

PN-ABS-337
89862

CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY

on

Drought in Southern Africa

before the Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on Africa
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.
July 31, 1992

TABLE OF CONTENTS
Drought in Southern Africa

1. Oral Statement
2. Written Statement
3. Budget information

COUNTRY TABLES

4. Angola
5. Botswana
6. Lesotho
7. Malawi
8. Mozambique
9. Namibia
10. Swaziland
11. Zambia
12. Zimbabwe
13. Regional

ISSUES PAPERS

Status of Assistance

14. What is the U.S. doing to ensure our assistance is getting to those in need?
15. Why has so little of U.S. food aid been delivered?
16. What is the difference between the \$382 million U.S. contribution figure given in June vs. today's figure of \$535 million?
17. What is A.I.D. doing about transit fees on humanitarian assistance in Mozambique?

Distribution

18. What problems has A.I.D. encountered in food distribution?
19. What is A.I.D. doing to improve the management of food aid transportation and delivery?
20. What efforts are being made to coordinate transportation in the region?

Other Donors/UN/PVOs/Refugees

22. What are other donors doing?
23. What mechanisms has the UN put in place to coordinate donor and host government assistance?
24. What is the Administration doing to involve PVOs?
25. How has the drought affected the refugee population in southern Africa?

Impacts on Development

26. What has been the impact of the drought on our development programs in the region?
27. What have been the impacts on economic structural adjustment?
28. Have the reforms instituted under the SAPs magnified the impact of the drought on the poor?
29. After the drought, what will A.I.D. do to support restoration?
30. Why can't the South Africa aid program be reduced this year and money applied to drought?!

Comparison to the Horn

31. How do need and emergency programs in southern Africa compare to those in the Horn?
32. Are drought relief activities in southern Africa detracting from efforts in the Horn? (Status of assistance to Ethiopia, Sudan, Somalia, Kenya and Madagascar follow)

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

33. Food for Peace Table of U.S. Gov't Food Assistance
34. ODFA Situation Report as of 7/31/92

A.I.D.

Statement of the Agency for International Development
before the Committee on Foreign Relations
Subcommittee on African Affairs
United States Senate
Washington, D.C.
July 31, 1992

DROUGHT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Mr. Chairman,

A crisis exists in Africa, a major drought affecting the ten countries of southern Africa. Experts say the drought is the worst to hit the region in this century.

The drought affects a large number of people and has inflicted massive crop loss. Of the region's 100 million people, United Nations agencies estimate that 30 million will be affected, 18 million are at serious risk (of whom 2 million are refugees and even more are displaced), and 3.4 million may be exposed to famine or will be vulnerable to acute food insecurity.

Crop losses average 50% across the region and are 60%-70% in Zimbabwe and South Africa, which normally export grain to their neighbors. The United Nations World Food Program (WFP) has estimated that the southern African region (not including South Africa) needs 4.2 million metric tons of food aid in addition to commercial imports to compensate for losses in this crop year. (Attachment 1 gives more detail on WFP food estimates.)

This crop loss is worse than that experienced by countries in the Horn and the Sahel in the terrible African drought of 1984-85. The 1984 drought required the biggest emergency relief effort ever mounted in Africa. Because of the larger number of people affected and the extent of crop loss, southern African relief needs may be even greater than in the Sahel, although this time we have earlier warning of the emergency and the opportunity to prevent massive starvation.

We are just now beginning to see the worst effects of this crisis. Many countries have dealt with early food shortages through commercial purchases. However, food aid needs will peak late this summer and continue at a high level until the next harvest is due in May 1993. Water problems are also becoming severe, especially in Zimbabwe and Mozambique.

How bad the situation will get is hard to predict at this point. On the one hand, the region has several things going for it. First, compared to past drought areas of Africa, most of the countries in southern Africa have more developed economies, better transport infrastructure, and greater ability to help themselves. (Mozambique and Angola are exceptions.)

Second, most of the governments in the region have recognized the severity of the crisis and responded promptly. Several countries have made large commercial purchases of food to meet early emergency needs.

Third, the donors are mobilizing a major relief effort, coordinated by the United Nations (U.N.) and the Southern African Development Coordination Conference (SADCC). Donor food aid, much of it from the United States, together with commercial procurements, seem to be arriving fast enough to meet critical needs as stocks are depleted.

On the other hand, various obstacles have to be overcome. One is the lack of experience and structures for dealing with this type of emergency in the countries themselves, which have not had such severe drought problems in the past. Another is the large demands being placed on donor assistance at a time when emergency requirements are high elsewhere in the world.

A third obstacle is transport. Even though transportation systems in most of southern Africa are good, the quantity of commercial and emergency food (about 12 million metric tons) and other critical imports that have to be moved is so great that the transport systems may not be able to cope. The ports have not yet become a bottleneck although inland transport seems to be slow.

The next two months will be a litmus test for how these factors play out. Will the transport and food distribution systems be able to cope? Will we see major migrations of people in search of food and water (which would create a more severe crisis)? Will governments be able to cope with water, health, and other problems?

U.S. Response

The severity of this crisis and the need for immediate action have driven the U.S. response. Our efforts to assist the region have been based on three principles: moving fast, reallocating existing FY 1992 resources to the region, and coordinating with other donors.

For the first time in an emergency such as this, about half the U.S. food aid is program food aid to be sold on the market, while the other half is targeted food aid to be distributed free or in special nutrition or food-for-work programs. This heavy use of market channels to complement normal targeted food aid is appropriate in southern Africa because of the very large number of people affected by the drought (too many to handle by targeted feeding programs alone), and because of the need to keep markets functioning at relatively stable prices so that food can stay affordable to as many people as possible, thus helping to prevent large population displacements, and so that production can recover quickly after the drought. Such a heavy reliance on market mechanisms to deliver food in an emergency is a "first" in relief efforts.

Our ability to act quickly was greatly helped by the in-country presence of A.I.D. missions. The missions took the lead in alerting Washington to the drought and its consequences. Without this early warning utilization of market channels for food would not have been feasible.

The United States has reached deep into all relevant programs to mobilize food and non-food resources for the drought. We have reallocated FY 1992 food and dollars from less critical programs to this crisis, while protecting food allocations to other emergencies in the world, including other parts of Africa. No emergency food programs in other countries or regions have been cut by our reallocations.

Total U.S. resources mobilized for the southern African drought to date are valued at about \$535 million, which includes program, targeted, and non-food assistance. This figure represents food and dollar assistance from the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the Bureau of Refugee Programs of the Department of State.

The U.S. Government's biggest contribution is in food aid, amounting to 1,500,000 metric tons valued at approximately \$427 million. This includes 537,000 metric tons from A.I.D. P.L. 480 Title II and Title III grant food aid programs, valued at \$130 million, and 963,000 metric tons from USDA P.L. 480 Title I concessional sales and Section 416(b) grant food aid programs, valued at \$297 million. Of this \$427 million, \$344 million is a new allocation to the region specifically for drought needs, added since March.

U.S. food aid is being moved quickly. Over 580,000 metric tons will be delivered to ports in southern Africa by the end of July. Another 42,000 metric tons is scheduled to arrive in August.

The U.S. contribution to emergency needs in areas such as water, health, and transport is approximately \$96 million. Finally, the United States has committed an additional \$12 million to refugee programs. (Attachment 2 gives details of U.S. Government assistance.)

The above refers only to FY 1992 resources. The Administration hopes to allocate additional food and dollar assistance to the southern Africa drought in the first part of FY 1993. However, the FY 1993 contribution may be considerably less than the FY 1992 contribution, because of the magnitude of the U.S. Government contribution in FY 1992 and because other donors are expected to contribute more. Also, Section 416(b) commodities are not expected to be available next year. This assumes the drought does not continue for another year beyond May 1993.

Total Donor Response

The responses of other donors are hard to characterize with specificity, because of the evolving situation and the various procedures that different donors follow.

A main vehicle for mobilizing donor contributions to the drought was the donor conference convened by the U.N. and SADCC in Geneva on June 1-2 based on a special U.N. appeal. This appeal covered only targeted food aid and some non-food needs totaling \$854 million. U.N. estimates indicate that approximately \$572 million has been pledged against these needs, of which only a portion of the U.S. total contribution is reflected. Further assistance that was already planned, but related to drought relief needs, indicates an overall donor effort substantially higher than this amount.

According to the most recent reporting from WFP, more than half of the region's total estimated food needs has been pledged (3.4 million metric tons of food pledged, against a total estimated need [commercial and food aid] of 6.3 million metric tons). A higher proportion of targeted, free distribution food needs has been met than of program food to be sold on the market. Targeted food aid pledges total 1.3 million metric tons, against a total estimated need of 1.65 million metric tons. Program food aid pledges total 900,000 metric tons, against a total estimated need of 2.55 million metric tons. Of the 2.1 million metric tons in commercial imports needed, over 1.2 million metric tons have been pledged or procured.

Principal donors other than the United States are the European Economic Community (EEC) and Japan. The EEC has contributed approximately 555,000 metric tons of food. Japan has said it will give approximately \$110 million of mainly non-food

aid. Sweden has also made a major contribution, estimated at over \$50 million.

New assistance is also going into the region through channels that are not counted against the U.N./SADCC appeal, such as assistance from the World Bank. The Bank is providing some \$350 million in additional loans to the region to help countries cope with the demands of the drought, including cash that can be used for food purchases. For example, the Bank has given \$150 million to Zimbabwe to help pay for a comprehensive relief program which it helped the government design and for critically needed imports. A similar program of \$100 million is in the works for Zambia.

The United States, and to some extent the other donors and the countries of the region, have focused their early emergency efforts on the food problems, because of the lead times involved in transporting food to the region. Through commercial purchases and food aid from the United States and others, this process appears to be working fairly well, at least at this stage. According to WFP, one quarter of the approximately 12 million metric tons of food needed (commercial and food aid) is already flowing into the region.

How well systems for distributing food within countries and for targeted feeding will work is not clear yet. We have not seen major problems to date (except in Mozambique, where food distribution has been hampered by the conflict). Private voluntary organizations (PVOs) and governments appear to be mobilizing means for distributing food to the ultimate beneficiaries in-country. We were especially gratified to learn of Zimbabwe's recent agreement with WFP designating twenty PVOs to operate targeted feeding programs, thus alleviating the burden placed on government systems. Whether there will be problems later--with deliveries that are too slow or inadequate donor contributions to meet total food needs--remains to be seen. We will monitor this situation closely.

Growing Attention to Non-Food Needs

The United States is now turning more attention to non-food problems such as water and health. Water is a concern in both rural and urban areas. Water shortages in rural areas can cause people to migrate, which compounds relief needs and can add to overcrowding in cities. Some cities are experiencing major water problems--for example, Bulawayo, the second largest city in Zimbabwe, and Maseru in Lesotho. Bulawayo has had to ration and close some schools and hospitals because of the water shortage.

Lack of water, drawing water from contaminated sources, and overcrowding in urban areas are likely to lead to increased health risks from diarrheal diseases, pneumonia, malaria, measles, and other infectious diseases. The Centers for Disease Control predicts that the drought could have a significant impact on southern Africa's AIDS epidemic, especially if there are large migrations of people.

The drought is also having a devastating impact on the region's livestock, which are not only a source of food and income, but also serve as draft animals for small-scale farmers. Any long-term environmental consequences are still to be identified, though wildlife in game reserves is suffering and culling has been increased to preserve habitat.

The United States is funding emergency programs in many of these areas, often in cooperation with American and indigenous PVOs and with U.N. agencies. Examples of PVO programs funded by the U.S. Government are \$2.9 million for water and health activities in Angola, \$2 million for emergency airlifts of relief supplies in Mozambique, and \$1.1 million for a water program in Malawi. A.I.D. has also increased funding by \$11.9 million for a PVO support project in Mozambique, which includes PVO emergency assistance activities. Tools, seeds, immunizations, and other relief supplies are being provided through grants to the United Nations Childrens Fund (UNICEF) and Red Cross societies.

The United States is also funding programs to cope with the special needs of refugees in the region, whose numbers are growing as a result of the drought (particularly Mozambican refugees moving into Malawi and Zimbabwe). For example, the United States has allocated 60,000 metric tons of maize to refugees in Malawi through WFP, and another 60,000 metric tons to Mozambique for people displaced by drought and civil conflict. The Bureau of Refugee Programs (RP) at the State Department granted \$10 million to WFP for purchase and delivery of additional food for refugees in the region and made a \$2 million contribution to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to help meet the non-food needs of refugees.

Finally, the United States is looking at ways to assist prompt recovery after the drought is over. For example, A.I.D. has provided a grant of \$1.15 million to the International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics (ICRISAT) to accelerate the production of drought-resistant sorghum and millet seeds in Zimbabwe. With the planting season expected to begin on or about October, drought recovery activities will require increasing attention in the coming months.

Economic Impacts

The drought is having serious adverse effects on the economies of the region. This will be due to the fall in national production due to crop losses, water shortages, and the attendant problems in agriculture-related and energy-dependent industry, and to the cost to governments of meeting emergency needs. Some industries are already curtailing operations with the concomitant loss of production, exports, and most importantly, jobs. In Zimbabwe and South Africa especially, the high cost of commercial food purchases and food transport will put major strains on national budgets, which will reduce growth, pull resources away from other social needs, and create balance-of-payments problems.

In Zimbabwe we estimate that the drought could reduce annual real growth from +5% to -10%. This loss would be due to such factors as reduced food and crop production, closure of the sugar industry, and closure of two-thirds of the country's cotton ginneries. During 1992 and 1993 the Government of Zimbabwe is likely to spend at least 8%-10% of the country's gross domestic product (GDP) on famine and drought mitigation activities. This will put inevitable strains on economic reform efforts.

Similar effects can be expected elsewhere. Unfortunately, the adverse economic impacts of the drought will not disappear with good rains over the next growing season, but are likely to linger for several years.

The southern Africa drought is different from earlier droughts in Africa. In earlier droughts, the threat was sheer loss of life in very weak economies with populations already on the edge. Most of the southern African countries have a greater ability to cope with drought. Their economies are stronger, they can afford to buy some food commercially, and their populations are healthier. However, the cost could be economic stagnation or decline that would affect society as a whole, and raise the potential for political discontent.

