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Introduction

The West Africa Regional Program (WARP) was authorized in September 2000 and received its first OYB in FY 2001. The Mission Director arrived at post in May 2001.

The establishment of WARP as an operational unit has been the primary concern of the mission over the last three years, and WARP believes that it has demonstrably achieved this objective. Moreover, despite the fact that a significant proportion of the mission’s energies have been focused upon the mechanics of creating a mission, WARP has also experienced major successes in all program sectors.

WARP’s showcase programmatic achievements over the last three years include the development of joint program activities with two key regional intergovernmental organizations (IGOs): the Economic Community or West African States (ECOWAS) and the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS).

With ECOWAS, WARP has established two successful flagship programs in the areas of energy (the West Africa Power Pool) and tariff reform (ECOTrade project which aims at creating a common external tariff for the region). With CILSS, WARP has continued to support the development, application and dissemination of more refined food security assessment techniques and environmental monitoring systems. More importantly we have assisted this thirty year old organization to undertake major institutional reforms (i.e., drastic staff reductions, joint donor audits and program evaluations) aimed at re-establishing its credibility with its principal donors.

WARP has also incorporated two major USAID Initiatives into its strategic framework: (1) Trade for African Development and Enterprise (TRADE), for which WARP has established a regional Trade Hub, and (2) The Initiative to End Hunger in Africa (IEHA), under which WARP is launching exciting new activities in the area of science and technology, including biotechnology. WARP has also completed the design of a project (signed August ’04) to create a regional Market Information System that will be jointly funded under TRADE and IEHA, because it will both foster trade and improve food security.

In health, WARP has designed and is implementing a ground-breaking health project which, we believe, sets a new standard for regional health programs. Finally, WARP has been able to work with three USAID bilateral missions in the region to craft targeted joint interventions in conflict zones.

I. WARP’s Rationale and Mandate

A. Rationale for WARP’s Creation

The rationale for the creation of WARP remains valid. The region still requires an entity that can address issues that are inherently regional in nature and that cannot be handled at a purely bilateral level. The issues that do not respect national boundaries include: health, in particular the expanding HIV/AIDS pandemic; economic integration,
above all the promotion of intra-regional and international trade in goods and services; trans-boundary food security and natural resource management issues, and last, but not least, regional conflict. WARP’s three Strategic Objectives and one Special Objective are focused on these critical areas where regional development needs and developmental opportunities coincide with USAID’s comparative advantage and strategic interests. They are:

SO1 / SO4: “Regional economic integration strengthened in West Africa.”

SO2 / SO5: “Increased sustainable use of selected reproductive health, HIV/AIDS-STI, and other child survival services and/or other products in West Africa.” Currently, “Increased adoption of sustainable FP/RH, STI/HIV/AIDS and child survival policies and approaches in West Africa.”

SO3 / SO6: “Food security and ENV/NRM policies and programs strengthened and implemented in West Africa.” Currently, “Enhanced capacity to achieve regional food security, improved natural resources management, and agricultural growth.”

SpO7: “Early detection and response mechanisms to prevent regional conflicts established and functioning.” Currently, “Improved enabling conditions for peace and stability in West Africa.”

A number of markedly positive developments have occurred in the region over the past five years including:

- the emergence of ECOWAS as a credible regional force;
- distinct areas of sectoral collaboration among regional intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) (e.g., agriculture policy, food security, a regional customs union, and transportation);
- the appearance of a new cadre of democratically elected leaders who are willing to become involved in regional peacekeeping; and
- the termination of two of the region’s protracted civil wars.

The period has also seen an increase in both the quantity and quality of donor coordination, above all in programs implemented with the regional IGOs. Regional donors, including the Sahel and West Africa Club (SWAC) have also sought to promote so-called North/South exchanges on key issues (e.g. the conflict in Cote d’Ivoire). Lastly, the entire subcontinent has been buoyed by the launch of the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), and West Africa, led by ECOWAS has pledged itself to ensuring its successful implementation. On the other hand, the dismal socio-economic conditions that prevailed when WARP was first envisioned have not changed significantly over the last five years.

