SO2 team in carrying out reviews of proposals, participating in mid term evaluations, program design (at both the Mission and CS levels), backstopping the FANta project, liaising with other Bureaus and Agencies on nutrition and health activities and, overall, enhancing the programming of Title II resources focused on nutrition and health.

Another important source of capacity strengthening is the partnership between BHR's Environmental Officer (BEO) and Food Aid Management, a consortium of food aid PVOs supported with ISA funds. This BHR/FAM partnership provides technical assistance and training to CSs in environmental review and compliance. Such support is particularly critical for the Title II development program since it supports many activities that have potential environmental consequences, including development of roads, irrigation schemes and other types of infrastructure, agricultural production and natural resource management, and building of latrines and sanitation facilities. An area of particular concern for environmental technical assistance is the assessment of Title II-funded activities designed to improve food production that involve the application of pesticides. BHR's BEO provides highly valued and important support to the SO2 team and its partners by conducting all of the necessary IEE reviews, advising Missions and CSs on the preparation of IEEs, and advising the FAM group.

The Institutional Support Agreements (ISA) are a critical component of the team's strategy for strengthening CS capacity. During FY 1998, new three-year ISAs were awarded to 14 Title II CSs. The procurement process allowed the SO2 team to further refine and target the use of these important resources on priority areas of technical strengthening for the CSs. The ISA RFA identified a number of focus areas for the new cycle of agreements. These areas included, but were not limited to the following: partnering arrangements among CSs to enhance the long-term success of food security programs; institutional capacity building in order that headquarters can better support field activities; providing a framework for improving human resources through workshops and training courses.

In addition to, and in support of, the "internal" sources of technical strengthening, the team continues to rely on Global Bureau sources of technical support. One critical source of support is the new Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANta) project. FANta provides direct technical support to the SO2 team in the review of Title II development activities; supports capacity strengthening of Mission and CS staff in food security program design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E); and develops and disseminates best practices for improved food security program design and implementation. FANta will continue the types of support accessed by the team through its predecessor projects (IMPACT and the Food Security Unit of Linkages) but will broaden the breadth of support to include a greater focus on program design and implementation, in addition to the traditional strong support received by the team and its partners in monitoring and evaluation.

Another Global project that forms part of the SO2 team's strategy for capacity strengthening is the Food Security II (FSII/MSU) project, an Agriculture and Food Security Cooperative Agreement with Michigan State University. The SO2 team support of the FSII/MSU activity helps replicate and more widely disseminate progress made to date in the use of early warning vulnerability analyses to prevent food shortages from escalating into conditions of widespread food insecurity or famine; in enhancing capacity in carrying out Bellmon Analyses to avoid the disincentive effects of food assistance on local agricultural production and market disruptions; in strengthening Mission and CS capacity to monitor and evaluate the impacts of Title II program, especially on income; and in applying studies on food insecurity resulting from climatic change to other parts of Sub-Saharan Africa.

Strengthened capacity of PVOs

The DAPs received during FY 1998 did show an improvement over those received during FY 1997 (see Performance Data Table 3.) The percentage of approved DAPs satisfying at least 75% of review criteria increased from 27% to 50%. However, this did not meet the FY 1998 target of 60%, and there is clearly still room for improvement in the quality of the Development Activity Proposals (DAPs) received from the CSs.

Two important tools the SO2 team has to strengthen the capacities of the Title II implementing partners (CSs) are the Institutional Support Assistance agreements (ISAs- formally Institutional Support Grants - ISGs) and technical assistance provided through Global Bureau projects.

Evaluations of the previous round of ISGs highlighted a number of noticeable improvements in CSs capacity because of the grants (see box 5.)

Box 5. CS capacity strengthened through ISGs

ISG Helps Improve CRS Program Development and Focus

The 1998 evaluation of CRSs five (5) year institutional support grant (ISG), found that CRS is now implementing technically sound DAPs. The evaluation also found that, through ISG support, CRS has improved its Title II health programs by moving from input-oriented, center-based MCH initiatives to community-based food assisted child survival (FACS) initiatives.

ISG Provides Cross-Regional Expertise in ACDI/VOCA

The 1998 evaluation of the ACDI/VOCA ISG found, “By providing for a separate food for development staff, ISG has permitted ACDI/VOCA to have a focal point with cross-regional expertise in food aid. This, in turn, has permitted a unified philosophical approach to food aid, encompassing the food systems approach as well as a food security analytical framework.”