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have recognized the special problems created by the drought and are taking steps to mitigate them. The Bank and Fund are showing greater flexibility regarding the pace of some elements of structural adjustment programs, offering additional resources to fund relief activities and purchase imports, and seeking additional donor support to help countries of the region close financing gaps created by the drought. This is the first time that the Bank and Fund have taken such an active role in helping African countries deal with an emergency, and reflects a

recognition that adjustment programs have to take such events into account.

Logistics

The ability of the region's transport systems to handle the enormous volume of food and other shipments over the next year is a key question. Six of the affected countries are landlocked and dependent on the port, road and rail systems of South Africa, Mozambique, Tanzania and Namibia. The physical capacity of these systems to handle nearly four times the normal tonnage of grain is in doubt, unless additional equipment is purchased or leased. In the past, procedural and regulatory delays and incompatible equipment have impeded rail and road traffic across borders, including the timely return of rail cars to the ports. A few such incidents, including the imposition of transport fees and onerous visa requirements for shipments crossing Mozambique from Zimbabwe to Malawi, have already occurred, but so far these appear to be the exception rather than the rule.

The countries of southern Africa are working well together to minimize these problems. Cooperation on transport and logistics between South Africa and its neighbors has been excellent. Bureaucratic delays have been flagged early and are being aggressively addressed. Additional locomotives and rail cars are being brought out of mothballs and being employed, many of them leased from South Africa by other railways in the region. Communications and grain handling equipment is being purchased and installed.

A key challenge will be to spread out and coordinate the deliveries of food and other commodities so as not to overly tax any particular elements of the regional logistics system. The World Food Program, tasked by the United Nations with responsibility for coordinating food deliveries, is working closely with SADCC and South Africa to schedule shipments efficiently and avoid bottlenecks at the ports or other parts of the system. WFP and SADCC have established a Logistics Advisory Unit in Harare for this purpose, and have representatives at the Operations Center created by South African Railways (SPOORNET) in Johannesburg.

A.I.D. has been the leading donor in assisting these efforts. Through the Southern Africa Regional Program based in Harare, A.I.D. has funded a \$13.1 million project which provides operational support to WFP, SADCC, national action groups and along the major corridors leading into the region. This project also includes a technical assistance rapid response fund to resolve bottlenecks as they are identified throughout the system, and an equipment rapid response fund to quickly mobilize additional rail wagons and locomotives needed by SADCC member

//

railways to move drought relief food and to provide specialized equipment to enhance the capacity of the transport system.

Special problems are posed by the continuing conflict in Mozambique, which is preventing food from reaching vulnerable groups in that country, and which could hinder the ability to move food through Mozambique to Malawi, Zimbabwe, and other countries. On July 16, an agreement was announced between the Government of Mozambique and the rebel group RENAMO to allow expanded delivery of relief supplies under supervision of the U.N. and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) by air and by overland routes yet to be determined. If implemented, this agreement could increase our ability to respond to the food and other relief needs in Mozambique, as more people become accessible. A planned meeting between Mozambican President Chissano and RENAMO leader Dhlakama in Rome in early August also holds some promise for improving access to contested areas as well as speeding progress towards a general settlement.

WFP has successfully negotiated with several governments in the region to reduce or eliminate various road fees and taxes which would have escalated delivery costs. WFP has similarly reached agreement with Malawi on use of the port of Dar es Salaam which the Government of Malawi had been reluctant to utilize due to concern over a grain borer infestation. A potentially serious problem before us is the possibility of a general strike in South Africa disrupting food transport to landlocked southern African states dependent on South Africa's ports.

Donor Coordination

Consistent with the President's emphasis on working through the United Nations, we are looking to the U.N. to take a leadership role, in cooperation with SADCC, in mobilizing donor support, coordinating relief efforts, and managing logistics problems.

At the U.N./SADCC conference, the United States and some other donors asked U.N. Under Secretary General for Emergency Assistance Eliasson to appoint a special, full-time regional coordinator based in the region, to operate under Ambassador Eliasson's office. We proposed that this person have the authority necessary to bring about real coordination, not just information sharing, among all U.N. agencies involved in this emergency.

Ambassador Eliasson recently announced a more limited step: appointment of the WFP and U.N. Development Program (UNDP) resident representatives in Harare to serve as regional coordinators for logistics and non-food assistance, respectively. They report to Charles Lamuniere, head of Eliasson's office in Geneva. They also are responsible in the region for sorting out

issues such as transport and customs charges impeding relief deliveries. We are encouraged by this step, and are monitoring developments carefully to see whether it will meet the coordination need. Mr. Lamunier's office in Geneva is responsible for overall coordination, including issuance and follow-up of donor appeals. We understand a revised appeal may be issued in September or October.

The United States has made its own efforts to promote donor coordination on the drought. We have repeatedly shared information on the crisis as it emerged with other donors, and have sought to encourage a strong donor response. We started this process as early as February 27, when A.I.D. officials briefed donors on the southern African drought at a donor meeting on African emergencies in Brussels. We have continued our efforts in special sessions on the drought as part of the Zambia and Malawi Consultative Group meetings of aid donors, at a May World Bank meeting with all major donors to Africa, at meetings here in the United States with PVOs, at the meeting in Rome of WFP's Committee on Food Aid in late June, and at the U.N./SADCC donor conference. Just this week two WFP experts visited Washington for discussions with A.I.D., USDA, and the State Department on the food aid situation.

In May, Mrs. Quayle visited the region to highlight the seriousness of the drought and focus the international spotlight on the situation prior to the U.N./SADCC conference. Mrs. Quayle visited Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa; met with senior government officials, PVOs, and official donors; and urged a generous response to the U.N. appeal and close coordination on relief issues and needs.

Finally, the State Department has made specific contacts with Western donors to encourage a forthcoming response to the drought. At the recent G-7 meeting, Secretary of State Baker made a special plea for support for southern Africa by European and other donors.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, before this drought hit, southern Africa was one of the most promising regions of Africa with political leaders taking bold new steps in Zambia, South Africa, and elsewhere to liberalize their political and economic systems. The current crisis was not brought about by the mistakes of man, but by the misfortune of natural calamity.

We believe that this makes it all the more important to support southern Africa in its time of need, so that the region can recover and fulfill its earlier promise. With a new democratic government in Zambia dedicated to economic reform, with Zimbabwe embarking on structural adjustment, with South

Africa struggling toward a non-racial democracy, with Angola moving toward elections, and with Mozambique making progress in ending its long-standing conflict, the region's potential is tremendous.

The United States has traditionally responded generously to humanitarian emergencies wherever they exist. We believe our response to this crisis is indicative of that moral commitment. We believe it is now time for other donor countries to also reach deep into their pockets for this worthy cause.

We appreciate your committee's interest in the drought in southern Africa, and we intend to keep you fully informed of our efforts as they unfold.

Thank you.

Food Needs

The United Nations World Food Program has estimated the total grain import requirement for all ten countries in the southern Africa region (Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe), plus South Africa, to be about 11.6 million metric tons. This includes maize, sorghum, wheat and rice. In addition, there will be supplemental feeding for particularly vulnerable groups, such as pregnant mothers, children, the disabled, and the elderly. This brings the total to about 11.9 million metric tons. Of that amount, about 7.7 million metric tons will be commercially imported, of which South Africa accounts for 5.5 million tons.

The region's poorer countries, however, cannot finance commercial food imports on the massive scale needed. This leaves an unmet food gap, according to WFP, of about 4.2 million metric tons. This is the amount of food aid that WFP estimates has to come from the international community, if total food needs of the region are to be met.

WFP has further broken down this 4.2 million metric ton need into "program food aid" (food aid that is sold on the market), estimated at 2.55 million metric tons, and "emergency food aid" (targeted food aid that is distributed free or in special nutrition or food-for-work programs), estimated at 1.65 million metric tons.

The 4.2 million metric tons of food will have to be distributed throughout the crop year, which runs until May 1993. However, a large portion of the food must reach southern Africa before December to be available when widespread food shortages are projected to become acute and to avoid massive logistical bottlenecks.

U.S. Government Assistance

Some details on U.S. assistance for the drought:

- The largest amounts of U.S. food aid will go to the four most severely affected countries: 183,000 metric tons for Malawi (including 60,000 metric tons for Mozambican refugees), 333,000 metric tons for Mozambique, 253,000 metric tons for Zambia, and 275,000 metric tons for Zimbabwe. In addition, we are providing 50,000 metric tons for Angola, 4,000 metric tons for Botswana, and 8,000 metric tons for Lesotho. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) recently approved an increase in Section 416(b) corn for sub-Saharan Africa to be channeled through the World Food Program. Although specific country amounts are still under discussion, it appears that approximately 400,000 metric tons will be available to southern African countries affected by the drought. Namibia and Swaziland will be included in this allocation. The total value of U.S. food aid is approximately \$427 million, composed of \$130 million from A.I.D. and approximately \$297 million from USDA.

- To date, A.I.D.'s Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) has programmed a total of \$26,600,973 in assistance to drought-affected countries. Of this, \$5.1 million was provided to the United Nations World Food Program (WFP) for regional logistics and transport, \$2.5 million went to the United Nations Childrens Fund (UNICEF) for water projects and nutritional surveillance programs in Lesotho, Malawi, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia, Zimbabwe; and \$3 million was reserved to fund a regional food monitoring program. The food monitoring program will review monitoring systems for U.S. food aid. An additional \$1.4 million was approved for the American Red Cross in response to the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) Appeal which included emergency water, health, nutrition, training, and seed provision programs in Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. The remaining funds have been used for A.I.D. and private voluntary and non-governmental organizations (PVO/NGO) emergency projects in the region. A.I.D. mission requests for personal services contractors to coordinate PVO response and to provide technical assistance to WFP have also been funded. OFDA is currently reviewing proposals for water projects, food distribution programs, and other emergency programs in the region. In total, OFDA has set aside \$29 million in FY 1992 funds for drought-related programs in southern Africa.

- A.I.D.'s Africa Bureau has allocated a total of \$67.4 million to the drought for FY 1992. This will cover areas such as: (1) drought-related projects in health, water and infrastructure; (2) an expansion of PVO support and water projects in Mozambique; (3) extension of A.I.D.'s Famine Early Warning System to cover the southern Africa region, which will strengthen indigenous information systems and provide updated information on vulnerable populations; and (4) a project to alleviate transport bottlenecks in the region under A.I.D.'s Southern Africa Regional Program.

- Of the \$12 million for refugee programs, \$10 million will go to WFP for food aid for refugees and \$2 million to the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

- An example of the creative approaches A.I.D. field missions are using is the U.S.-funded P.L. 480 Title III program in Zambia. The U.S. Government committed \$18 million toward the purchase and delivery of U.S. corn to the Government of Zambia. At the instigation of the A.I.D. mission, the Government of Zambia has established a trust fund account with both government funding and other donor contributions. Monies from this account are being used to pay the transportation costs of the food, allowing more food to be procured with the U.S. funds. Instead of the 45,000 metric tons originally planned, A.I.D. will now be able to deliver 153,000 metric tons of corn to Zambia.

Statement of
Christopher Goldthwait
Acting General Sales Manager and
Associate Administrator
Foreign Agricultural Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Before the African Affairs Subcommittee of
the Senate Foreign Relations Committee
July 31, 1992

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to be part of this panel to discuss and update the impact of the drought on southern Africa.

My statement will discuss our evaluation of the drought's severity and impact, regional assistance needs, USDA and international activities to help move food and agricultural commodities into the area, commercial trade, and factors to watch as the crop season develops.

The United States is doing its share to meet the serious food shortages in southern Africa. USDA is providing both commercial and food aid programs. The USDA food aid programs which I will cover in my statement will provide more than one million tons of commodities valued at almost \$110 million. USDA will also cover associated transport (both ocean and inland) costs currently estimated at more than \$200 million. As the committee is aware, inland distribution costs in southern Africa can be very high. We will be continuously monitoring the situation and trying to act expeditiously in meeting needs that may arise for additional programming or other assistance.

Our efforts will, of course, be supplemented by food assistance provided through the P.L. 480 Titles II and III programs, which are administered by the Agency for International Development, by programs of other nations, and by commercial shipments from the United States and other exporters in meeting the overall need.

The Drought and Its Impact on Production

Corn is the principal staple food in the region affected by the drought in southern Africa. Conservative estimates place corn import needs for the drought-ridden region over the next 12 months at up to 11 million metric tons.

Weather conditions were generally favorable until mid-December for the 1991/92 southern Africa coarse grain crop, which was planted in October through December 1991. In December 1991, southern African countries were expecting average to above-average coarse grain production.

Production prospects across southern Africa took a sharp turn for the worse in January as the weather turned unusually hot and dry. Most of the corn-producing regions received less than 50 percent of normal rainfall during January and February, the peak growing season for coarse grains. By late February, the drought was affecting virtually every country in the region. The 1991/92 coarse grain harvest began in March and continued through June.

The severe drought across southern Africa has sharply reduced 1991/92 grain production (mainly corn) and is causing regional food shortages during 1992/93. Scant rainfall and above-normal temperatures since mid-December 1991

have led to one of the worst droughts in decades in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Botswana, Swaziland, Lesotho, Mozambique, Malawi, and Namibia.

It is extremely difficult to assess accurately the impact of the drought on food production and food needs. Although there are differences between production and import estimates of the FAO and USDA, both agree that production decreases will be significant.

The FAO, for example, estimates that the region's production for 1991/92 will be down 50 percent, whereas the USDA July 1992 estimate of total southern African grain production stands at 9.6 million tons, down significantly from the previous year's poor harvest. In either case, the declines are severe and a serious food deficit exists.

South Africa and Zimbabwe normally export surplus corn to their neighbors, but this year they are among the most severely affected by the drought. By contrast, the major grain producing area of Angola was the only region of southern Africa to escape this year's hot, dry weather.

Analysis of the Countries Affected

The nine nations of southern Africa that have been hard hit by the drought have a combined population of roughly 90 million people. A country-by-country analysis of the effect of the drought follows:

Republic of South Africa - The severe drought will have a serious effect on South Africa's food supply and may cause damage to its economy. Production

prospects were initially optimistic but declined dramatically in January as the drought intensified in most of the major corn growing regions. Regional soil moisture is poor for 1992/93 winter wheat planting, which occurs in May-July. Only 10-20 percent of the normal planted area may be sown in 1992. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 2.6 million tons, down 5.7 million tons or 68 percent from last year's average harvest.