The 1999 Strategy Paper portrayed the West Africa region as, “one of the world’s greatest development challenges” and “the poorest in the world, with the highest rate of population growth, and one of the lowest levels of human capital development.” In 2004, seventy-five percent of the countries in the region still rank among the 25 countries at the bottom of the UN Human Development Index. All but one country is categorized as “low income” by the World Bank and approximately 60% of the region’s population lives on less that $1 a day. Modest GDP growth rates of 3.3% have been eroded to unacceptably low 0.5% rates because of rapid population growth rates of 2.8% per annum. The region has also received appallingly low levels of Foreign Direct Investment (FDI): $3.2 billion per year, or less that one half of one percent of global FDI, in 2002.

In 1999 Liberia and Sierra Leone were embroiled in vicious civil wars, and the region’s chronic hot spots, Casamance, Northern Ghana, and Northern Mali, remained unstable. Today, the major economic players in the region (Cote d’Ivoire and Nigeria) are plagued by civil war and by periodic outbursts of ethnic and religious
violence, respectively, while Sierra Leone and Liberia have only recently emerged from civil wars to be labeled as “fragile states.” Currently, six of nineteen West African states are rated as “free” by the Freedom House Survey (up from three in 1999) with six unequivocally characterized as “not free” down from seven five years ago. In sum, although there have been definitive gains in the area of democratic governance in recent years, and although the cast of key characters and countries have changed, the region remains politically unstable.

B. WARP’s Mandate

WARP’s mandate was to add value to the programs of the region’s seven bilateral missions, a directive which requires extensive collaboration and, where possible, joint programming. It was also instructed to furnish some level of support to countries where there was no USAID presence (NPCs). WARP is currently responsible for covering the fifteen countries that comprise ECOWAS (Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Cote d’Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo). It also works in three countries that are contiguous to ECOWAS (Cameroon, Chad and Mauritania, formerly an ECOWAS member state) and that are an integral part of the West Africa Region in both socio-economic and political terms. More recently WARP has been asked to become involved in countries of special interest to the USG (e.g., oil-rich Sao Tome and Principe). Lastly, WARP provides limited sporadic services (primarily training and technical assistance) to some of the francophone countries in Central Africa (e.g. the Central African Republic and Gabon).

II. Challenges: The First Three Years

WARP’s principle challenge during its first three years has been simply that of transforming itself from a Regional Strategy Team embedded within the Mali Mission into an independent Operating Unit. In real teams, this has meant simultaneously tackling a number of critical issues including: a shortage of staff, lack of office space, absence of basic management systems, a rapidly mutating program and strategic framework, funding shifts, and an inadequate program monitoring system.

A. Staffing

As initially designed, WARP was a small 17 person mission (10 managers and technical specialists and 7 FSNs). Administrative, procurement and controller services were to be provided to WARP by a host mission (Mali). However, for the first twelve months of operation, WARP functioned with a core staff of 6.5 individuals. These included the Mission Director, 50% of the time of USAID Dakar’s Health Team leader, a RSSA Agricultural Specialist (SO6 team leader), a US/PSC Trade and Investment Specialist (SO4 team leader), an FSN/PSC Conflict Specialist (SpO7 team leader) and two FSN Program Assistants: essentially, one individual per SO team. The core staff was supplemented by an Abidjan-based Management Unit of three professionals and support staff that implemented the regional Family Health and AIDS (FHA) health program. WARP also housed the Regional Environmental Advisor, who was responsible for assisting bilateral missions to prepare Environmental Assessments and meet Regulation 216 requirements but was not involved in implementing the Mission’s programs. Unsurprisingly, staffing-up was the mission’s primary concern.

In the latter half of its second year of operation (FY 2002), WARP acquired two New Entry Professionals USDHs as team leaders for its Economic Integration and Food Security Teams, respectively, and employed a US local hire
combination Program Officer/Conflict Advisor to beef up these functions, bringing the total number of team members in two SO teams up to two. WARP was constrained from hiring additional FSNs in Mali because of the impending move of the Mission to Accra, Ghana in 2003.