ISG Support Leads to Restructuring of Save the Children Federation’s Offices

Through the support of the ISG, Save the Children realized the necessity to provide a greater focus on humanitarian relief programming. With this in mind, SCF reorganized its structure to create the Division of Humanitarian Response as well as creating positions at the VP and AVP level to provide support for this division. The ISG also provided support for the development of four DAPs.

The SO2 team's investments in Global Bureau projects (e.g. G/PHN's Food Security Unit of G/PHN's Linkages project during FY 1998, now through G/PHN's Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANta) project; and G/EGAD's Food Security II project (FSII/MSU)) have led to program improvements, and generated positive feedback from our partners (see box 6.)

Box 6. Global Bureau projects improve the capacity of the SO2 team's partners

Design and management of food security programs improved in East Africa

In Ethiopia, the FSII/MSU-supported Famine Early Warning System (FEWS) analyses have resulted in DAPs that factor the country's vulnerability to droughts and market prices instability into their design and implementation.

In Mozambique, the Mission and its Title II CS partners have adopted program management and evaluation tools designed to better track food aid results reporting. FSII/MSU devised indicators to measure the impact of food aid as a development intervention through its effects on household income.

G/PHN projects provide in-country technical support

During FY 1998, the FSU (now FANta) participated in the field review of Title II development activities in Ghana, Bolivia, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. During the course of the TDYs, technical assistance in monitoring and evaluation and Title II program integration was provided to USAID Missions and the Title II Cooperating Sponsors. As a result of Ghana TDY, the Mission is better able to integrate scarce resources while meeting reporting and legislative requirements.

Several opportunities to strengthen Title II programming were identified during the Bolivia and Guatemala visits. As a result of the Bolivia TDY, a workshop on Maximizing the Benefits of Food Aid Rations in Maternal and Child Health Programming will be held in FY 1999, with the participation of the Bolivia and Peru CSs. In Guatemala, the need to strengthen the complementary feeding components of the Title II programs was recognized. A workshop on Nutritional Education for Optimal Child Feeding is being planned for the first or second quarter of FY99. In addition, a joint programmatic review will be held of the CS programs, with the aim of elaborating a common vision of the Title II program for Guatemala. This common vision will feed into the development of new 5 year proposals by at least 3 of the CSs: CARE, CRS and World Share.

The FSU also helped identify the priorities and concerns of involved stakeholders (USAID/Managua, the CSs and BHR/FFP) in order to reorient an operations research (OR) food aid study. As a result, an approach has been identified that would reorient the OR activities to focus on capacity building of the CSs in order to strengthen their ability to design and implement sustainable Food Assisted Child Survival (FACS) and food security programs. The approach would reorient the two data collection components to provide information to meet current program needs while providing the basis for design of a longer-term food security program.

Title II non-emergency programs brought into compliance with Reg. 216.

One of the major accomplishments during FY 1998 was strengthening CSs capacity to do environmental analysis, and thereby bringing the Title II non-emergency program into compliance with regulation 216. All Title II CSs were required to submit Initial Environmental Examinations (IEEs) as part of their development proposals by the end of FY 1998. The majority of CSs met that deadline and submitted carefully thought out and well-written IEEs. By the close of FY 1998, 63 out of a total of 65 IEEs were submitted to BHR/FFP for final clearance by the BEO/BHR. All 65 IEEs have now been submitted and cleared.⁴

As part of the FY 1998 training process, staff from several CSs received training in environmental review issues and procedures. The trainings were held in Ghana, Cape Verde, Honduras, Bolivia, Kenya and Washington, DC, and were funded out of several sources, including ISG and 202(e) grants, and from the EPIQ technical assistance task order. These initial workshops provided an important general introduction, but in the process of preparing the IEEs, participants generated questions concerning more specific aspects of environmental review, most notably in pesticide/IPM use, and in small-scale irrigation training. In addition, many of the IEEs submitted could have been strengthened by stronger monitoring and mitigation plans.

In a survey prepared by the Food Aid Management (FAM) Environmental Working Group (EWG) (summer 1998), increased technical assistance was requested in the areas of pesticides/IPM, small-scale irrigation, road construction and rehabilitation, and in water and sanitation. As the FY 2000 DAP/PAA proposal period was gearing up for the Title II PVOs, it also became apparent that trainings should also continue focusing on the fundamentals of environmental compliance.