Zimbabwe - Zimbabwe is suffering from one of the worst droughts in its history. The primary grain producing region of northern Zimbabwe was hit hard by drought. There will be no significant rainfall until the rainy season resumes in October. A severe shortage of irrigation water could reduce 1992/93 wheat area by up to 90 percent. Tobacco, Zimbabwe's most important cash crop, was not seriously affected by the drought, but the 1991/92 oilseed and cotton crops are forecast to decline by one-half. However, conditions were most severe in the south, southwest, and eastern parts of Zimbabwe, where grazing is the most important agricultural activity.

The drought has had a much stronger effect on farmers in the region's over-populated communal areas, where small plots of dryland corn, tobacco, and other crops are cultivated on marginal land with few inputs and little technical assistance. Many farmers have started to sell their cattle to prevent them from starving during Zimbabwe's long, dry winter season. The scattered fields of dryland corn, tobacco, beans, and other row crops are in very poor condition, and most of the fields are expected to be abandoned. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 362,000 tons, down 1.2 million tons or 77 percent below 1990/91's poor crop.

Zambia - At the beginning of the growing season, Zambian officials predicted that the 1991/92 corn crop would be well above average. The major corn producing areas experienced drought just as the crop entered the critical tasseling stage and yield prospects deteriorated rapidly. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 600,000 tons, down 650,000 tons or 52 percent below the previous year's already poor harvest.

Malawi - The drought was most severe in central and southern regions. Grain production was a complete failure in parts of southern Malawi, home to almost one million refugees from Mozambique. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 600,000 tons, down 1 million tons or 63 percent from the average crop produced in 1990/91.

Mozambique - The serious effects of the 1991/92 drought are aggravated by the unstable political situation which has caused chronic food shortages in recent years. Rainfall since December has been only 30 percent of normal. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 150,000 tons, down 150,000 tons or 50 percent from the large harvest of 1990/91.

Angola - The major grain producing regions of northern Angola were not affected by the drought conditions. Corn and sorghum production are expected to increase in 1991/92 due to beneficial rainfall in northern crop areas and an increase in planted acreage. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 370,000 tons, up 70,000 tons or 23 percent above the previous year's crop.

Svaziland - Extended dry weather in December and January stressed the 1991/92 coarse grain crop severely, and in many areas the corn crop was a total loss. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 50,000 tons, down 103,000 tons or 67 percent below last year's average crop.

Lesotho - Coarse grain prospects for 1991/92 are poor due to light, spotty rainfall during the growing season. The USDA July corn production estimate for 1991/92 is 50,000 tons, down 44 percent from last year and the lowest crop in more than 10 years.

Botswana - Severe drought in Botswana has reduced the 1991/92 grain production estimate by nearly 75 percent. The USDA July corn and sorghum production estimates for 1991/92 are 5,000 and 10,000 tons, respectively -- compared to a combined total of 55,000 tons in 1990/91.

Namibia - USDA does not maintain a data base for grain production in Namibia. However, corn production is expected to decline by approximately 50 percent (normal crop size is about 60,000 tons).

U.S. and USDA Response

The most serious drought impact has been on the supply of corn for human consumption. Southern African consumers prefer white corn and are traditionally self-sufficient in its production.

However, the drought has forced many of these countries to purchase yellow corn for cash on the open market. The necessity of buying corn for cash has jeopardized economic reform programs designed to reduce external debt and increase foreign exchange reserves. Our assistance is aimed both at mitigating the food shortages and limiting the side effects of the shortages.

The donor community is working with the African governments involved to address the need for food aid to meet the critical food shortages. Within the overall U.S. Government effort, USDA, as I mentioned, is using its various food aid and commercial credit programs to move food and agricultural commodities to the region. Our efforts are closely coordinated with assistance provided through the programs administered by AID. We have established an ad hoc working group that meets weekly to ensure coordination.

In terms of food aid, USDA is providing under section 416(b) authority to the Southern Africa region almost 800,000 metric tons of donated commodities, mainly corn, valued at about \$290 million, including the ocean transportation and very high inland freight and distribution costs.

Of that amount, USDA has pledged to make available under Section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 [Section 416(b)], 608,500 metric tons of corn, valued at nearly \$60 million, through the World Food Program (WFP). Freight costs associated with the WFP component are almost \$170 million, including inland transportation costs. This corn will be distributed by WFP throughout Angola, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. A significant portion of the commodities already have been shipped,

with the remainder leaving U.S. ports before the end of the calendar year. Just this week we have held extensive meetings with WFP officials to discuss the status of our assistance efforts.

In addition to the pledge to the World Food Program, USDA has signed bilateral Section 416(b) government-to-government agreements with Zambia and Zimbabwe. These agreements will provide 80,000 tons of corn, with a commodity value of \$7.8 million to Zambia; and 58,000 tons of corn, 50,000 tons of sorghum, and 750 tons of butteroil worth nearly \$12 million to Zimbabwe. USDA also is considering other bilateral agreements with severely affected drought countries at this time. We are especially concerned with finding ways to help the people of Somalia.

USDA has made a concerted effort to program all available Section 416(b) commodities to the region and has expedited the agreement processing procedure in order to make commodities available as soon as possible.

As we continue to monitor food needs, we will consider other appropriate programming. Although the most seriously affected countries are considered to be eligible to receive grant assistance under Title III of Public Law 480 -- and most are receiving a combination of assistance under Titles II and III of Public Law 480 -- countries with some ability to purchase grains on the open market also have requested concessional credit assistance. In the case of Zimbabwe, we have signed a P.L. 480 Title I concessional sales agreement which provides approximately 220,000 tons of corn valued at \$25 million and 12,000 tons of vegetable oil, valued at \$5 million.

Commercial Programs

Not all of the southern African needs will have to be met by food aid. Several of the countries will be able to import some food commercially, and USDA is using its commercial programs to facilitate this trade. South Africa is expected to meet all of its food needs through commercial imports. We have announced the availability of GSM-102 export credit guarantees in connection with sales of agricultural commodities to Namibia, Botswana, Zimbabwe, and Angola for a total of \$37.5 million which includes coverage for an estimated 200,000 to 250,000 tons of corn, wheat, and/or wheat flour.

As a direct result of the drought, USDA also has received requests that export credit guarantees be made available or the amount of such guarantees be increased in connection with sales of agricultural commodities to Zimbabwe, Zambia, Malawi, and South Africa. These requests are being reviewed on a priority basis.

Corn Trade

The serious drought conditions in much of the southern Africa region are expected to result in a dramatic shift in corn trade throughout the southern and central African region over at least the next 12 months. Countries in the region which had traditionally met regional import demand will themselves need to become importers. Commercial import programs have already begun for South Africa, Zimbabwe, and Zambia.

South Africa, traditionally a significant exporter to world markets, is forecast to import 4.5 million tons of corn during its May 1992/April 1993

marketing year. South Africa has already bought over 1.3 million tons of corn for shipment from March through June 1992. Purchases have been almost evenly divided between the United States and Argentina.

Zimbabwe, normally an exporter of corn to neighboring countries, is now expected to import 1.8 million tons of corn during 1991/92 (Oct.-Sept.). Zimbabwe has reportedly purchased over 200,000 tons of corn from Argentina for shipment from April through July. U.S. corn commitments through July 16 total 190,200 tons, but additional quantities have reportedly been purchased from the United States.

Zambia is expected to import 600,000 tons of corn to help meet its annual consumption needs of 1.25 million tons. Most of it will come from the U.S. Reportedly, Zambia has secured 70,000 tons of U.S. corn and additional quantities from Argentina. In addition, Zambia reportedly purchased 135,000 tons of corn from South Africa in late 1991.

As my discussion of the drought situation indicates, other countries in the region also need substantial imports. But given tight foreign exchange positions throughout the region, actual import volumes will depend largely on outside assistance in the form of concessional credits and donations.

According to current information, responses to the announced total food needs have been favorable. Of the approximately 12.0 million ton total needs, the requirements for countries other than the Republic of South Africa was announced as 6.3 million tons, constituting 1.7 targeted food aid, 2.5 program

food aid, and 2.1 commercial. Of these needs, about 55 percent has been pledged or procured. Over 80 percent of the targeted food aid has been pledged or procured.

Problems of Port Capacity and Internal Distribution

One factor that will need to be closely monitored throughout the southern African relief effort is transportation.

Many of the countries affected by the drought are land-locked and depend on South African ports to receive their imports. South Africa has stated that its imports will take precedence and that it can guarantee the use of only Port Elizabeth for the transshipment of commodities to other countries. However, at present several ports in the Republic of South Africa are receiving shipments for others in the region. South African ports typically handle about 4 to 5 million tons of grain in a year but have the capacity to extend that to 7 or 8 million tons. This still falls short of the 11 million tons in estimated need for the region as a whole.

In addition, the supply of trucks and rail cars is tight and may not be able to move the volume of imports from port to the areas of need unless shipments are carefully coordinated. The projected traffic volumes are so high -- as much as four times the normal tonnage of commodities that need to be transported -- that major bottlenecks must be expected. Internal distribution to the neediest populations is also a major challenge.

While there are still potential transportation and distribution choke points, the overall network is functioning better than expected. Cooperation at the operational level is effective and is expected to improve as we move into the period of increasing commodity flows. Currently, Malawi, Mozambique, and Namibia are areas of key concern, with all three countries having high-volume drought related food aid needs, in addition to the ongoing difficulties of refugees and civil strife. The World Food Program has already increased its staff in Southern Africa, especially in Zimbabwe, and is continuing to closely watch the transportation system. If additional staff are needed, the World Food Program will place additional staff in the region.

The Outlook for Next Year

Production prospects in the drought-stricken countries are unfavorable for the 1992/93 winter wheat crop, planted from April through July. Soil moisture levels are very low due to the summer drought and unusually warm autumn temperatures.

Production is expected to drop significantly in the Republic of South Africa. Although no official estimate of planted area or production has been made for the 1992/93 wheat crop, preliminary reports indicate that wheat area in Orange Free State may be reduced by more than 80 percent due to the drought. Despite good weather conditions in Cape Province wheat-growing region, the USDA July wheat production estimate for 1992/93 is only 1.2 million tons, down 45 percent from last year.

Wheat area and production is also expected to drop sharply in Zimbabwe and Zambia because of planting problems and serious shortages of irrigation water.

It is too early to accurately predict the 1992/93 southern African coarse grain crop, which will not be planted until the spring rains begin in September and October.

Even with adequate rainfall, farmers in the region will likely have problems obtaining seeds, loans, supplemental irrigation, and other necessary inputs from their cash-strapped governments. The 1992/93 coarse grain area is expected to increase over last year but may not reach 1990/91 levels.

The USDA July coarse grain production estimate for 1992/93 for South Africa is 8.5 million tons, close to an average crop. This figure includes 8.0 million tons of corn, up from 2.6 million tons in 1991/92. Zimbabwe's 1992/93 corn production is forecast at 1.8 million tons, compared to only 0.4 million tons last year.

Mr. Chairman, we are using all of the programs at our disposal to assist in meeting the desperate food needs in this region and have further programming under review to try to alleviate suffering and hunger. We will continue to work with other U.S. agencies and with the world community in this effort. We recognize the magnitude of the problem and we will assist in every way possible over the coming months to help prevent hardship in this part of the world.

That concludes my statement, Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to answer questions from the Committee.

U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO AFRICA

FY 1987 – 1993
(\$ million)

FY	Development Fund for Africa	Economic Support Funds	Food Aid*	Foreign Disaster Assistance	Total
1987	396.7	164.8	244.3	16.6	822.4
1988	553.6	39.7	287.9	41.8	923.0
1989	578.4	99.3	249.7	32.7	960.1
1990	585.1	28.9	250.7	31.0	895.7
1991	804.7	59.3	297.4	44.7	1,206.1
1992 (est)*	801.0	29.7	254.3**	30.0***	1,115.0
1993 (ABS)	790.0	19.3	237.5	***	1,046.8

* Food aid levels do not include transport costs.

** FY 1992 levels will still change as food aid levels evolve in response to the drought in southern Africa.

***Emergency assistance levels are not requested in advance and may increase.

7/30/92

32

Country Table – Southern Africa Drought

ANGOLA

Date: July 30, 1992 8,668,000
 Total Population:
 Affected Population: 1,400,000

	FAO/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (g)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	323,265							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>160,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT:	163,265							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	9,000							
TARGETED FOOD AID	154,265		53,984	25,393,050				
(a)	(44,969)	55,911,000						
Sub-Total Food			53,984	25,393,050				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		537,000						
HEALTH & NUTRITION	(b)	4,248,000		2,467,527				
WATER SUPPLY	(c)	3,115,000		420,138				
OTHER	(d)	<u>12,388</u>		<u>4,669,068</u>				
Sub-Total Non-Food		7,912,388		7,556,733				
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
UN SPECIAL RELIEF PROGRAM	(e)			3,244,000				
OTHER	(f)			<u>118,248</u>				
Sub-Total Drought-Related				3,362,248				
GRAND TOTAL			53,984	36,312,031				

a) Of the 154,265 MT needed, 109,298 MT was already available from WFP resources, (including some of the USG contribution), leaving a balance of 44,969 MT needed for an estimated value of \$55,911,000.

b) From OFDA: \$2,467,527 to IMC for immunization programs

c) From OFDA: \$420,138 to Africare for water projects

d) From OFDA: \$2,917,070 to CARE for food/seed distribution in SE and SW Angola; \$1,104,998 to CRS for food distribution and water activities; \$847,000 to ICRC for truck purchases

e) UN Special Relief Program: From OFDA – \$1 million for UNICEF, \$1.74 million for WFP, \$500,000 for UNDP

NOTE: According to the UN-SADCC appeal, funds requested under the section for Angola have already been requested of the international community under SRPA II. Since the response to the appeal has been inadequate, the UN-SADCC appeal has incorporated the unmet portions of SRPA II.