WARP’s staffing requirements increased dramatically when the Mission was assigned the management of three Agency Initiatives, TRADE, IEHA and Anti-Corruption in FY2002. Additionally, the new health project, designed and contracted for in FY2003 also mandated additional health specialists. WARP consequently engaged in a massive staff recruitment effort in FY 2003-2004 that has resulted in the acquisition of additional staff in every single SO team. The WARP staff now possesses three or four individuals per team, and every SO has its own program assistant. More importantly, WARP now has a three person Program Management Unit that can deal with budget affairs, support its growing reporting requirements, and handle communication matters, such as its new website. WARP also requested and was authorized a USDH Program Officer in 2003, and this individual is expected to arrive at post in June 2005.

One final word on staffing: the recruitment of bilingual staff, above all in HIV/AIDS has proven to be remarkably difficult. Ghana, where WARP has been located since October 2003, possesses a wealth of extremely well-trained personnel, but suffers from a dearth of French speakers. This factor has caused WARP to upgrade a number of FSN positions to USPSC/TCN in order to attract a wider pool of qualified bilingual applicants. Additionally, obtaining medical and security clearance in post 9/11 has been a protracted process, taking up to eight months. The consequence is that we have not achieved our goal of being fully staffed by the end of FY’04 and will probably not be there until the second quarter of FY’05, six months later that originally planned. (Attachment 1: Evolution of WARP Staffing FY2001-FY2004)

B. Office Space and Consolidation of the WARP Staff

With the WARP staff expanding, and space in USAID Mali severely limited, WARP requested and received permission from its Governing Board in 2002 (now the WARP Advisory Board) to move from Bamako, Mali to Accra, Ghana. The reasons for the move include, in order of priority, difficulties in attracting qualified USDHs and US/PSCs to Mali (which lacks an English-speaking high school and other key services), the high cost of operations (Accra’s ICASS costs are approximately one third of Bamako’s and FSN salaries in Accra are about half); and location (Accra is a true regional center and the location of a vast number or regional activities including ECOWAS workshops and conferences).

During 2003, WARP, with the unstinting support of USAID/Mali and USAID/Ghana, completed construction of the new WARP 23 office unit Annex at the USAID building in Accra. In September of 2003, WARP successfully transferred its staff from Mali and Dakar to Accra. Note that the WARP Food Security Team Leader, whose wife is the head of USAID Mali’s Health Team, remained in Bamako for compassionate reasons, as well as the four members of the SO6 team. They are expected to complete their move to Accra by June 2005.

C. Management Systems

As a new Mission, WARP has had to generate and institute effective management systems. This includes everything from developing procedures for tracking our own budget allowances, obligations, commitments and expenditures, through ensuring that all pre-obligation requirements are fully met before signing obligation documents. We have also had to create new obligation mechanisms including three comprehensive LSGAs with ECOWAS in 2001 and the Agency’s first regional SOAG with (CILSS) in 2002. WARP has also generated its own
Mission Orders (e.g., delegations of authority, training policies, etc.) to complement those of its host mission because the operating unit has a number of unique features (e.g., dozens of intra-regional trips that each staff member takes each year).

WARP is also developing new hard copy and electronic filing systems. The fact that we inherited a number of old long-term regional projects (the Sahel Regional Program and the FHA project) complicates the task of setting up these systems. Nevertheless, we have made a great deal of headway, to date. We now possess relatively respectable paper files, and an increasingly mature electronic filing system.

D. The Rapidly Mutating Program and Strategic Framework

WARP has experienced its most momentous changes in the area of its program and related strategic framework. The reason why can be encapsulated in a single word “Initiatives.” In the years 2002 and 2003 WARP was designated the home of a number of new initiatives: (1) Trade for African Development and Enterprise (TRADE), (2) Initiative to End Hunger in Africa (IEHA), and (3) Conflict and Anti-Corruption. We were also categorized as a “priority” country for the HIV/AIDS initiative that predated the Presidential Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR). All of these designations and initiatives have signaled a radical change in WARP’s program activities, most notably the elimination of a number of economic integration activities because of shifts in funding. The initiatives also brought an augmentation and re-direction of financial resources, and a concomitant increase in workload and personnel requirements.