Strengthened capacity of Missions

Redelegation to field

The SO2 team successfully negotiated and signed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with 3 Missions during FY 1998, with a fourth MOU scheduled to be signed in early FY 1999. However, for the second year in a row, the SO2 team did not fully achieve the targets for number of Missions with redelegated PAA approval authority (see Performance Data Table 4.)

A general reason for this is the concern expressed by the Mission of their ability to ensure that the necessary staff to assume these responsibilities will continue to be available. Several of the target Missions with demonstrated capacity for quality management of the Title II program depend on highly qualified and experienced FSNs. In some cases, these FSNs are funded

⁴ Twenty of the IEEs submitted included deferrals that will need to be addressed before the activity can be funded. The majority of the deferrals (11) were in programs having pesticide/IPM use. Issues related to small-scale irrigation in programming represented the second most cited reason for deferring environmental paperwork.

through Title III trust funds, in other cases, through other sources of trust funds or operating expense funds made available to the Mission. But in many cases, the long-term guarantees of accessing future funding for these FSN positions are shaky. Missions are therefore reluctant to accept increased responsibilities when they have serious doubts about their continued ability to carry them out. The geographic bureaus have been unable or unwilling to provide reassurance to these field Missions that their staffing needs for adequate management of Title II resources will be met (or at least prioritized) in future years.

In the case of USAID/Ethiopia, initial reluctance to access redelegation was based on similar concerns about the capacity of the Mission to absorb the increased management responsibilities. While Mission management seems to have modified their position, and were indicating their intention to endorse redelegation, war broke out with Eritrea.

The SO2 team has also realized that, even if the redelegation strategy were fully successful, the workload is not necessarily reduced to the extent hoped for. Even the redelegated Missions continue to require substantial backstopping. Many of the program operations activities still must be carried out in Washington for example the obligation of section 202(e) funds and transfer authorization documents, and increased travel to the field must be programmed to participate in program reviews. However, redelegation still serves the second objective of giving Missions more control over the Title II program review and approval process.

Strengthened capacity of FFP

The impact of staff turnover during FY 1998 has been discussed under Factors Affecting Performance. In addition, the Title II program management decentralization and documentation "mainstreaming" initiatives undertaken in FY 1998 and FY 1999 by the SO2 team created challenges for smooth procedural operation of reviews, approval, and documentation. Delegation of authority efforts, implementation of the new grant document, and NMS procedures are being phased into use. This has resulted in more complex documents and procedures as well as a multiplicity of management and procedural "models" evolving and/or operating concurrently.

The consequences of the high turnover, changes in internal office procedures, and on-going lack of sufficient staff and financial resources to support the Title II development portfolio, which in FY98 exceeded \$385 million, are clearly manifest in the responses to the survey on the quality of FFP support received to date from Missions. Approximately 60% of Missions have responded. A noticeable degree of dissatisfaction is still expressed by these important partners in the areas of support for management and logistics, and SO2 team efficiency and timeliness (see Performance Data Table 5.)

R 2: Improved integration of activities

Country team approach

One activity that has evolved in an effort to improve integration and streamline procedures is a country team approach undertaken by some CBOs. The team approach seeks to develop programs where the proposed activities to be carried out by the different CSs are developed in coordination with each other. This allows a greater ability to collaborate in the design of interventions and increased possibilities to design M&E plans with common indicators, to carry out joint IEEs and Bellmon analyses, and to program joint monetizations. During FY 1998, the country team approach was tested with CSs and Missions in Angola, Mozambique and Uganda, and has been received as a positive step by both CSs and Missions.

International organization coordination and integration

While coordination between USAID and the European Commission (EC) has not always been as smooth as it could be, recent events have been positive and suggest that future activities are likely to be undertaken in a more integrated fashion.

Beginning in 1995, the New Transatlantic Agenda (NTA) sought to coordinate the activities of the EC and USG. These early agreements focused on coordinated programming in five (5) of the most food insecure countries (Angola, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Malawi and Bolivia). Some success in Ethiopia, Malawi and Bolivia prompted the NTA to work on developing a Food Aid/Food Security Code of Conduct to be applied generally across countries. To this end, the USG, in collaboration with the EC, will pursue regional and sub-regional food aid codes of conduct particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. Highlights of these codes include: development of common terms of reference for carrying out joint country food security assessments, better integration of food aid and other food security related objectives and resources, development of coordinated, gender integrated strategies for refugees and transition situations in given areas, and coordinated distribution to ensure optimum use of logistical resources and commercial networks, in cooperation with local traders and non government organizations.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 1

Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2: Percentage of partners' activities that report complete baseline data and set targets for objectively-measurable indicators within first year of implementation.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of activities	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: PVO Results Reports.	1996	(baseline year)	39
	1997	60	88
Indicator Definition: FY96 Results Reports and FY98 PAAs for FY96-00 DAPs were reviewed by an M&E technical expert who determined whether a baseline survey had been completed, and targets set within the first year of implementation (i.e. by the end of FY96).	1998	90	100
	1999	95	
Comments: As of 4/7/99, FY 1998 Results Reports had been received for 50% of the DAPs that started operations in FY 1998 (4 out of 8). Of the 4 DAPs for which there is information, 100% had completed baseline data collection and set targets during the first year of operation.	2000	100	
	2001	100	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 2

<p>Strategic Objective 2: Increased effectiveness of BHR/FFP's Partners in carrying out Title II development activities with measurable results related to food security with primary focus on household nutrition and agricultural productivity.</p>			
<p>Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace</p>			
<p>Performance Indicator 3: Percentage of partners' targets demonstrated to be achieved based on objectively measured indicators.</p>			
<p>Unit of Measurement: Percent of targets achieved</p>	<p>Year</p>	<p>Planned</p>	<p>Actual</p>
<p>Data Source: PVO Results Reports (R2s)</p>	<p>1996</p>		<p>N/A</p>
	<p>1997</p>	<p>(baseline year)</p>	<p>69</p>
<p>Indicator Definition: Average percent of targets achieved across PVOs. Based on reporting by the PVO in their R2s. The performance indicators reported in each Results Report are identified by FFP's contractor M&E technical experts. The percent of performance indicator targets met or exceeded in the FY reported is calculated.</p>	<p>1998</p>	<p>75</p>	<p>67</p>
	<p>1999</p>	<p>80</p>	
<p>Comments: To date (4/7/99), 76% of R2s received (19 of 25) reported achieved results compared with targets for annual performance indicators (i.e. indicators measured above the level of project outputs.) The remaining R2s only reported results (without targets) or did not report on indicators above the level of project outputs. About half of programs have not yet turned in Results Reports, which were due by 1/30/99.</p>	<p>2000</p>	<p>85</p>	
	<p>2001</p>	<p>90</p>	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 3

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 1a: Percentage of approved DAPs assessed to satisfy 75% of DAP review criteria to a great extent or better.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of new approved DAPs	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: DAP review scoring sheets	1996	(baseline year)	0
	1997	50	27
Indicator Definition: Reviewers assess the DAPs using 11 review criteria (broken down into 33 sub-criteria) on a scale of (1) Not true of this DAP, (2) True to some extent, (3) True to a great extent with a few exceptions, or (4) True without exception or qualification. Satisfying a criteria to "a great extent or better" is defined as scoring an average of 3 or above on each DAP review scoring criteria.	1998	60	50
	1999	70	
Comments: Does not include scores from REST Ethiopia, CARE Bolivia, or CARE,CRS,SCF,WV Angola FY 99 DAPs, which had not been approved as of 4/7/99.	2000	75	
	2001	80	

NOTE: The scored assessments of the DAPs based on the review criteria are NOT used as criteria for DAP approval. The scores are solely used to calculate the R4 indicators (SO2.1 and IR1.1a), and are not aggregated until the R4 process is underway. The FFP CBO does not receive the aggregated scores during the DAP review process.

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 4

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 2b: Number of Missions developing Memoranda of Understanding with FFP outlining specific plans for re delegating Title II program authority.			
Unit of Measurement: Number of Missions	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: FFP SO2 Team files	1996	0	0
	1997	3	0
Indicator Definition: (as stated above)	1998	6	3
	1999	5 (7)*	
Comments: India, Bangladesh, and Haiti signed MOUs before 9/30/98. Mozambique signed a MOU on/about 12/98 and Peru signed a MOU on/about 4/99 both will be included in the FY 1999 cumulative total. * Original target in parentheses.	2000	6 (9)	
	2001	6 (10)	

PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE 5

Intermediate Result 1: Strengthened capabilities of PVOs, USAID Missions and FFP to design, manage, monitor and support activities.			
Approved: 07/31/97 Organization: BHR/Food for Peace			
Performance Indicator 3b: Percentage of scores of "good" or "excellent" by PVOs/Missions on surveys of quality of FFP program support.			
Unit of Measurement: Percent of scores 3 or greater on survey of quality of FFP support in 4 areas	Year	Planned	Actual
Data Source: Survey of PVOs/Missions on quality of FFP support	1996	(baseline year)	71, 67, 58, 60
	1997	80% each	71, 80, 77, 53
Indicator Definition: The survey contains seven questions. The first four were scored by the respondents for the purpose of tracking SO2 Team performance. These four questions cover FFP support for (1) design & implementation; (2) management & logistics; (3) monitoring & evaluation.; (4) efficiency & timeliness. For each question written comments were also requested. For the scored questions, which reflect FY 97 performance, the percent of respondents rating FFP performance as adequate or excellent (i.e., score of 3 or above) was calculated.	1998	85% each	100, 70, 100, 67
	1999	90% each	
Comments: As of 4/9/99, responses had been received from 59% of the Missions surveyed, and 0% of the CSs. The team proposes dropping this indicator from the performance monitoring plan because of difficulties in getting an adequate response rate. However, the trends in responses received to date do still indicate serious problems in the team's ability to support the management and logistics of the program in a timely and efficient manner.	2000	90% each	
	2001	90% each	

Appendix 1. Office of Food for Peace Development Programs FY 1999 approved programs
(as of 5/6/99).

Country/Sponsor	LOA	Title II (Estimated)		202(e) \$	% of value by component					ME#
		Tons	\$		HN	WS	AG	ED	HA	
AFRICA										
<u>Angola</u>		42,300	\$9,901,800	\$0						
CARE**	99-03	10,980	\$2,569,700	\$0			100			
CRS**	99-03	3,460	\$810,300	\$0			100			
SCF**	99-03	9,940	\$2,327,200	\$0			100			
World Vision**	99-03	17,920	\$4,194,600	\$0			100			
<u>Benin</u>		5,035	\$2,054,800	\$0						
CRS***	96-00	5,035	\$2,054,800	\$0	93				7	
<u>Burkina Faso</u>		25,108	\$13,265,900	\$321,689						
Africare	99-03	2,830	\$1,265,000	\$167,159	43		57			
CRS	97-01	22,278	\$12,000,900	\$154,530				88	8	
<u>Cape Verde</u>		9,490	\$1,765,100							
ACDI***	97-01	9,490	\$1,765,100	\$0			73		27	
<u>Chad</u>		1,000	\$447,000							
Africare*	97-01	1,000	\$447,000	\$175,789	40		60			
<u>Eritrea</u>		530	\$521,000							
Africare	95-97	530	\$521,000	\$206,726			100			
<u>Ethiopia</u>		95,997	\$42,686,500	\$1,082,830						
Africare	99-03	4,190	\$1,761,100	\$239,785			100			
CARE	97-01	15,053	\$6,760,000	\$0	37		58			5
CRS***	97-01	22,965	\$11,046,400	\$0	30		24	1	37	9
EOC**,***	98-02	7,801	\$3,512,300	\$0		10	90			
FHI**	96-98	10,461	\$4,410,200	\$293,571	14	8	78			
REST**	99-03	21,190	\$9,241,100	\$442,280		50	50			
SCF***	99-03	9,051	\$3,699,000	\$55,714	61		39			
World Vision	95-97	5,286	\$2,256,400	\$51,480	2	4	94			
<u>Gambia</u>		3,686	\$2,263,700							
CRS	97-01	3,686	\$2,263,700	\$0	79		21			
<u>Ghana</u>		65,952	\$19,728,300	\$634,985						
ADRA	97-01	16,691	\$4,339,000	\$374,396		17	83			
CRS	97-01	27,111	\$9,792,800	\$20,070	7			79	15	
OICI	99-03	6,150	\$1,788,500	\$240,519			100			
TechnoServe	97-01	16,000	\$3,808,000	\$0			100			
<u>Guinea</u>		0	\$0	\$559,149						
Africare*,***	96-00	0	\$0	\$147,889						
OICI*,***	96-00	0	\$0	\$411,260						
<u>Guinea Bissau</u>		0	\$0	\$202,664						
Africare	95-98	0	\$0	\$202,664						
<u>Kenya</u>		9,627	\$6,576,000	226,422						
ADRA	98-02	1,287	\$921,500	\$109,601			100			
CARE	98-02	692	\$495,500	\$0			100			
CRS	97-00	4,080	\$2,604,300	\$0	100					
FHI	98-02	1,372	\$982,400	\$13,386	37		63			
TechnoServe	98-01	1,450	\$1,038,200	\$92,202			100			
World Vision	97-00	746	\$534,100	\$11,233			100			

Appendix 1 cont. Office of Food for Peace Development Programs FY 1999 approved programs (as of 5/6/99).