f) From OFDA: \$118,248 for other support activities

g) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

53

Country Table – Southern Africa Drought

BOTSWANA

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 1,292,281

Affected Population: 100,000

	FAO/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (a)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	241,700							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>225,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT:	16,700							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	11,700							
TARGETED FOOD AID	<u>5,000</u>	<u>3,106,000</u>	<u>4,368</u>	<u>1,354,300</u>				
Sub-Total Food	16,700	3,106,000	4,368	1,354,300				
II. NON-FOOD								
AGRICULTURE		335,000						
HEALTH & NUTRITION		60,000						
WATER SUPPLY		1,900,000						
OTHER		<u>331,000</u>						
Sub-Total Non-Food		2,626,000						
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER								
Sub-Total Drought-Related								
GRAND TOTAL			4,368	1,354,300				

a) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

34

Country Table – Southern Africa Drought

LESOTHO

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 1,801,000

Affected Population: 170,000

	FAO/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (b)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	299,702							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>222,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT:	77,702							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	62,000							
TARGETED FOOD AID	<u>15,702</u>	<u>4,951,000</u>	<u>13,114</u>	<u>5,429,000</u>				
Sub-Total Food	77,702	4,951,000	13,114	5,429,000				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		4,412,000						
HEALTH & NUTRITION		1,347,262						
WATER SUPPLY		0						
OTHER (a)		<u>362,650</u>		<u>255,000</u>				
Sub-Total Non-Food		6,121,912		255,000				
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER								
Sub-Total Drought-Related								
GRAND TOTAL			13,114	5,684,000				

a) From OFDA: \$105,000 to American Red Cross for Int'l Federation of Red Cross & Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) appeal to SADE for emergency relief activities;
\$150,000 to UNICEF for water, nutritional surveillance and other emergency programs

b) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

35

Country Table – Southern Africa Drought

MOZAMBIQUE

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 15,814,099

Affected Population: 3,150,000

	FAO/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (d)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	1,424,881							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	71,000							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT	1,353,881							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	861,000		241,500	49,241,000				
TARGETED FOOD AID	492,881	198,280,880	242,579	75,774,700				
Sub-Total Food	1,353,881		484,079	125,015,700				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		42,457,500						
HEALTH & NUTRITION (a)		274,520		7,000,000				
WATER SUPPLY		6,631,520						
OTHER (b)		2,083,460		2,356,551				
Sub-Total Non-Food		51,447,000		9,356,551				
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER (c)				14,500,000				
Sub-Total Drought-Related				14,500,000				
GRAND TOTAL			484,079	148,872,251				

a) From DFA: \$7,000,000 for Mozambique's Primary Health Care Project

b) From OFDA: \$1,771,000 to World Vision for emergency airlifts to inaccessible areas, \$264,251 for airlifts to Zambezia, \$321,300 to American Red Cross for IFRC emergency relief activities

c) From OFDA: \$2,600,000 to WFP for food aid logistical support; From new and reprogrammed DFA: \$11,900,000 for PVO support project

d) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

36

Country Table – Southern Africa Drought

NAMIBIA

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 1,520,000

Affected Population: 250,000

	FAOWFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (d)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	126,350							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>65,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT	61,350							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	43,500							
TARGETED FOOD AID	<u>17,850</u>	6,925,000	<u>10,000</u>	<u>2,530,000</u>				
Sub-Total Food	61,350		10,000	2,530,000				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		2,212,000						
HEALTH & NUTRITION		1,525,000						
WATER SUPPLY (a)		7,750,000		456,832				
OTHER (b)		<u>950,000</u>		<u>751,350</u>				
Sub-Total Non-Food		12,437,000		1,208,182				
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER (c)				<u>28,150</u>				
Sub-Total Drought-Related				28,150				
GRAND TOTAL			10,000	3,766,332				

a) From OFDA: \$25,000 (Drought Assistance) for water bladders and \$431,832 to IMC for water drilling

b) From OFDA: \$51,350 to ARC for IFRC; \$700,000 to UNICEF

b) From OFDA: \$28,150 for support personnel

d) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

37

Country Table – Southern African Drought

SWAZILAND

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 882,891

Affected Population: 250,000

	FAO/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (c)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	134,475							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>69,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT:	65,475							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	19,000							
TARGETED FOOD AID (a)	<u>46,475</u>	14,297,000	<u>10,606</u>	<u>3,080,605</u>				
Sub-Total Food	65,475		10,606	3,080,605				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		0						
HEALTH & NUTRITION		144,950						
WATER SUPPLY		1,518,860						
OTHER (b)		<u>253,000</u>				<u>150,000</u>		
Sub-Total Non-Food		1,916,810				150,000		
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER								
Sub-Total Drought-Related								
GRAND TOTAL			10,606	3,230,605				

a) Of Which: OFDA Drought Assistance, \$25,000 for 106 MT of maize

b) From OFDA: \$100,000 to American Red Cross for IFRC; \$50,000 to UNICEF

c) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

Country Table -- Southern Africa Drought

ZAMBIA

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 8,745,284

Affected Population: 1,700,000

	FAC/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (c)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	985,000							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>150,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT	835,000							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	726,000		252,992	51,500,000				
TARGETED FOOD AID	<u>109,000</u>	50,051,000	<u>30,000</u>	<u>10,590,000</u>				
Sub-Total Food	835,000		282,992	62,090,000				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		0						
HEALTH & NUTRITION		915,000						
WATER SUPPLY		1,450,000						
OTHER (a)		<u>1,040,000</u>			<u>525,550</u>			
Sub-Total Non-Food		3,405,000			525,550			
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER (b)					<u>20,123,950</u>			
Sub-Total Drought-Related					20,123,950			
GRAND TOTAL			282,992	82,739,500				

a) From OFDA: \$275,550 for American Red Cross for IFRC; \$250,000 to UNICEF

b) From OFDA: \$123,950 for support personnel; From DFA: \$20,000,000 for Zambia NPA

c) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

DRAFT

Country Table – Southern Africa Drought

ZIMBABWE

Date: July 30, 1992

Total Population: 10,720,000

Affected Population: 4,600,000

	FAO/WFP NEEDS ASSESSMENT		USG CONTRIBUTION		OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS (e)		REMAINING GAP	
	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$	MT	\$
I. FOOD AID								
TOTAL IMPORT REQUIREMENT	1,424,400							
LESS COMMERCIAL IMPORTS:	<u>750,000</u>							
TOTAL FOOD AID REQUIREMENT	674,400							
OF WHICH:								
PROGRAMME FOOD AID	203,400		345,750	n/a				
TARGETED FOOD AID	471,000	182,636,250	85,000	n/a				
FOR REFUGEES (a)			<u>10,000</u>	n/a				
Sub-Total Food	674,400		430,750	98,045,250				
II. NON-FOOD AID								
AGRICULTURE		5,610,000						
HEALTH & NUTRITION		855,000						
WATER SUPPLY (b)		9,820,000		275,000				
OTHER (c)		<u>9,907,500</u>		<u>1,094,000</u>				
Sub-Total Non-Food		26,192,500		1,369,000				
III. OTHER DROUGHT-RELATED ASSISTANCE								
REFUGEE								
OTHER (d)				<u>10,125,000</u>				
Sub-Total Drought-Related				10,125,000				
GRAND TOTAL			430,750	109,539,250				

a) For refugees: 10,000 MT to WFP

b) From OFDA: \$25,000 Drought Assistance for water projects; from reprogrammed DFA, \$250,000 for water activities

c) From OFDA: \$144,000 to American Red Cross to IFRC; \$950,000 to UNICEF

d) From OFDA: \$125,000 for support personnel; From DFA: \$10,000,000 (estimated) To Be Determined

e) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

DRAFT

Southern African Drought: Country Table Summary

SOUTHERN AFRICA REGION

COUNTRY	AFFECTED POPULATION	FAO/WFP FOOD NEED ESTIMATE MT	FOOD				NON-FOOD				TOTALS						
			U S CONTRIBUTIONS MT	U S CONTRIBUTIONS \$	OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS (c) MT	OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS \$	TOTAL FOOD CONTRIBUTION MT	TOTAL FOOD CONTRIBUTION \$	REMAINING GAP MT	REMAINING GAP \$	UN ESTIMATED NON-FOOD AID NEEDS \$	US CONTRIBUTION \$	OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTION \$	TOTAL NON-FOOD AID CONTRIBUTION \$	TOTAL US CONTRIBUTION \$	TOTAL OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTION \$	TOTAL CONTRIBUTION \$
ANGOLA	1,400,000	183,285	53,884	25,383,050	n/a		n/a		n/a		7,812,388	10,918,081	n/a	n/a	38,312,031	n/a	n/a
BOTSWANA	100,000	18,700	4,368	1,384,300	n/a		n/a		n/a		2,626,000	0	n/a	n/a	1,384,300	n/a	n/a
LESOTHO	170,000	77,702	13,114	5,428,000	n/a		n/a		n/a		6,121,912	285,000	n/a	n/a	5,854,000	n/a	n/a
MALAWI	5,700,000	719,352	283,000	108,209,000	n/a		n/a		n/a		18,310,000	2,288,883	n/a	n/a	110,504,883	n/a	n/a
MOZAMBIQUE	3,150,000	1,353,881	484,078	128,015,700	n/a		n/a		n/a		51,447,000	23,058,551	n/a	n/a	148,872,251	n/a	n/a
NAMIBIA	250,000	81,350	10,000	2,530,000	n/a		n/a		n/a		12,437,000	1,239,332	n/a	n/a	3,789,332	n/a	n/a
SWAZILAND	250,000	85,475	10,808	3,080,805	n/a		n/a		n/a		1,916,810	180,000	n/a	n/a	3,230,805	n/a	n/a
ZAMBIA	1,700,000	835,000	282,882	82,060,000	n/a		n/a		n/a		3,405,000	20,848,500	n/a	n/a	82,738,500	n/a	n/a
ZIMBABWE	4,810,000	674,400	430,750	88,045,250	n/a		n/a		n/a		28,182,500	11,484,000	n/a	n/a	109,536,250	n/a	n/a
REGIONAL																	
Allocated (a)																	
Unallocated (b)												35,020,728	n/a	n/a	35,020,728	n/a	n/a
												1,399,508	n/a	n/a	1,399,508	n/a	n/a
Sub-Total Regional												38,420,234	n/a	n/a	38,420,234	n/a	n/a
TOTAL	17,320,000	3,987,125	1,572,853	431,146,805	n/a		n/a		n/a		131,398,810	107,278,481	n/a	n/a	538,423,388	n/a	n/a

a) From OFDA: \$105,500 (est) for regional assessment, \$36,911 for personnel support, \$2,500,000 to WFP for food aid logistics, \$3,000,000 for food monitoring project, \$17,085 for telecommunications assessment team support, \$180,230 to American Red Cross for IFRC regional delegates

From USAID/SAHP: \$13,110,000 for regional transport, from ICRISAT: \$1,182,000 for seeds, for FEWS (Famine Early Warning System) \$2,900,000

From State/Bureau for Refugee Programs: \$10,000,000 to WFP and \$2,000,000 to UNHCR

b) From OFDA: \$1,399,508

c) Other Donor Contributions: n/a

41

TARGETING SADE ASSISTANCE

Issue: What is the U.S. doing to ensure our assistance is or will be getting to those most in need in the region?

Talking Points

- Targeting drought assistance will not be an easy task to accomplish because of the severity of the drought and the number of countries and people affected, many of whom are not use to coping with this kind of emergency. A.I.D. is working in several areas to assist in the targeting of food and non-food assistance to the most affected people in the region.

- Our Missions are working directly with host country governments, UN agencies and other non-governmental entities to develop targeting informaticn and programs such as food for work.

- A.I.D. is providing resources directly to UN agencies such as UNICEF that will be used to help identify those most at risk, such as women, children and the elderly.

- A.I.D.'s Famine Early Warning Systems (FEWS) Project, in coordination with host country governments and SADCC, is developing sub-national level data bases in the region that can be used to assist policy-level decision makers in targeting drought assistance.

- The A.I.D. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) is assisting Missions to hire technical staff to work with host government and non-governmental entities in the effective distribution of drought assistance.

- The A.I.D. Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) has put out a request for proposals for a major accounting firm to review monitoring procedures for U.S. food aid, to ensure adequate accountability.

Issue: Deliveries of U.S. Food Aid

Question: Why has so little of U.S. food aid to southern Africa been delivered to date?

Talking Points

- Of the 1.5 million metric tons of U.S. food aid provided so far, roughly 400,000 MT of Section 416(b) corn was just approved by USDA within the past two weeks.

- Of the 1.1 million metric tons approved earlier, 73,000 MT were additional P.L. 480 Title I resources for Zimbabwe and 110,000 MT were additional P.L. 480 Title III resources for Mozambique that were approved in June and agreements were signed with the recipient governments in early July.

- The 580,000 MT of food delivered to the region by the end of July, and the 42,500 MT to arrive in August represents 40% of the food assistance approved for Southern Africa. Virtually all of the remainder is due to arrive by December. This reflects the substantial effort A.I.D. and USDA have made to provide our assistance as rapidly as possible. According to the UN, the U.S. is the only donor to have moved significant quantities of food to the region to date.

- The original approvals agreed between the affected countries and donors was that commercial imports would meet needs mainly during the March - August period with donor food aid becoming more predominant starting in August - September where food shortages are predicted to become severe.

SADTPUB\DOCS\DELIVER.Q&A;7-29-92

U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO THE DROUGHT

Issue: In testimony last month and at the United Nations conference in Geneva held in early June, the total U.S. contribution to the drought was said to be \$382 million. You now say it is \$535 million. What is the difference between these two figures?

Talking Points

o Since early June, the USDA has provided additional allocations of Section 416(b) and P.L. 480 Title I food assistance to southern Africa. This includes:

* 440,000 metric tons of Section 416(b) corn to the World Food Program for emergencies in sub-Saharan Africa, of which an estimated 395,500 MT, valued at \$132,500,000, will be available for southern African countries.

* An additional \$15.0 million in Title I commodities for Zimbabwe.

o In addition, our current figure includes small increases in the amounts of non-food assistance provided by OFDA and various AID Missions in the region.

MOZAMBIQUE - Government User Fees for Emergency Programs

ISSUE: What is A.I.D. doing about transit fees and other taxes on humanitarian assistance?