1. TRADE: The TRADE Initiative is intended to build trade capacity in the region, above all by preparing countries to take advantage of global trading opportunities. It also aims at assisting countries and individuals in West Africa to take advantage of the terms of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA). The Initiative is implemented primarily via the West African Trade Hub (WATH), located in Accra. It is also implemented through a number of parallel economic integration activities that predated the establishment of the Hub and which include:

(a) the creation of a common external tariff (CET) for the region;
(b) modernization of the region’s customs system;
(c) enhanced business linkages between the West African and American private sector through the West Africa International Business Linkages (WAIBL) program; and
(d) a regional Market Information System that will facilitate intraregional trade in key agricultural commodities and that is jointly funded with the IEHA initiative.

TRADE activities are also complemented by the development of a West Africa Power Pool (WAPP) for energy trading and the construction of a gas pipeline between Nigeria and Ghana, a USAID/Ghana project that is being handed over to WARP in FY2005 for its final two years.

The TRADE Initiative came with a budget of $1.5 million in FY2002, $4.5 million in FY2003, $8.3 million in FY2004 and an estimated $9.0 million in the two remaining out years. TRADE is an extremely high-profile activity that is under intensive scrutiny from other USG agencies such as USTR, Commerce, Treasury and Agriculture, all of which are major players in U.S. trade and investment issues.
2. **IEHA:** This Initiative is concerned with the effective application of science and technology, including biotechnology, to African agriculture with an eye to increasing productivity and reducing rural poverty in the region. Like the West African Trade Hub, it is implemented through multiple instruments including:

(a) two contracts that will furnish the region with technical expertise in technology transfer, above all in the area of biotechnology, while working to increase knowledge about bio-safety in the region;
(b) grants and cooperative agreements with West African regional research institutions, that focus upon identifying and disseminating technologies that have the greatest potential for increasing agricultural productivity; and
(c) the above-mentioned Market Information System for improving intra-regional trade in key agricultural commodities and to a lesser extent, food security.

Like TRADE, IEHA is closely watched by other USG agencies including USDA and USTR and requires close attention to the needs and interests of these partners. IEHA is also concerned with furnishing a range of technical assistance to the region’s cotton producers including - improving inputs, making available relevant technology, expanding markets and introducing alternative income sources. Cotton is a particularly sensitive topic given its linkages to the success or failure to the WTO trade negotiations. Recently, it has begun to take on the trappings of a separate initiative in terms of potential design, management, and reporting requirements and oversight. IEHA’s estimated budget is $2.7 million in FY2003, $4.9 million in FY2004 and $9.0 million in the two remaining out years.

3. **ANTI-CORRUPTION:** This is a small (in dollar terms) but vital Initiative that aims at helping to reduce corruption, “the scourge of the region” in West Africa. The program’s objectives are to encourage complementarities and ensure improved coordination among USAID’s numerous anti-corruption activities while enhancing the capacity of the West Africa’s public and private sector to implement programs in this area. The Initiative also seeks to heighten regional awareness of the pernicious effects of corruption on development and anti-poverty programs. Given the relatively low level of funding ($0.60 million in FY2003 and in FY2004) WARP is implementing the program by integrating anti-corruption components into WARP’s own region-wide sectoral program activities (starting with Health and Economic Growth). The current intention is to expand coverage by incorporating anti-corruption into the activities of the bilateral USAID missions in FY2005 and FY2006.

4. **HIV/AIDS:** WARP does not have a major HIV/AIDS initiative. That designation is reserved for the President’s Emergency Program for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) countries, all of which have received enormous sums of money and developed large complex programs that require phenomenally rapid implementation. On the other hand the lion’s share of the funding for WARP’s new health program, redesigned during FY2003 in anticipation of the close out of the Family Health and AIDS project (1995-2003), is now for HIV/AIDS. Moreover, funding for programs in Family Planning and Child Survival has decreased. This trend has had a marked impact on the design of the new health project AWARE and on the anticipated results.