Country/Sponsor	LOA	Title II (Estimated)		202(e) \$	% of value by component					ME#
		Tons	\$		HN	WS	AG	ED	HA	
<u>Madagascar</u>		13,755	\$8,244,200	\$370,224						
ADRA	98-02	2,480	\$1,775,700	\$166,408			100			
CARE	98-02	3,280	\$2,348,500	\$108,693		63	25		12	
CRS	95-98	7,995	\$4,120,000	\$95,123	87		10		3	
<u>Mali</u>		1,000	\$447,000							
Africare	99-03	1,000	\$447,000	\$107,540	33	25	42			
<u>Mauritania</u>		1,735	\$870,700							
Doulos***	96-00	1,735	\$870,700	\$0	80				20	
<u>Mozambique</u>		66,140	\$19,576,300	\$1,244,919						
ADRA	97-01	6,126	\$1,328,600	\$93,146			100			
Africare	97-01	3,730	\$887,700	\$136,735	52		48			
CARE	97-01	12,910	\$3,079,200	\$200,742			100			
FHI	97-01	5,580	\$1,177,400	\$132,019	27		73			
SCF	97-01	3,804	\$932,000	\$96,956	10		90			
World Vision	97-01	33,990	\$12,171,400	\$585,321	15		85			
<u>Rwanda</u>		1,078	\$579,300							
CRS	98-00	1,078	\$579,300	\$173,925			100			
<u>Uganda</u>		19,710	\$10,973,700	\$566,472						
ACDI	97-01	9,850	\$7,177,600	\$314,560			49			51
Africare	97-01	3,460	\$1,332,100	\$158,121	15		85			
Technoserve	99-03	4,000	\$1,540,000	\$52,781			100			
World Vision	99-00	2,400	\$924,000	\$41,010			100			
ASIA										
<u>Bangladesh</u>		70,028	\$14,845,900	\$0						
CARE*,**	94-99	70,028	\$14,845,900	\$0			100			
<u>India</u>		215,652	\$98,717,300	2,088,777						
CARE	97-01	159,712	\$76,962,000	\$500,000	100					
CRS	97-01	55,940	\$21,755,300	\$1,588,777	31		40	29		
LATIN AMERICAN/CARIBBEAN										
<u>Bolivia</u>		45,148	\$20,299,100	\$1,333,295						
ADRA	97-01	17,454	\$7,864,300	\$338,328	28	32	37	3		
CARE	99-01	5,000	\$2,243,400	\$368,816	76	2	23			
FHI	97-01	9,842	\$4,409,100	\$278,125	12	26	34	28		
PCI	97-01	12,852	\$5,782,300	\$348,026	23	23	39	16		
<u>Guatemala</u>		69,569	\$16,157,400	\$442,766						
CARE	96-00	19,414	\$5,325,300	\$159,400	50	32	18			
CRS	97-01	45,043	\$9,045,300	\$283,366	31		69			
SHARE	96-00	5,112	\$1,786,800	\$0	80		20			
<u>Haiti</u>		66,099	\$26,051,900							
ADRA*,**	96-00	23,287	\$9,064,500	\$0	34	16	7	39	3	
CARE*,**	96-00	23,390	\$9,301,600	\$0	27		14	59		
CRS*,**	96-00	19,422	\$7,685,800	\$0	24	3		57	14	3
<u>Honduras</u>		11,445	\$3,995,700							
CARE***	96-00	11,445	\$3,995,700	\$0	36		64			

Appendix 1 cont. Office of Food for Peace Development Programs FY 1999 approved programs (as of 5/6/99).