TALKING POINTS:

- o The Government of Mozambique (GRM) is facing severe budgetary constraints and has been trying to garner additional revenues, including fees from donors and NGOs by imposing a series of user fees and taxes on both humanitarian assistance commodities and program personnel.
- o The GRM recently issued a decree governing the duty and tax-free status of commodities, including transportation for emergency programs. Implementation of the new decree has yet to be effected and the NGOs have been frustrated by lack of progress in addressing their concerns.
- o The GRM has held several meetings with NGOs in an attempt to resolve these problems. However, continued dialogue will be necessary to make the system work.
- o In a meeting with the Minister of Finance on July 6, 1992, the AFR Bureau stressed the importance of the Government of Mozambique not being perceived as trying to profit from emergency operations or use them as an opportunity to collect taxes. The Minister explained that no additional taxes are being imposed on organizations providing humanitarian assistance and that the airport fees, for example had been reduced from \$ 150/ton to \$ 50/ton and the revenue used to perform needed airport repair work.
- o A.I.D. continues to stress to the GRM that a basic principle of development and emergency assistance is that host country governments neither profit nor be perceived to profit from assistance programs by taxing them or imposing service charges not reasonably related to services provided.
- o The World Bank resident representative assured A.I.D. that no recommendation has been made to tax emergency efforts, but only to encourage improved fiscal management within acceptable macroeconomic parameters.
- o The WFP regional representative from Harare has recently visited Mozambique and met with government officials. There has been agreement to reduce fees through the Tete corridor.
- o Both A.I.D. and the WFP continue to actively monitor the situation.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION

ISSUE: What problems has A.I.D. encountered in food distribution? What problems are projected for the remainder of the emergency response?

TALKING POINTS:

- 580,811 MT of food commodities will have been delivered to southern African port by the end of July. This represents approximately one-third of the total U.S. commitment to be delivered this calendar year.
- More than 1.5 million MT has been committed by the U.S. Government. Of this, nearly 400,000 MT of 416 (b) maize was allocated by USDA to WFP in late July. Other agreements (Zimbabwe Title I and enhancement of Mozambique's Title III) have also been negotiated and signed this month.
- Drought relief shipments are just now beginning to arrive in-country, with the bulk of the relief expected from August through the remainder of the year. To date, no major logistics problems have been encountered. The WFP reports bureaucratic delays are impeding transport through the Tete Corridor through Mozambique, but its office in Harare has been addressing this issue with the respective governments. WFP also advises that the reported turn-around time for railwagons in Zambia averages 35-40 days, as opposed to four days in Zimbabwe.
- The next hurdle is in-country food distribution through commercial and targeted feeding programs. Missions have been working with the World Food Program (WFP) and host governments on approaches to best reach beneficiaries. For example, the Government of Malawi has just printed ration cards which are to be distributed in the near future and has established a profession transport unit which will be responsible for internal food transport in most of the districts.
- Zimbabwe is compiling lists of individuals for free distribution programs and has drafted NGO guidelines for the national Child Supplementary Feeding Program. The Government has approved 20 PVO's/NGO'S to conduct food distribution program.
- In Botswana, the under-five child feeding program has just been started by the WFP.
- Because few of the affected countries have prior experience with distributing food, designing these systems is taking some time. While no major problems have yet been highlighted, we are watching the various country plans for food distribution quite closely.

SADTPUB\DOCS\FOODDIST.Q&A;7-29-92

MANAGEMENT OF FOOD AID

ISSUE: What is A.I.D. doing to improve the management of food aid transportation and delivery?

TALKING POINTS:

- o Six Missions have requested the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance to provide Personal Service Contractors (PSCs) to assist in PVO coordination, liaison with the U.N. World Food Program, and food monitoring. To date, OFDA has approved funding for PSCs in Malawi, Namibia and Zambia. Requests from South Africa, Swaziland and Zimbabwe are being processed.
- o The AFR Bureau has approved a \$13.11 million project to address key bottlenecks in the delivery system and to help those systems operate more efficiently. The project will selectively address the full range of delivery constraints including analytical capacity, port capacity, transport corridor capacity, (e.g., rail, trucking, storage and bagging capacity) and internal country distribution.
- o OFDA is also in the process of engaging the services of a U.S. accounting firm to assess food aid monitoring systems in the region.
- o Under A.I.D.'s Famine Early Warning (FEWS) Project, a logistics model designed to enhance transport analytic capability in the region is being field tested in Johannesburg and Harare this month.
- o A team of specialists are currently in the region assessing hardware and software requirements for establishing an electronic bulletin board system within the region. This system will also connect WFP and AID/W with the regional network.

REGIONAL COOPERATION ON TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

ISSUE: What efforts are being made to coordinate transportation in the region?

TALKING POINTS:

- o The U.S. is working closely and coordinating with SADCC, countries in the region, and WFP on transport and logistics issues. A.I.D. is funding a specific regional project to help improve the transport and logistics capacity and capabilities. WFP has been assigned the lead role for coordinating transport and logistics throughout the region.
- o A.I.D.'s Famine Early Warning (FEWS) Project is developing a logistics model designed to enhance transport analytical capability for the region. This model is currently being field tested in the region.
- o The AFR Bureau and OFDA have funded a communications assessment team which is currently visiting the region. The team will catalog information needs and determine the best methods of coordination electronic communications within the region and with Washington and other donor headquarters.
- o In April, six corridor groups were formed to monitor logistical and operation activities involved with the transportation of imported grain on a regional basis. Information from all corridors is collected by the Logistics Advisory Centre (LAC) established by WFP and SADCC in Harare. This information is disseminated to the various corridors. This mechanism represents regional cooperation and coordination on an unprecedented scale.
- o Because of the pivotal role South Africa's ports and rail networks play in relief delivery, the southern African countries have begun working level meetings with South Africa. For example, Zimbabwe, breaking a 12 year boycott of Ministerial level meetings with South Africa, signed an agreement in Pretoria last month aimed at cutting red tape and speeding up imports.
- o Early in the emergency, Transnet (South Africa Transport) established an Emergency Operating Group consisting of representatives of Portnet (South Africa Harbor Authority), Spoornet (South Africa Railways), and GMB (South Africa Grain Marketing Board). The purpose of this group is to determine transportation needs for the region, port facilities available in South Africa, railroad scheduling, and port allocations. Ultimately, each SADCC country will assign a representative to this Operating Group in Johannesburg.

OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DROUGHT

Issue: What are other donors doing to respond to the drought in southern Africa?

Talking Points

o An overall figure of other donor contributions to the drought-relief effort is not available because United Nations and other compilations are not comprehensive or compatible.

o We do have some information which gives an indication of the contributions of the principal other donors. This includes:

* 550,000 metric tons of food aid this year from the European Community, of which approximately 370,000 MT is new assistance directly related to the drought.

* Japan has pledged \$110 million to the region, much of it in the form of cash resources that can be used for the purchase of food.

* The World Bank has approved \$346 million in additional assistance in response to the drought, as follows:

\$150 million for Zimbabwe

\$100 million for Zambia

\$ 50 million for Malawi

\$ 46 million for Mozambique

In addition, the World Bank has identified a significant amount of resources from current programs that is being reprogrammed for drought-related needs.

o The United Nations/SADCC consolidated appeal in May provided a complete estimate of food aid needs in the region, although only targeted and program food needs were costed. Also, the appeal included only a partial estimate of non-food needs. It did not include, for example, many PVO or government programs which do not directly involve a UN agency or an estimate of additional balance-of-payments assistance to compensate for lower economic growth or export earnings caused by the drought. Donor contributions in these areas, therefore, are not captured in UN reporting of contributions against the appeal.

o Recent WFP estimates of food pledges and remaining shortfalls are shown in the attached tables.

- We have approached major donor capitals, as well as our Missions in the region, for a more complete accounting of other donor contributions. We expect to have this information soon.



SOUTH AFRICA DROUGHT

1. Preamble

Joint FAO/WFP assesment missions carried out in March/April 1992 covered ten countries of the Southern Africa region affected by drought. The results were published in the alert issued to donors on 15 April 1992, and formed the basis of the Secretary-General's appeal launched jointly with SADCC (Southern Africa Development Cooperation Conference) at the United Nations on 18 May 1992. A donors' pledging conference was subsequently held in Geneva on 1/2 June 1992 where contributions and statements of support were announced.

2. Requirements and Status of Food Pledges

As of 17 July 1992, the requirements and status of food pledges are as follows (figures in metric tons):

	Required (as per alert)	Pledges/procured	Shortfall
Targetted Food Aid*	1,645,000	1,304,000	341,000
Programme Food Aid*	2,540,000	900,000	1,640,000
Commercial Imports	2,075,000	1,238,600	836,400
Total	6,260,000	3,442,600	2,817,400

* Breakdown by country as per Annex.

3. WFP Role

World Food Programme, in addition to its role as a major channel for multilateral emergency food aid, has been assigned the responsibility of coordinating with SADCC the entire Logistic and Transport data for food aid deliveries to the region. In this task, WFP is working with bilateral donors, NGOs and host governments to ensure as smooth as possible a delivery and distribution operation for all food assistance.

(i) Specifically, the Programme has recently approved its largest ever single project (WFP Emop 5052/60) - a commitment of 711,824 metric tons of food assistance to nearly nine million drought victims in nine countries in the region. The total cost of this commitment, including external transport and ITSH, is over US\$ 316

million.

(ii) In addition to the above "umbrella" project, WFP has approved other feeding programmes, prior to the launching of the Appeal, for refugees, displaced persons and demobilization in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe, which include 398,000 tons of food, as yet unresourced at the time of the Appeal and thus also included in the Appeal document under the heading of "targetted food aid".

(iii) The combined total emergency food aid committed by the Programme is therefore 1,110,000 metric tons, or 67% of the total targetted food requirements for the region.

(iv) WFP food will, where possible and practical, be distributed free for the drought-affected people under special drought alleviation programmes, under VGF (vulnerable group feeding) and/or food-for-work programmes, implemented by host governments and NGOs operating in the countries of the region.

(v) As of 30 June 1992, the resource position on the "umbrella" EMOP is as follows:

Commitment:	711,824 mtn
Firm pledges	569,254 mtn (80%)
Tentative	8,071 mtn (1%)
To be identified	153,497 mtn (22%)

The outstanding 22% of commitment, still to be resourced, could prove to be most difficult as most major donors have already announced their pledges. Details of status of contributions by country are shown in the Annex.

4. Deliveries

So far, a total of 57,700 metric tons of food has been shipped by WFP, under the above EMOP. Of this, a shipment of 45,000 mt has been delivered to refugees in Malawi. As the Appeal was officially launched on 1/2 June 1992, the "delayed" response could be anticipated; a large arrival programme starts in fact in August.

5. Regional Logistics Advisory Centre (RLAC)

With back-up from WFP Headquarters Southern Africa Task Force, the Regional Logistics Advisory Centre in Harare collects, assembles, and disseminates information on the movements of all food aid shipments to, and being transported within, the region. On the basis of such information, the Centre is in a position to advise donors/shipping agents and port/railway authorities on the anticipated volume of food shipments expected, and thereby to help all involved to plan and execute a more efficient operation. Information within the region is fed into the Centre from a team of WFP logistics and shipping officers already in place in ports throughout the Region (from Dar-es-Salaam to Lobito). This team, working from all major port and inland logistics

centres, helps reschedule, if needed, the incoming shipments, resolve bottlenecks and generally ensure a smooth flow of food aid. A WFP sub-regional Logistics Support Unit, established in Johannesburg and working with SPOORNET, helps to coordinate the shipping and transit logistics for shipments coming through Port of Durban.

6. Summary

(i) While the donor response to the Appeal can be considered reasonable, it is essential that pledges are converted into deliveries as soon as possible. The next harvest in most of the region is due April/May 1993. Consequently, deliveries must be made within the coming few months so that the food can be moved from the ports and either railed or trucked to the end destinations in good time for the pre-harvest "hungry season".

(ii) Donors must be encouraged to make pledges/shipments of programme food aid in tandem with targetted food. That is to say that food marketing mechanisms of recipient countries must be kept well primed so that the numbers requiring free food distribution are kept to a minimum.

(iii) With the additional volume of commercial food imports expected in the coming months, donors and NGOs need to be further urged to follow closely RLAC advice on shipping schedules at various ports so that bottlenecks/berthing delays can, as far as possible, be avoided.

(iv) With most recipient governments facing grave financial and organizational difficulties in handling the anticipated volume of food aid, there is need for substantial assistance towards meeting (a) costs of internal transport, storage and final handling, as well as distribution of the food; (b) costs of monitoring and supervision; (c) at least part of the Government and NGO distribution management costs; (d) non-food expenditure to deblock problems in the logistics area (much of it through WFP).

(v) All agencies, be they NGOs or UN or Government services, must coordinate action to ensure that there is no duplication and so as to guarantee cost effectiveness. NGOs are encouraged to enquire with WFP whenever they plan to procure and/or ship food commodities. WFP has itself a very large shipment programme, it has also been requested by the Zambia Government to arrange on its behalf purchases of maize for a value of US\$ 100 million; it is therefore in a good position to advise and, if necessary, assist in procurement, transport and overland delivery of food commodities to the Region.

Disaster Relief Service

KF/BS/sm
17.7.1992

53

SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL EMERGENCY OPERATION

Status of Resourcing

17 July 1992

<u>Country</u>	<u>Requirement (MT)</u>	<u>Confirmed (MT)</u>	<u>Tentative (MT)</u>	<u>Donor TBI (MT)</u>
BOTSWANA	5,000	1,700	-	3,300
LESOTHO	14,592	11,192	-	3,990
MALAWI	233,614	203,998	-	29,616
MOZAMBIQUE	173,150	140,163	2,000	35,655
NAMIBIA	15,050	13,961	571	2,858
SWAZILAND	22,325	22,900	-	1,825
TANZANIA	3,976	-	-	3,976
ZAMBIA	46,400	54,900	500	-
ZIMBABWE	<u>197,717</u>	<u>120,440</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>72,277</u>
Totals	711,824	569,254 (80%)	8,071 (1%)	153,497 8/ (22%)

8/ Some operations have been over-resourced,
budget revisions requested.

Note: This document is for internal use only.
Tentative pledges are subject to change
and should therefore not be reflected
in reports circulated outside the Programme.