5. **CONFLICT:** WARP is not designated as a manager of Conflict Initiative funds. However WARP has received funds from AID/W’s Conflict Initiative. The WARP SpO was originally designed to be funded at approximately $450,000 per annum and was to have ended in September 2004. Since 2002, however, the program has been funded at significantly higher levels ($2.96 million in 2002, $3.0 million in 2003 and $4.6 million in 2004). The funding has been primarily generated by proposals submitted for funding to AID/W
by WARP (alone or in tandem with other USAID bilateral missions) for funding under AID/W’s Conflict Initiative ($1.8 million in FY2003 and $0.8 million in FY2004.) or by other earmarked funds such as Trafficking in Persons (TIP), Victims of Torture (VOT) and Women in Development (WID). In effect, the high levels of political instability in the region have motivated WARP and the regional missions to develop activities that address a range of conflict-related problems that encompass, gender-based violence, reintegration of combatants, pro-peace media messages, re-building relationships between warring factions and ethnic groups, as well as the above mentioned TIP and VOT. It is these activities that have produced the dramatic increase in WARP’s SpO 7 budget and resulted in a much wider program than initially envisioned. WARP currently manages alone, or jointly with bilateral missions, seven grants that work at the grass-roots level on most of the conflict-related problems listed above. Additionally, a number of other activities are being considered for funding. Although the Initiatives have brought additional funds, they have also been accompanied by a dramatic reduction in WARP’s core budget. This is particularly true for Economic Growth funds which have declined from levels of $4.1 million to $3.0 million to FY’01 and FY’02, respectively, to $0.89 and $0.90 in FY2003 and FY2004. Agriculture core funds have leveled out at around $4 million per year, approximately $2.5 million below initial projections of $6.5 million per annum. Such cataclysmic shifts in funding have required a reduction in the scope of many activities and the outright elimination others. At the same time, the influx of Initiative money has required the rapid development of the associated new programs (e.g., WARP was required to design and set up a trade Hub in under six months) and some IEHA deadlines have been equally draconian. The new sources of funding have also called for a comprehensive reworking of the strategic framework to better reflect funding amounts and sources. Lastly, the initiatives have greatly intensified the level of reporting required. (See Attachments 2a through 2d which illustrate WARP funding shifts by individual SOs for the period FY2001 through FY2004).

• **Food Security** (SO6) has experienced the most striking changes, expanding its scope of operations to add agriculture to existing food security and natural resource management activities and to decrease these activities as planned funding levels have declined. It has also had to generate a detailed documentation for the IEHA Action Plan.

• **Economic Integration** (SO4), has also revamped itself to quickly ramp up its trade capacity building activities (e.g., create the West Africa Trade Hub) and reduce its concern with smaller intra-regional and financial service activities. The FY2004 modification to the Trade Hub contract reflects the latest trend in the on-going transformation of the program.

• **Health** (SO5), has been required to completely revise the old FHA Project (changing it from a 4 to 18 country project) and then close it out eighteen months later, produce a new HIV/AIDS strategy, and design a new regional health project AWARE, which it began implementing in FY2004. The new project, which is highly innovative and truly regional in scope, emphasizes (1) capacity development and technical skill building, (2) the identification and replication of successful service delivery or finance models, and (3) improved advocacy and policy formulation skills among health professionals within the region’s private and public sectors.

• **Conflict** (SpO7), has also been transformed in response to the influx of monies received by the Mission for its new cross-border activities. Funds for the Anti-Corruption initiative have also bolstered this trend. The SpO has officially broadened its scope of activities and adopted a new IR to capture the results being
produced. In FY2004 the SpO requested and received approval to continue through FY2008, which is the final year of the current WARP Strategy, contingent upon the completion of its new PMP.

E. Program Monitoring and the WARP PMP

The impact of the Initiatives and the changes they have wrought are perhaps most visible in the process of developing a definitive Performance Management Plan (PMP). The Initiatives augmented the workload of the Mission’s small staff not only in the areas of program design and implementation, but also in program monitoring and reporting. WARP’s effort to develop a comprehensive PMP over the last three years has also been greatly constrained by the absence of a Program Office or a Deputy Director, individuals who would normally spearhead and facilitate such a process.

**FY 2001 PMP:** The ADS requires that Missions complete their PMP within one year of operation (i.e., for WARP by September 2001). The combination of a miniscule staff (the Mission Director arrived in May of 2001 and the two original USDHs departed shortly thereafter) and the total absence of any previous work on the PMP (no baselines, no targets), eliminated all possibility of meeting this deadline. In the FY2001 review of management systems, mandated under the Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA), the mission highlighted the lack of a PMP as a serious management shortcoming.