Country/Sponsor	LOA	Title II (Estimated)		202(e) \$	% of value by component					
		Tons	\$		HN	WS	AG	ED	HA	ME#
<u>Nicaragua</u>		8,772	\$4,042,900	\$582,150						
ADRA	96-00	3,560	\$1,743,200	\$191,250	28		72			
PCI	97-01	2,543	\$1,246,200	\$190,725	100					
SCF	96-00	2,669	\$1,053,500	\$200,175			100			
<u>Peru</u>		90,313	\$54,871,700	\$306,330						
ADRA	96-00	17,502	\$10,023,700	\$36,830	53		47			
CARE	96-00	23,628	\$14,998,700	\$0	21		71			8
Caritas	96-00	25,339	\$15,208,200	\$0	46		54			
CRS	99-01	2,740	\$1,961,800	\$0						100
PRISMA	96-00	19,704	\$11,676,900	\$269,500	78		8			13
Technoserve	98-02	1,400	\$1,002,400	\$0			100			

* These programs received incremental funding in FY 98 for commodities to carry out FY 99 programs
 ** This program's commodities are for monetization for FY 00 activities
 *** These programs received partial of full incremental funding in FY 98 for 202 (e) funds to carry out FY 99 programs
 General notes:
 HN – Health/Nutrition, WS – Water/Sanitation, AG-Agriculture/Natural resource management, ED-Education, HA-Humanitarian Assistance, ME-Microenterprise (if not part of AG component).
 The category of Natural Resource Management, used in FY 1998 data analysis, was combined with Agriculture. Activity area breakouts taken from information presented in DAPs/PAAAs for FY 99 activities.
 AER category tonnages and dollar values taken from the 4/22/99 FFPIS approvals report (5/6 for Ethiopia), or other FFPIS pending reports (Angola 4/28, other 4/26). Tonnage matches exactly, small differences from FFPIS dollars due to rounding.

Appendix 2: FY 2000 DAP/PAA Guidelines Monetization Proposal Criteria

1. Cost recovery is expected to meet or exceed the benchmark established in the *Title II Monetization Field Manual*, unless a waiver of this requirement has been sought based on the program's anticipated food security impact.
2. Proposal demonstrates how monetization will complement USAID's Food Security Policy Objectives; namely to mitigate food insecurity by increasing agricultural production and enhancing household nutrition.
3. Proposal does *not* indicate that the proposed monetization is a means of generating sales proceeds for program development or implementation costs of activities that do not enhance food security.
4. Monetization transactions will benefit activities in, and be undertaken in low-income food deficit countries (LIFDCs), or if not feasible, regionally in LIFDCs. If neither are feasible, then in a less-developed country (LDC) in the region.
5. Where monetization proceeds are to be used in support of general relief feeding and food for education activities they cover *only* administrative costs related to Title II food distribution, not complementary program activities (which are strongly encouraged but should be funded by the CS or other sources).
6. Studies concerning a proposed monetization activity's feasibility were carried out after USAID's review of a concept paper or in conjunction with the development of the DAP. The study included Bellmon Amendment storage and disincentive issues and potential impact on terms of commercial trade in like or similar commodities. Proposal provides evidence of market analysis.
7. Monetization of processed grains or other value-added commodities such as wheat flour, bulgur wheat, and blended-fortified foods, is encouraged.
8. DAPs advocating monetization of Title II commodities to generate sales proceeds for purchase of locally produced food will *only* be supported in exceptional cases. For example, a program may be supported where inland transportation is either prohibitively priced or so unreliable that it is demonstrably more cost-effective to monetize at a country's port of entry, and use sales proceeds to purchase food closer to distribution sites.
9. The designated USAID Mission (or REDSO) has demonstrated the commitment and resources needed for adequate oversight of the Title II monetization activity.

Appendix 3: Additional FY 2000 Guidelines to be used in the review of CS monetization activities.

1. In general, Title II monetization activities will not be undertaken in developed commercial markets for US-produced agricultural commodities;
2. Proposals advocating the monetization of value-added (i.e. packaged, bagged, processed, or refined) Title II commodities and sales designed and executed in consultation with the U.S. food export and processing trade, will receive the highest priority;
3. BHR/FFP will give top priority to monetization in the recipient country;
4. Relatively greater consideration will also be given to monetizations supporting or complementing the direct distribution of value-added Title II commodities and/or resulting in benefits directly linked to the reduction of hunger;
5. Development interventions entirely based on the monetization of Title II commodities will also be considered by BHR/FFP; so long as their benefits can be directly linked to reduction in household food insecurity and/or expansion of market opportunities for U.S.-produced food products that in itself will have a demonstrable impact on enhancing food security;
6. If there are compelling reasons that preclude in-country monetization, consideration will be given to monetization in an adjacent (e.g. a closely neighboring) country following consultations with U.S. commercial interests in all instances.