DROUGHT EMERGENCY SOUTHERN AFRICA
 /SUMMARY OF FOOD CONTRIBUTIONS AS OF 17.07.92

1. PLEDGES - TARGETTED FOOD AID (REFUGEES/DISPLACED/DROUGHT)

COUNTRY	AFFECTED POPULATION	REQ'MENTS	PLEDGES	SHORTFALL/ (SURPLUS)
ANGOLA	1,400,000	44,900	50,918	(6,018)
BOTSWANA	100,000	5,000	1,700	3,300
LESOTHO	170,000	15,700	15,942	(242)
MALAWI	5,700,000	379,400	356,874	22,526
MOZAMBIQUE	3,150,000	492,900	406,765	86,135
NAMIBIA	250,000	17,900	23,034	(5,134)
SWAZILAND	250,000	46,500	23,950	22,550
TANZANIA	800,000	16,500	3,500	13,000
ZAMBIA	1,700,000	109,000	88,700	20,300
ZIMBABWE	4,600,000	517,600	332,342	185,258
REGIONAL	N/A	0	0	0
TOTALS		1,645,400	1,303,725	341,675

2. PLEDGES UNDER PROGRAMME FOOD AID

COUNTRY	REQ'MENTS	PLEDGES	SHORTFALL/ (SURPLUS)
ANGOLA	9,000	5,000	4,000
BOTSWANA	11,700	3,000	8,700
LESOTHO	62,000	5,000	57,000
MALAWI	340,000	7,000	333,000
MOZAMBIQUE	861,000	322,139	538,861
NAMIBIA	43,500	10,000	33,500
SWAZILAND	19,000	0	19,000
TANZANIA	265,000	22,000	243,000
ZAMBIA	726,000	360,000	366,000
ZIMBABWE	203,400	165,750	37,650
REGIONAL	0	0	0
TOTALS	2,540,600	899,889	1,640,711

SS



SOUTHERN AFRICA DROUGHT

STAFF DEPLOYMENT (ADDITIONAL - PROFESSIONAL ONLY)

Regional Office Harare:	Regional Coordinator Adviser (Information) Data processing (under recruitment) Project (VGF) Adviser Office Administrator Logistics Officer
Johannesburg sub-office:	2 Logistics Officers (1 vacant, frozen temporarily)
Zambia:	Adviser (VGF/free distribution) 4 Logistics Officers (Kabwe, Livingstone, Lusaka, Ndola)
Malawi:	Adviser (VGF/free distribution) 1 Logistics Officer (Blantyre)
Mozambique:	3 Logistics Officers (Maputo, Beira, Nampula)
Tanzania:	Logistics Officer (for Zambia traffic mainly)
HQ Rome, strengthening:	Resources Service Personnel Transport Disaster Relief (3 pending)

In general: - monitoring staff in addition, through UNV programme and/or NGO channels; possibly JPO scheme with donors when they wish deliberately to use this approach (likely number of monitors: 30 altogether).

- General service staff (clerical, secretarial, drivers).

UN REGIONAL COORDINATION FOR SADE

Issue: What mechanisms has the UN put in place to coordinate donor and host government assistance and what is the U.S. government position on these efforts?

Talking Points

- o The U.S. and several other donors had requested that the UN appoint a special full-time regional coordinator, based in the region, to operate under Ambassador Eliasson's office. We proposed that this position be given authority to bring about "real coordination," - not just information sharing. Our proposal was based on the magnitude of the food and transport needs and complexity of technical and political issues in managing the emergency.

- o By way of comparison, during the 1984-85 African famine emergency, the UN created the Office of Emergency Operations (UNOEOA) to deal with the crisis. While the U.S. did not feel a new UN office or institution was required to deal with the myriad SADE issues, there was, in our view, a need for a high-level regional political coordinator.

- o Ambassador Eliasson recently announced a more limited step: appointment of the WFP and U.N. Development Program (UNDP) Resident Representatives in Harare to serve as regional coordinators for logistics and non-food assistance, respectively. These UN officials will report to Charles Lamuniere, head of Eliasson's office in Geneva. The WFP is also responsible for resolving issues including transport and customs charges that impede relief deliveries.

- o Mr. Lamuniere's office in Geneva is responsible for overall coordination, including preparation and tracking of appeals, preparing regular reports on the emergency and on donor contributions, conducting assessments, and chairing UN inter-agency meetings on this emergency.

- o The U.S. is encouraged by these steps taken by the UN to coordinate drought assistance efforts in the region and are monitoring developments carefully to ensure that they are effective during the upcoming critical months of the SADE.

- o We are also taking additional bilateral steps and sharing information with other donors and multilateral agencies to promote effective donor coordination in the region.

PVO INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHERN AFRICA DROUGHT RESPONSE

Issue: What is the Administration doing to involve PVOs in the relief efforts in southern Africa?

Talking Points:

- o At least fifteen international PVOs are already implementing development and relief assistance programs in eight of the affected southern Africa countries. Twenty PVOs, local and international, are now part of Zimbabwe's food distribution system, and nine PVOs are working with the Malawi government.

- o U.S. Government food aid currently includes targeted feeding programs, primarily in Angola and Mozambique, valued at over \$17 million and carried out by PVOs. PVOs are also expected to assist in distributing targeted food aid which the U.S. is channeling to the region through the World Food Program.

- o The U.S. contribution announced to date for non-food emergency relief includes more than \$20 million for PVO-implemented programs. Examples of U.S.-funded activities are \$2.9 million to Africare and the International Medical Corps (IMC) for water and health programs in Angola, as well as over \$4 million to CARE and Catholic Relief Services (CRS) for food aid support activities there. World Vision Relief and Development (WVRD) has received \$2 million for emergency airlifts in Mozambique. In Namibia, IMC has received \$430,000 for water drilling activities. A.I.D. has also contributed an additional \$11.9 million to an on-going PVO Support Project in Mozambique which includes emergency assistance, recovery and rehabilitation and training programs implemented by CARE, ADRA (Adventist Development and Relief Agency), Africare, Food for the Hungry International, Save the Children/U.S. and World Vision.

- o Because southern Africa is not often affected by drought of this magnitude, many of the U.S. PVOs working in most countries of the region do not have the same experience with famine and drought relief programs as those working in the Horn, West Africa, Mozambique and Angola. Several of the PVOs are still in the process of reviewing their capabilities to establish and operate relief programs in these new countries.

- o A.I.D. would like to see the PVO community increase its activities in the region. To this end, A.I.D. has encouraged discussions between field-based PVO representatives and the USAID missions, conducted briefings in Washington, distributed the OFDA drought assessment reports and endorsed PVO participation in the delivery of additional food aid channeled through WFP. A.I.D. welcomes the submission of proposals to address the needs in the region through PVO projects and we have encouraged PVOs to submit such proposals.

o We are also hopeful that PVOs will continue to play the very important role of mobilizing private resources to share in the burden of supporting emergency activities; a PVO community which is a significant source of funding for emergency assistance will allow us both (the USG and PVOs) to leverage our respective resources.

SADTPUB\DOCS\PVOS.Q&A;7-29-92

SOUTHERN AFRICA: DROUGHT AND REFUGEES

Issue: How has the drought affected the refugee population in southern Africa?

Talking Points

- o The drought has numerous negative impacts on refugees:
 - Mozambique and Angolan farmers who worked as subsistence farmers have lost their crops. Mozambican refugees who worked as day laborers are losing their jobs.
 - There will continue to be increased movements into refugee camps -- new refugees coming from Mozambique, spontaneously settled refugees no longer able to cope on their own, even hungry nationals of the host countries. Over 5,000 new refugees per month have been registered in Malawi and 3,000 per month have entered Zimbabwe.
 - The World Food Program has counted in the past on local purchases and on swaps of food in the region to keep the refugee food pipelines full. None of the regional sources will be available this year.
 - Lead times for refugee food deliveries will increase. The timing question is particularly important since nearly one million refugees in Malawi are dependent for their daily rations on a regular supply of relief food.
 - Program costs for the UNHCR (and therefore demands on donor resources) will increase.
 - In addition to concerns about food, there are concerns that water sources in refugee camps are drying up.
 - Refugees (and refugee assistance agencies) will face increased competition with nationals for water, food, and the region's limited logistical capacity.
 - There may well be increased hostility toward refugees, for whom assistance networks are already in place, if nationals do not also get timely relief.
 - Existing, disquieting tendencies toward forced repatriation of refugees may be strengthened.
 - Angolan repatriation could be delayed; significant Mozambican repatriation is unlikely this year.

IMPACT ON DEVELOPMENT

Issue: What has been the impact of the drought on our development programs in the region?

Talking Points:

- o The longer-term effect of the drought on A.I.D. development programs is **not yet evident**. We are continuing to monitor this issue, and have already asked our **A.I.D. Missions** to provide assessments.
- o At this point, two specific effects have been chronicled: (a) **Swaziland's** project designed to **create and sustain markets** for **small and medium scale agriculture** which was just beginning to successfully meet some targets and objectives has been put on hold, and (b) **Zimbabwe's** ongoing **conservation and natural resource utilization** programs are now at risk as participants and rural dwellers scramble just to survive.
- o As an overview, it is apparent that the drought is causing major social and economic disruptions throughout all of eastern and southern Africa, affecting **food supplies**, constraining **economic reform**, decelerating **production**, and overloading **transportation/coordination/distribution** services.
- o The most obvious **generic problems** are becoming visible: **urban and rural water supply shortages** and increasing **unemployment** as economic downturns affect agricultural and commodity production. A significant **rural population influx** into the cities in search of food and work is also probable.

Clearances:

AFR/SA: KEBrown (draft)	_____	Date: 7/23/92	_____
AFR/SA: RHarber (draft)	_____	Date: 7/27/92	_____
AFR/DP: JGovan (draft)	_____	Date: 7/24/92	_____
AFR/SADE/TF: SSmith (draft)	_____	Date: 7/24/92	_____
DAA/AFR: JHicks	_____	Date:	_____

AFR/SA: JRoberts: 7/23/92: AFRPUB\docs\sade2.ar

STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT, THE DROUGHT AND THE POOR

Issue: Have the reforms instituted under the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) magnified the impact of the drought on the poor?

Talking Points

- The drought has hurt almost all people in the region through loss of income and/or higher prices for food.
- The poor have been more vulnerable because they have the least savings to rely on.
- In general, the SAPs have had little impact on the lowest income groups.
 - ▶ The poor benefitted least from past food subsidies as the subsidies went primarily to government and urban workers.
 - ▶ Although many of the SAPs have provisions for decreasing the size of the civil service, the poorest groups have not been part of the civil service and thus have not been hurt directly.
 - ▶ Some poor may have received income transfers from relatives in civil service or parastatal jobs; the SAPs, however, provide for a year's severance pay.
- The poorest groups will continue to remain at or below the poverty level after the drought unless countries in the region increase per capita GDP and remove the barriers to efficient private-sector and market-oriented activity.
- Had more adjustments been made in the past, these countries and the poorest groups in them would be feeling fewer effects from the drought.
- In the meantime, to make sure the poor survive the drought, as they have "survived" good crop years, host-country and donor programs have been targeting assistance to these most vulnerable groups.
- The World Bank has modified adjustment targets to reflect the economic consequences of the drought. It has also provided approximately \$350 million in additional assistance to help Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and Zimbabwe cope with drought relief needs.

IMPACT OF THE DROUGHT ON ECONOMIC REFORM

Issue: What have been the impacts on economic structural adjustment as a result of the drought?

Talking Points

o While the overall impact of the drought has been negative, the drought has expedited implementation of some policy reforms which will facilitate both short- and long-term recovery.

o Reforms include increased private sector participation; greater use of market-oriented pricing, production, and distribution; increased diversification, and better regional coordination. In addition, the transportation sector has benefitted greatly.

o **Increased private sector participation:** Given the need for private sector assistance in relief activities, governments are changing regulations, subsidies, and other conditions that limited private-sector involvement in the past.

- ▶ Zimbabwe has abolished the Grain Marketing Board's monopoly in small-holder areas and has allowed the private sector to purchase, transport, and sell maize within and between these areas. Many licensing laws have been liberalized or abolished. Competition has increased in the grain milling subsector, resulting in a cheaper, more nutritious product.
- ▶ The Zimbabwe private sector now has easier access to foreign exchange for financing imports, and the list of eligible goods has expanded.
- ▶ In Mozambique, private sector participation in marketing has increased and greater involvement is expected in all aspects of the marketing chain.

o **Greater use of market-oriented pricing:** Countries are beginning to see the market system as an important tool in allocating resources, e.g., redirecting supply and demand.

- ▶ With a skyrocketing budget deficit, the Governments of Zambia and Zimbabwe cannot continue subsidizing consumer grain purchases. Future subsidies in Zimbabwe will go only to the most needy people.
- ▶ Both Zambia and Zimbabwe have raised the price paid to farmers. (In Zimbabwe, this price increased by over 60%, to a level between import and export parity. The decision is directly attributable to drought-induced awareness of the need to stimulate local production.)

- ▶ The Zimbabwe government is moving toward removal of the subsidy on roller meal -- the country's most used meal.
- **Diversity:** The drought has encouraged governments to see the advantages of economic diversification and the harmful impact of pricing and regulatory policies on agricultural development.
 - ▶ In both Zambia and Zimbabwe, the drought is encouraging expansion into millet and sorghum, which are more drought resistant.
 - ▶ In both countries, pricing policy is encouraging farmers and consumers to diversify.
 - ▶ In Malawi, the drought is increasing agricultural diversity as people grow a greater variety of crops or experiment with new seed varieties of existing crops.
 - ▶ Hydro-electric power is the major source of electricity in much of the area. Given electricity shortages caused by the drought, countries are looking for alternative short- and long-run power sources.
- **Coordination** among all countries in the region has been good. Most remarkable, however, is the increased cooperation between the SADCC countries and South Africa.
- **Transport:** Increasing budget deficits and the need for timely provision of drought commodities have highlighted the need for better cooperation and efficiency in the transport industry.
 - ▶ Zambia and Zimbabwe have encouraged faster, more efficient turn-around time for rail transport.
 - ▶ In Zimbabwe, the Railway is dropping unutilized or poorly utilized freight and passenger runs; profitable runs receive priority in maintenance; the Railway is changing the rate structure to decrease or eliminate subsidies.

RESTORATION

Issue: After the drought, what will A.I.D. do to support restoration?