**FY 2002 PMP:** In the first quarter of FY 2002, WARP brought in a team of three contractors to assist the mission and its partners to develop a minimal PMP. However, the lack of staff (WARP was still at the one-person team stage) and the unwillingness of some program managers to make changes to the existing results and indicators (which they argued were still relatively new and valid), rendered the exercise only marginally effective. By the end of FY2002 the status of the WARP PMP was as follows:

**Economic Integration/SO4/IR3 (Energy):** (1) PMP completed for energy with inputs from partner (ECOWAS) and key contractors and grantees. (2) New Team Leader reassesses IR1 and IR2 in light of (a) growing uncertainties about funding streams and (b) the lack of coherence between activities and results, and begins to discard and replace performance indicators, accordingly.

**Health/SO5:** (1) FHA project redesigned and expanded from four to 18 countries and a new comprehensive project monitoring system developed. Tulane University is charged with annual reporting on project activities for the consortium of five CAs. (2) Concept paper for new regional health project prepared and reviewed by AID/W.

**Food Security/SO6:** New Team Leader reviews program and begins realignment of results and indicators to better reflect USAID funding projections of only %60 of planned strategic levels and new expectations from CILSS.

**Conflict SpO7:** Decision taken to adopt and report against new conflict framework

The Mission again noted the absence of a completed PMP as a management shortcoming in the FY 2002 annual FMFIA and proposed to complete the task by 9/2003.

**FY 2003 PMP:** Program development activities, linked to the new TRADE, IEHA, Anti-Corruption and Conflict Initiatives in late FY2002 and FY2003 delayed development of full PMPs for all three SOs because the program frameworks needed to be extensively reworked to incorporate the new goals, objectives, results, and reporting
requirements. As part of this process, the Mission developed a number of draft frameworks under which SO4 and SO6 were combined into a single SO to take advantage of the multiple areas of complementarity between TRADE and IEHA. This option was not pursued. During FY 2003 the following progress was made on completing PMP work:

**Economic Integration/SO4:** (1) Old activities dropped from the SO along with associated indicators because of deep cuts in core funding and shifting program realities. (2) Began reporting on TRADE indicators in the OPIN system.

**Health/SO5:** (1) Annual Report utilizes data provided by Tulane on the FHA for the final year of the project. (2) New HIV/AIDS Strategy and Project design/SOW reviewed and approved by AID/W. (3) SO-level statement minimally revised. (4) Work starts on the development of the PMP for the new regional health project.

**Food Security /SO6:** (1) Revision and finalization of the non-IEHA portion of the PMP (some indicators discarded and new indicators developed that reflect lower core funding and changing activity focus). (2) Reporting on IEHA Initiative and finalization of the PMP retarded by slow authorization process (finally completed in mid FY2004).

**Conflict/SpO7:** No further work done on the PMP in FY 2003.

*For the third consecutive year, the Mission noted the lack of a comprehensive PMP as a managerial weakness in the annual FMFIA and extended the compliance date to 9/2004.*

**FY 2004 PMP:** WARP’s PMP made a giant leap forward in FY 2004, thanks in large part to the establishment of its three-person Program Team, and has produced a comprehensive PMP for each SO.

**Economic Integration/SO4:** (1) Strategic framework reworked and all IRs reworded to incorporate TRADE Initiative. (2) Measures taken to ensure coordination of SO reporting on TRADE with Agency-level requirements. (3) PMP completed.

**Health/SO5:** Work on SO5 PMP finalized.

**Food Security/SO6:** (1) SO statement modified and IRs reworked to include IEHA program activities. (2) IEHA related indicators finalized and PMP completed.

**Conflict/SpO7:** (1) SO statement marginally modified to reflect expansion of program activities from new funding streams. (2) Indicators finalized and PMP completed.

*The Mission reported in the FY2004 FMFIA (which took place three months earlier in FY2004) that it would meet its September 2004 deadline for completing its PMP.*

### III. A Summary of WARP’s Major Program Achievements

WARP’s stellar achievement over the last three years is, indisputably, the creation of the Mission as a viable operating unit. At the same time, the Mission has also attained some impressive programmatic successes which are detailed below.
A. Economic Growth (SO4)

- The development of a Global Development Alliance project, the West Africa Power Pool (WAPP), which is also an ECOWAS flagship program under NEPAD. This project has made major strides towards creating the mechanisms for establishing the power pool (e.g., adoption of a Regional Energy Protocol in FY2003 and a Generation and Transmission Master Plan in FY2004). It has also leveraged over $8.0 million in donor funding and a planned $110.0 million in multi-lateral development bank financing for the cross-border transmission lines needed to make energy trading a reality. Finally, it has contributed significantly to improving ECOWAS’s credibility as a driver of regional economic integration.