Talking Points:

- o A.I.D. programs in the region are not waiting for the drought to end. Many bilateral and regional projects, including research, production, and marketing of drought-resistant food production of wheat and maize, sorghum and millet, and root crops are already underway. We hope these efforts will help minimize the effects of the drought.
- o Other important projects which will impact on long-term post-drought recovery and restoration are focused in: Mozambique (PVO Support and Child Survival projects - \$11.9 million); Zimbabwe (Grain Marketing Reform - \$20 million); and Malawi (Agricultural Sector Assistance Program Amendment - \$6 million).
- o A.I.D.'s Southern Africa Regional Program (SARP), working directly with the Southern Africa Development Coordination Conference (SADCC) is also designing other post-drought recovery activities. These will impact directly and positively on interregional trade, rail and transportation efficiencies, and regional telecommunication improvements.
- o Other programs in the region support economic and social policy reforms that will facilitate the recovery of these economies once the drought is over.

Clearances:

AFR/SA: KEBrown (draft)	_____	Date: 7/23/92	_____
AFR/SA: RHarber (draft)	_____	Date: 7/27/92	_____
AFR/DP: JGovan (draft)	_____	Date: 7/24/92	_____
AFR/SADE/TF: SSmith (draft)	_____	Date: 7/24/92	_____
DAA/AFR: JHicks	_____	Date:	_____

AFR/SA: JRoberts: 7/23/92: AFRPUB\docs\sade2.ar

SOUTH AFRICA

ISSUE: Why can't the South Africa aid program be reduced this year or next and money applied to drought?

TALKING POINTS:

- o The \$80 million level for FY 1992 was set by the President when he announced the lifting of sanctions in July 1991. There would be credibility problems associated with a change, especially this late in the fiscal year.
- o Most observers would argue that FY 1993 is a key year in the transition process, with the probable installation of an interim government sometime over the next eighteen months. A reduction in aid levels during this critical time would be extremely damaging to our credibility, particularly among those groups which are already cynical about the extent to which the United States really is prepared to assist a new, post-apartheid South Africa.
- o From a procedural standpoint, there are difficulties. All funds for FY 1992 are already programmed, if not necessarily obligated. Negotiations for dozens of small grant agreements are in advanced stages. In many cases, funds have already been earmarked or committed. Reprogramming funds at this stage would cause havoc in a programming process that is already the most complex in the Agency.
- o If OYB adjustments were contemplated for FY 1993, the Mission would encounter a different set of problems which are just as serious. New projects and activities are being designed in support of the transition process now underway. Reductions in the planned level for FY 1993 would necessitate another review of the portfolio, including the possible elimination or reduced obligations for such new projects as "Tertiary Education Linkages," "Training for Employment," and "Support for Basic Education Reconstruction;" or a reduction in existing mortgages, entailing a cut-off of expected funds to already existing grantees.
- o Further, given the current problems associated with the CODESA process, this is clearly not repeat not the time for any question about USG support and resolve.

Drafted:AFR/SA:WElliott:7-4328:7/24/92:TALKPT.DP

Clearances:

AFR/SA:KBrown draft
AFR/DP:JGovan draft
AFR/SAD:SSmith SS
DAA/AFR:JHicks _____

PROPOSED FUNDING LEVELS (1992)

Human Rights and a Civil Society (23 percent)

- Community Outreach and Leadership Development \$10.7 million
- Labor Unions \$3.5 million
- Human Rights \$4.5 million

Human Resource Development (53 percent)

- Basic Education \$10.5 million
- Tertiary Education, including Bursaries \$32.1 million

Private Sector Mobilization (17 percent)

- Black Private Enterprise Development \$4.0 million
- Housing/Urban Development \$9.2 million

Other (7 percent)

- AIDS Education and Prevention \$3.0 million
- Program Design and Support \$2.0 million
- Self Help \$0.5 million

Total

\$50.0 million

SOUTHERN AFRICA VS. THE HORN

ISSUE: How do need and emergency programs in southern Africa compare to those in the Horn?

Talking points:

The situations differ considerably in terms of the nature of the food crisis, as well as in the economic and political context.

With the exception of Mozambique and Angola, the countries in southern Africa are relatively more developed, with generally higher standards of living, and more developed agriculture and infrastructure. The political regimes in the region tend to be more stable and except for Mozambique and Angola, civil strife is less of a factor than in the Horn.

This emergency is caused not by man, but by the lack of rain at a critical point in the maturation of the corn crop. Also, southern African countries do not generally face the structural deficits -- at the regional and national level -- faced repeatedly by the countries in the Horn.

Southern African countries generally have cereals markets that work and a higher standard of living which allows consumers access to marketed food supplies. This has served them well in good harvest years. It is for this reason that donors have been providing program food aid for sale as opposed to direct feeding programs like those in the Horn. However, the extent of the emergency in southern Africa is such that direct feeding is also required to save lives. Southern African countries do not have developed systems for direct feeding, and these systems must be established from scratch both to identify and reach the needy.

The country in the southern Africa region which is most like those in the Horn is Mozambique, which is strife-torn, dependent on donor food aid and expatriate PVOs to ensure minimal levels of food security.

AFR/DP/PSE:PRader:AFRPUB\DOCS\SADE.AR

Clearance: AFR/DP, JGovan (draft)
ODFA, THalmrast-Sanchez
AFR/SADE, SSmith (draft)
AFR/SA, KBrown (draft)

HORN OF AFRICA - RELIEF PROGRAMS

ISSUE: Are drought relief activities in southern Africa detracting from efforts in the Horn?

TALKING POINTS:

- o The sizable contributions we have made to southern Africa have not been at the expense of relief programs in the Horn.
- o In FY 1992, AID has provided a total of approximately \$228 million for emergency relief programs in the Horn.

Ethiopia

- o AID has provided \$128.5 million in emergency assistance to Ethiopia in FY 1992. This includes nearly 240,000 metric tons of food at a value of approximately \$124.2 million plus \$4.3 million in non-food assistance.
- o Although Ethiopia's long civil war finally ended in May, 1991, the new Transitional Government was faced with an estimated 6 million people in need of emergency assistance. These include: drought affected, displaced persons, demobilized soldiers and their families, refugees and returnees.

Sudan

- o AID has provided approximately \$50 million in emergency assistance to Sudan in FY 1992. This includes 126,000 metric tons of food valued at approximately \$38.8 million plus \$11.1 million in non-food relief supplies.
- o In FY 1991, AID provided \$131 million in food and relief supplies. The reduction in our relief program this year reflects the increasing difficulty and danger in providing emergency assistance to Sudan. Most of our NGO-cooperating sponsors' relief programs in the South currently are on hold because of the renewal of full-scale warfare. In the North, Government policies continue to hamper the operations of our cooperating sponsors.

Somalia

- o The U.S. and other donors have substantially increased their emergency assistance to Somalia, despite the fact that continuing civil war, banditry and political instability make it almost impossible to carry out effective relief programs.
- o AID has provided \$43 million in emergency assistance to Somalia in FY 1992. This includes 68,500 metric tons of food, worth \$35.5 million and \$7.3 million in other forms of emergency assistance. The corresponding totals for FY 1991 were 12,200 metric tons for food valued at \$5.7 million and

\$4.3 million for non-food relief.

Kenya

- o AID has provided \$6.5 million in emergency assistance within Kenya in FY 1992. These funds represent the value of approximately 9,700 metric tons of supplementary foods which are being provided to children through a UNICEF managed program. Some non-food assistance also has been provided. Also, USDA 416 includes 44,500 for Kenya, approved in July.

Drafted: AFR/EA: RGold 7/21/92 EAPUB\DOCS\HORNAFRI\RELIEF

Cleared: FHA/OFDA: GGottlieb (draft)
AFR/EA: GLewis (draft)
AFR/DP: JGovan (draft)

MADAGASCAR - Famine Situation

What is the current status?

- May 14, 1992 the government declared a famine disaster
- Government is coordinating famine relief with donor community
- \$1.4 million generated from local in-kind contributions
- Recent survey shows high malnutrition levels
21% of 6-30 month old children are acutely malnourished
46% of 6-60 month old children are chronically malnourished
- Famine related deaths have been reported and migrations are on the rise
- The government and donors are cooperating in the efforts to stabilize the situation, prevent deaths and prepare for a rehabilitation phase when the next planting season arrives (November/December 1992)
- Southern Madagascar is in the same climatic zone and is experiencing the same drought as southern African countries. Relief to Madagascar should be considered as part of the southern drought relief effort to ensure adequate attention and maximize logistic efficiency

What are donors doing to assist?

- Total donor contributions for May 1992 - March 1993 amount to 38,700 tons of food including transportation costs
- Besides the United States other donors include France, Switzerland, Great Britain, Japan, Mauritius, Norway and South Africa
- Other assistance has been received from missionary organizations, rotary clubs, private enterprises and multilateral organizations
- EEC, French and German governments are now planning to contribute 3,000 MTS of cereal

What is the United States doing to assist?

- PL 480 counterpart funds for FY 1992 totaling approximately \$630,000 have been released for famine relief which includes:
 - \$42,000 have been earmarked for WFP's food distribution unit

\$530,000 have been earmarked to help pay internal transport costs

\$58,000 will be used to assist the government with surveys

- U.S. is contributing 25,500 MTS of corn (Section 416B) to WFP/Madagascar
- U.S. has contributed \$25,000 to UNICEF and has requested \$100,000 from OFDA for famine-related activities
- A.I.D./Madagascar currently has consultants in the field to review the locust problem (cost \$11,000)

Clearance:

AFR/EA:GLewis (draft)

AFR/DP:JGovan (draft)

SADE:SSmith (draft)

Drafted: AFR/EA:SPulaski:7-7988:07/21/92:Madagascar\FAMSITU.MEM

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
Listing of Affected Countries/
FY 1992 USG Response**

<u>Country</u>	<u>Metric Tons</u>		<u>Estimated Dollars</u>	
	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>
<u>Angola</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II	33,984	Title II	\$18,283,100
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416	20,000	Section 416	\$7,109,950
	Subtotal	<u>53,984</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$25,393,050</u>
<u>Botswana</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II	4,368	Title II	\$1,354,300
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416		Section 416	
	Subtotal	<u>4,368</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$1,354,300</u>
<u>Lesotho</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II	8,114	Title II	\$3,864,000
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416	5,000	Section 416	\$1,565,000
	Subtotal	<u>13,114</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$5,429,000</u>
<u>Malawi</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II	45,000	Title II	\$17,055,000
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416	238,000	Section 416	\$91,154,000
	Subtotal	<u>283,000</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$108,209,000</u>
<u>Mozambique</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II	42,579	Title II	\$14,781,700
	Title III	241,500	Title III	\$49,241,000
	Section 416	200,000	Section 416	\$60,993,000
	Subtotal	<u>484,079</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$125,015,700</u>

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
Listing of Affected Countries/
FY 1992 USG Response**

<u>Country</u>	Metric Tons		Estimated Dollars	
	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>
<u>Namibia</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II		Title II	
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416	10,000	Section 416	\$2,530,000
	Subtotal	<u>10,000</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$2,530,000</u>
<u>Swaziland</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II		Title II	
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416	10,500	Section 416	\$3,055,605
	Subtotal	<u>10,500</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$3,055,605</u>
<u>Zambia</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II	20,000	Title II	\$6,860,000
	Title III	152,992	Title III	\$18,000,000
	Section 416	110,000	Section 416	\$37,230,000
	Subtotal	<u>282,992</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$62,090,000</u>
<u>Zimbabwe</u>	Title I	227,000	Title I	\$30,000,000
	Title II		Title II	
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416	203,750	Section 416	\$68,045,250
	Subtotal	<u>430,750</u>	Subtotal	<u>\$98,045,250</u>
<u>WFP Regional Supplemental</u>	Title I		Title I	
	Title II		Title II	
	Title III		Title III	
	Section 416		Section 416	
	Subtotal		Subtotal	
<u>Corn</u>				

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
Listing of Affected Countries/
FY 1992 USG Response**

<u>Country</u>	Metric Tons		Estimated Dollars	
	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>
<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	Title I	227,000	Title I	\$30,000,000
	Title II	154,045	Title II	\$62,198,100
	Title III	394,492	Title III	\$67,241,000
	Section 416	797,250	Section 416	\$271,682,805
		1,572,787	Subtotal	\$431,121,905

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
USG Pre and Post Drought Approval
FY 1992**

Country	Funding Source	Originally Proposed PRIOR TO March 1992		Reprogrammed/Approved AFTER March 1992		Total	
		Metric Tons	Total Dollars	Metric Tons	Total Dollars	Metric Tons	Total Dollars
<u>Angola</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II	33,984	\$18,283,100			33,984	\$18,283,100
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416			20,000	\$7,109,950	20,000	\$7,109,950
	Subtotal	<u>33,984</u>	<u>\$18,283,100</u>	<u>20,000</u>	<u>\$7,109,950</u>	<u>53,984</u>	<u>\$25,393,050</u>
<u>Botswana</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II	250	\$254,800	4,118	\$1,099,500	4,368	\$1,354,300
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416					0	\$0
	Subtotal	<u>250</u>	<u>\$254,800</u>	<u>4,118</u>	<u>\$1,099,500</u>	<u>4,368</u>	<u>\$1,354,300</u>
<u>Lesotho</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II	8,114	\$3,864,000			8,114	\$3,864,000
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416			5,000	\$1,565,000	5,000	\$1,565,000
	Subtotal	<u>8,114</u>	<u>\$3,864,000</u>	<u>5,000</u>	<u>\$1,565,000</u>	<u>13,114</u>	<u>\$5,429,000</u>
<u>Malawi</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II			45,000	\$17,055,000	45,000	\$17,055,000
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416			238,000	\$91,154,000	238,000	\$91,154,000
	Subtotal	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>283,000</u>	<u>\$108,209,000</u>	<u>283,000</u>	<u>\$108,209,000</u>
<u>Mozambique</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II	34,499	\$8,623,000	8,080	\$6,158,700	42,579	\$14,781,700
	Title III	110,000	\$27,100,000	131,500	\$22,141,000	241,500	\$49,241,000
	Section 416			200,000	\$60,993,000	200,000	\$60,993,000
	Subtotal	<u>144,499</u>	<u>\$35,723,000</u>	<u>339,580</u>	<u>\$89,292,700</u>	<u>484,079</u>	<u>\$125,015,700</u>
<u>Namibia</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II					0	\$0
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416			10,000	\$2,530,000	10,000	\$2,530,000
	Subtotal	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>\$2,530,000</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>\$2,530,000</u>

Southern Africa Drought Emergency USG Pre and Post Drought Approval FY 1992

Country	Funding Source	Originally Proposed PRIOR TO March 1992		Reprogrammed/Approved AFTER March 1992		Total	
		Metric Tons	Total Dollars	Metric Tons	Total Dollars	Metric Tons	Total Dollars
<u>Swaziland</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II					0	\$0
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416			10,500	\$3,055,605	10,500	\$3,055,605
	Subtotal	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>10,500</u>	<u>\$3,055,605</u>	<u>10,500</u>	<u>\$3,055,605</u>
<u>Zambia</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II	20,000	\$6,860,000			20,000	\$6,860,000
	Title III	50,000	\$18,000,000	102,992		152,992	\$18,000,000
	Section 416			110,000	\$37,230,000	110,000	\$37,230,000
	Subtotal	<u>70,000</u>	<u>\$24,860,000</u>	<u>212,992</u>	<u>\$37,230,000</u>	<u>282,992</u>	<u>\$62,090,000</u>
<u>Zimbabwe</u>	Title I			227,000	\$30,000,000	227,000	\$30,000,000
	Title II					0	\$0
	Title III					0	\$0
	Section 416			203,750	\$68,045,250	203,750	\$68,045,250
	Subtotal	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>430,750</u>	<u>\$98,045,250</u>	<u>430,750</u>	<u>\$98,045,250</u>
<u>WFP Regional Supplemental</u>	Title I					0	\$0
	Title II					0	\$0
	Title III					0	\$0
<u>Corn</u>	Section 416			0	\$0	0	\$0
	Subtotal	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
<u>GRAND TOTAL</u>	Title I	0	\$0	227,000	\$30,000,000	227,000	\$30,000,000
	Title II	96,847	\$37,884,900	57,198	\$24,313,200	154,045	\$62,198,100
	Title III	160,000	\$45,100,000	234,492	\$22,141,000	394,492	\$67,241,000
	Section 416	0	\$0	797,250	\$271,682,805	797,250	\$271,682,805
	Subtotal	<u>256,847</u>	<u>\$82,984,900</u>	<u>1,315,940</u>	<u>\$348,137,005</u>	<u>1,572,787</u>	<u>\$431,121,905</u>

81

Southern Africa Drought Emergency Shipping Logistics FY 1992 USG Response

Metric Tons									
<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Already Delivered</u>	<u>July Delivery</u>	<u>August Delivery</u>	<u>September Delivery</u>	<u>October Delivery</u>	<u>Ordered; Delivery To Be Scheduled</u>	<u>To Be Ordered</u>
<u>Angola</u>	Title I								
	Title II	33,984	15,173	2,080		1,100	15,631		
	Title III								
	Section 416	20,000		15,000					20,000
	Subtotal	53,984	15,173	17,080	0	1,100	15,631	0	20,000
<u>Botswana</u>	Title I								
	Title II	4,368	250		4,118				
	Title III								
	Section 416								
	Subtotal	4,368	250	0	4,118	0	0	0	0
<u>Lesotho</u>	Title I								
	Title II	8,114	8,114						
	Title III								
	Section 416	5,000							5,000
	Subtotal	13,114	8,114	0	0	0	0	0	5,000

69

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
Shipping Logistics
FY 1992 USG Response**

Metric Tons									
<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Already Delivered</u>	<u>July Delivery</u>	<u>August Delivery</u>	<u>September Delivery</u>	<u>October Delivery</u>	<u>Ordered; Delivery To Be Scheduled</u>	<u>To Be Ordered</u>
<u>Malawi</u>	Title I								
	Title II	45,000	45,000						
	Title III								
	Section 416	238,000	45,000	15,000			78,000		100,000
	Subtotal	283,000	90,000	15,000	0	0	78,000	0	100,000
<u>Mozambique</u>	Title I								
	Title II	42,579	22,180	5,522	1,372	5,425		8,080	
	Title III	241,500	47,250	47,250	37,000	66,000	44,000		
	Section 416	200,000	49,227	10,773					140,000
	Subtotal	484,079	118,657	63,545	38,372	71,425	44,000	8,080	140,000
<u>Namibia</u>	Title I								
	Title II								
	Title III								
	Section 416	10,000							10,000
	Subtotal	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000

Southern Africa Drought Emergency Shipping Logistics FY 1992 USG Response

Metric Tons									
<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Already Delivered</u>	<u>July Delivery</u>	<u>August Delivery</u>	<u>September Delivery</u>	<u>October Delivery</u>	<u>Ordered; Delivery To Be Scheduled</u>	<u>To Be Ordered</u>
<u>Swaziland</u>	Title I								
	Title II								
	Title III								
	Section 416	10,500							10,500
	Subtotal	10,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,500
<u>Zambia</u>	Title I								
	Title II	20,000	20,000						
	Title III	152,992	52,500	100,492					
	Section 416	110,000		80,000					30,000
	Subtotal	282,992	72,500	180,492	0	0	0	0	30,000
<u>Zimbabwe</u>	Title I	227,000					10,000	217,000	
	Title II								
	Title III								
	Section 416	203,750							203,750
	Subtotal	430,750	0	0	0	0	0	217,000	203,750

h8

Southern Africa Drought Emergency Shipping Logistics FY 1992 USG Response

		Metric Tons							
<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Approved To Date</u>	<u>Already Delivered</u>	<u>July Delivery</u>	<u>August Delivery</u>	<u>September Delivery</u>	<u>October Delivery</u>	<u>Ordered; Delivery To Be Scheduled</u>	<u>To Be Ordered</u>
<u>WFP Regional</u>	Title I								
<u>Supplementals</u>	Title II								
	Title III								
	Section 416								
	Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	Title I	227,000	0	0	0	0	10,000	217,000	0
	Title II	154,045	110,717	7,602	5,490	6,525	15,631	8,080	0
	Title III	394,492	99,750	147,742	37,000	66,000	44,000	0	0
	Section 416	797,250	94,227	120,773	0	0	78,000	0	519,250
		1,572,787	304,694	276,117	42,490	72,525	147,631	225,080	519,250

58

Southern Africa Drought Emergency USG FY 1992 Response By Sponsor Type

Country	Funding Source	Metric Tons				Total Dollars			
		PVO	WFP	GTG	Total	PVO	WFP	GTG	Total
<u>Angola</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II	13,905	20,079		33,984	\$6,597,200	\$11,685,900		\$18,283,100
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416		20,000		20,000		\$7,109,950		\$7,109,950
	Subtotal	13,905	40,079	0	<u>53,984</u>	\$6,597,200	\$18,795,850	\$0	<u>\$25,393,050</u>
<u>Botswana</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II		4,368		4,368		\$1,354,300		\$1,354,300
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416				0				\$0
	Subtotal	0	4,368	0	<u>4,368</u>	\$0	\$1,354,300	\$0	<u>\$1,354,300</u>
<u>Lesotho</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II		8,114		8,114		\$3,864,000		\$3,864,000
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416		5,000		5,000		\$1,565,000		\$1,565,000
	Subtotal	0	13,114	0	<u>13,114</u>	\$0	\$5,429,000	\$0	<u>\$5,429,000</u>
<u>Malawi</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II		45,000		45,000		\$17,055,000		\$17,055,000
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416		238,000		238,000		\$91,154,000		\$91,154,000
	Subtotal	0	283,000	0	<u>283,000</u>	\$0	\$108,209,000	\$0	<u>\$108,209,000</u>

86

Southern Africa Drought Emergency USG FY 1992 Response By Sponsor Type

Country	Funding Source	Metric Tons				Total Dollars			
		PVO	WFP	GTG	Total	PVO	WFP	GTG	Total
<u>Mozambique</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II	28,281	14,298		42,579	\$10,642,400	\$4,139,300		\$14,781,700
	Title III			241,500	241,500			\$49,241,000	\$49,241,000
	Section 416		200,000		200,000		\$60,993,000		\$60,993,000
	Subtotal	28,281	214,298	241,500	<u>484,079</u>	\$10,642,400	\$65,132,300	\$49,241,000	<u>\$125,015,700</u>
<u>Namibia</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II				0				\$0
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416		10,000		10,000		\$2,530,000		\$2,530,000
	Subtotal	0	10,000	0	<u>10,000</u>	\$0	\$2,530,000	\$0	<u>\$2,530,000</u>
<u>Swaziland</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II				0				\$0
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416		10,500		10,500		\$3,055,605		\$3,055,605
	Subtotal	0	10,500	0	<u>10,500</u>	\$0	\$3,055,605	\$0	<u>\$3,055,605</u>
<u>Zambia</u>	Title I				0				\$0
	Title II			20,000	20,000			\$6,860,000	\$6,860,000
	Title III			152,992	152,992			\$18,000,000	\$18,000,000
	Section 416		30,000	80,000	110,000		\$10,590,000	\$26,640,000	\$37,230,000
	Subtotal	0	30,000	252,992	<u>282,992</u>	\$0	\$10,590,000	\$51,500,000	<u>\$62,090,000</u>

87

Southern Africa Drought Emergency USG FY 1992 Response By Sponsor Type

Country	Funding Source	Metric Tons				Total Dollars			
		PVO	WFP	GTG	Total	PVO	WFP	GTG	Total
<u>Zimbabwe</u>	Title I			227,000	227,000			\$30,000,000	\$30,000,000
	Title II				0				\$0
	Title III				0				\$0
	Section 416		95,000	108,750	203,750		\$30,780,000	\$37,265,250	\$68,045,250
	Subtotal	0	95,000	335,750	<u>430,750</u>	\$0	\$30,780,000	\$67,265,250	<u>\$98,045,250</u>
<u>Regional</u>	Title I				0				\$0
<u>Supplemental</u>	Title II				0				\$0
	Title III				0				\$0
<u>Corn</u>	Section 416				0				\$0
	Subtotal	0	0	0	<u>0</u>	\$0	\$0	\$0	<u>\$0</u>
<u>GRAND</u>	Title I	0	0	227,000	227,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$30,000,000
<u>TOTAL</u>	Title II	42,186	91,859	20,000	154,045	\$17,239,600	\$38,098,500	\$6,860,000	\$62,198,100
	Title III	0	0	394,492	394,492	\$0	\$0	\$67,241,000	\$67,241,000
	Section 416	0	608,500	188,750	797,250	\$0	\$207,777,555	\$83,905,250	\$271,682,805
	Subtotal	42,186	700,359	830,242	<u>1,572,787</u>	\$17,239,600	\$245,876,055	\$168,006,250	<u>\$431,121,905</u>

88

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
USG FY 1992 Response
Commodity Mix -- Metric Tons**

<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Butteroil</u>	<u>Corn</u>	<u>Cornmeal</u>	<u>CSB/CSM</u>	<u>Pinto Beans</u>	<u>Red Beans</u>	<u>Rice</u>	<u>Sorghum</u>	<u>Veg Oil</u>	<u>Cotton</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Angola</u>	Title I											0
	Title II		16,722	3,659	1,362	3,806	0	6,667		1,768		33,984
	Title III											0
	Section 416		20,000									20,000
	Subtotal	0	36,722	3,659	1,362	3,806	0	6,667	0	1,768	0	<u>53,984</u>
<u>Botswana</u>	Title I											0
	Title II								4,118	250		4,368
	Title III											0
	Section 416											0
	Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,118	250	0	<u>4,368</u>
<u>Lesotho</u>	Title I											0
	Title II			7,220						894		8,114
	Title III											0
	Section 416		5,000									5,000
	Subtotal	0	5,000	7,220	0	0	0	0	0	894	0	<u>13,114</u>
<u>Malawi</u>	Title I											0
	Title II		45,000									45,000
	Title III											0
	Section 416		238,000									238,000
	Subtotal	0	283,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>283,000</u>

**Southern Africa Drought Emergency
USG FY 1992 Response
Commodity Mix -- Metric Tons**

<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Butteroil</u>	<u>Corn</u>	<u>Cornmeal</u>	<u>CSB/CSM</u>	<u>Pinto Beans</u>	<u>Red Beans</u>	<u>Rice</u>	<u>Sorghum</u>	<u>Veg Oil</u>	<u>Cotton</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Mozambique</u>	Title I											0
	Title II		31,733		5,168	3,355	1,800			522		42,579
	Title III		236,500					5,000				241,500
	Section 416		200,000									200,000
	Subtotal	0	468,233	0	5,168	3,356	1,800	5,000	0	522	0	<u>484,079</u>
<u>Namibia</u>	Title I											0
	Title II											0
	Title III											0
	Section 416		10,000									10,000
	Subtotal	0	10,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>10,000</u>
<u>Swaziland</u>	Title I											0
	Title II											0
	Title III											0
	Section 416		10,500									10,500
	Subtotal	0	10,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>10,500</u>
<u>Zambia</u>	Title I											0
	Title II		20,000									20,000
	Title III		152,992									152,992
	Section 416		110,000									110,000
	Subtotal	0	282,992	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>282,992</u>

90

Southern Africa Drought Emergency USG FY 1992 Response Commodity Mix -- Metric Tons

<u>Country</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Butteroil</u>	<u>Corn</u>	<u>Cornmeal</u>	<u>CSB/CSM</u>	<u>Pinto Beans</u>	<u>Red Beans</u>	<u>Rice</u>	<u>Sorghum</u>	<u>Veg Oil</u>	<u>Cotton</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Zimbabwe</u>	Title I		217,000							10,000		227,000
	Title II											0
	Title III											0
	Section 416	750	153,000						50,000			203,750
	Subtotal	750	370,000	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	10,000	0	<u>430,750</u>
<u>Regional Supplemental</u>	Title I											0
	Title II											0
	Title III											0
	Section 416											0
	Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<u>0</u>
<u>Grand Total</u>	Title I	0	217,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	0	227,000
	Title II	0	113,455	10,879	6,530	7,162	1,800	6,667	4,118	3,434	0	154,045
	Title III	0	389,492	0	0	0	0	5,000	0	0	0	394,492
	Section 416	750	746,500	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	0	0	797,250
	Subtotal	750	1,466,447	10,879	6,530	7,162	1,800	11,667	54,118	13,434	0	<u>1,572,787</u>

91