- The ECOTRADE Project which is working with ECOWAS and the states that are not members of the francophone Africa Economic and Monetary Union (specifically Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Guinea and The Gambia) to establish a common external tariff (CET) for the region and make the creation of a West Africa Customs Union a reality. Key milestones have been met for this project and it is fully on-track to meet the January 2005 target for starting the implementation of the new CET.

- The ECOGEE Project which has supported the establishment of the West African Businesswomen’s Network (WABNET) and has built the capacity of West African businesswomen to improve their participation in the global marketplace. Support has included providing members of the networks with skills in the areas of communications (including IT), management, trade show participation and advocacy.

- The West African Trade Hub (WATH) which, after a slow start, is furnishing technical assistance and building capacity in multiple areas to the public and private sectors on the complex aspects of trade.

- West Africa Business Linkages Program (WAIBL) which has, as of June 2004, completed 544 business transactions between West African and U.S. businesses for a combined value of $131.0 million.

- The innovative design (by two competing grantees) of the new regional Market Information System (MIS) that is part of both the TRADE and IEHA initiative and will begin implementation in September FY 2004.

B. Food Security, Natural Resource Management and Agriculture

Ongoing work with Permanent Interstate Committee on Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), our perennial regional partner to keep the threat of famine at bay in the Sahel region through the development of mechanisms such as:

- A Vulnerability Assessment Mechanism (VAM) system that will make an incalculable contribution to assessing food needs among at-risk populations and ultimately ensuring their food security.

- With the assistance of US Geological Survey, mapping of the region with time-series (over four decades) satellite images that provide concrete evidence of the variations (both positive and negative) in ground cover in the Sahel. The program will be extended to the littoral upon the request of WAEMU and is a positive sign of improved collaboration among regional IGOs.
• The successful **design of the IEHA program** that will include activities on (a) Biotechnology (which start implementation in FY2004) and on (b) the transfer and dissemination of agricultural technology to increase productivity and tackle rural poverty.

C. Health

• The final evaluation and successful **closeout of the venerable FHA project** (1995-2003), including a full year (FY2003) of implementing the evaluation’s recommendations, with a focus on the intensive dissemination of successful ideas and activities developed under the project.

• The **design of the new WARP Regional Health Project (AWARE)**, that provides a brand new perspective and approach to improving regional health policy formulation and service delivery capacity.

• The creation of an **Ambassador’s HIV/AIDS Fund** that provides small grants to NGOs and technical assistance to Ministries of Health (MOH) in thirteen non-presence countries. This program, although low-cost and low-tech has yielded excellent results. For example, a $15,000 grant to the MOH in Mauritania permitted them to carry out an HIV/AIDS study that furnished the data used to prepare a successful $5.6 million proposal for the Global Funds for AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

• The **Regional Cross-Border Project** (prevention of HIV/AIDS on the major migratory routes in the region with a focus on high-risk populations) which has resulted in a significant decrease in high-risk sexual behavior among targeted truckers, sex workers and migrant workers (e.g., increased us of condoms with last sexual partners for both sex workers and truckers). The program has been replicated by the World Bank, in collaboration with the WARP team, in their MAPS project on coastal routes.

D. Conflict

• A **comprehensive assessment of all of the regional NGOs involved in conflict management work** and the subsequent development of a cooperative agreement with Catholic Relief Services (CRS) and the **West African Network for Peace (WANEP)** aimed at strengthening these NGOs by creating a regional peace-building network, and building public private partnerships for peace. Currently, WANEP’s regional network is composed of 12 country networks and includes over 300 participating NGOs.

• The signing of a groundbreaking **MOU between WANEP and ECOWAS’s Political Affairs, Defense and Security (PADS) department**, to work hand-in-hand on conflict prevention in the region. This MOU was a hard-won milestone requiring almost two years of intensive interaction and negotiation. Today, a WANEP staffer is based at ECOWAS in the PADS department, and provides ECOWAS with periodic assessments (called WARN Reports) on potential areas of conflict in the region based on data acquired from WANEP’s national member networks.

• The creation of **three cross-border programs jointly developed and funded with USAID Bilateral Missions**, specifically covering The Gambia/Guinea Bissau region, on the Sierra Leone/Liberia border, and the Burkina Faso/Cote d’Ivoire/ Mali region. The programs focus on targeted problems in including those linked to Victims of Torture, Trafficking in Persons, and Gender Based Violence.
• Development of three joint donor funded/organized and implemented activities on conflict issues and others in West Africa (building TIP capacity at the regional and national level with UNODC, financial capacity building for ECOWAS with CIDA, and managerial capacity building for ECOWAS with UNDP).

E. WARP in General

In addition to program specific successes, the WARP Mission can register success in (a) building the capacity of its key regional public sector partners and (b) increasing the range and level of collaboration among regional donors. WARP places a high premium on these efforts since we know that the results of these efforts can either make or break our programs. Specific actions that have been undertaken by WARP in these areas include:

• High profile efforts to reform the key IGOs (e.g. down-size CILSS, upgrade ECOWAS management and implementation capacity, providing ECOWAS with medium-term technical staff).

• Design and implementation of programs requiring IGOs to collaborate (e.g., developing a regional agricultural policy (CILSS, ECOWAS and WAEMU), creating food security networks beyond the Sahel (CILSS and WAEMU), and improving regional transportation linkages (ECOWAS WAEMU).

• Taking a lead role in obtaining strong donor consensus around CILSS reforms and ECOWAS’s capacity building efforts. Joint donor funding to hire medium-term personnel in critical areas (including agriculture, trade, transportation and management) for ECOWAS is the most tangible result of this effort.

• Developing a number of effective communication tools including our new Website and our Quarterly Newsletter (featured in our website).

• Organizing and holding annual Technical Advisory Group meetings in the region for each sector (Health, Economic Growth, Agriculture and Conflict), as well as an annual Advisory Board for WARP’s USG partners, where region-specific issues are raised and discussed and ways and means of collaborating on program activities are developed.

IV. Key Issues

Discussions among the WARP team members reveal that, there are surprisingly few urgent issues. This is primarily because the staffing, location, management and programming issues in FY 2001-2003 were of such enormous magnitude, that today’s issues seem trivial indeed. At the same time, the following were cited as areas that should be flagged.

A. SHIFTING AGENCY PRIORITIES AND ASSOCIATED FUNDING

  o The impact of shifting Agency priorities on our programs, above all on the strategic planning process makes it difficult to stay the course: witness SO4 and SO6. It is impossible to plan and implement rationally when core funds disappear and are replaced by new programs with highly-compressed implementation timelines and differing objectives. Note that we do not pretend that this is a WARP-specific issue.

B. WARP’S SERVICE PROVISION ROLE
Clarity on WARP’s role as a regional service provider in technical areas: For example, how do we measure the contributions of the Regional Environmental Advisor, the regional Africa Emergency Locust and Grasshopper Advisor (AELGA), and the Global Alliance Builder to meeting WARP’s strategic goal? Do we need to prepare a separate program support objective to try and capture their inputs? Do we propose moving them to USAID/Ghana which provides other administrative and technical services to the region? Do we just not think about it (since they are all great folks)?

Specifying the parameters for providing services to non-presence countries: The more we do for the NPCs, the thinner we are spread, and the more dissatisfied our clients become. At the same time we are committed to supporting these countries through our regional projects such as: the West Africa Power Pool, the Common External Tariff, the West Africa Trade Hub, AWARE, support for the West Africa Network for Peace Building and our new regional Market Information System. We believe that we need to articulate more clearly (in consultation with AID/W) just what our limitations are.

Clarity on WARP’s potential role vis-à-vis the MCA in non-presence countries: This is an emerging issue and could well loom large on our horizon in the next two fiscal years as “threshold” countries are identified for possible MCA funding. We need to receive guidance on how we would be expected to work with them, precisely what we would be expected to do, and what resources would be available to support our intervention.

C. UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEEDS OF REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The protracted time-line required to see the impact of capacity building programs: These programs are critical for achieving anything in the development arena and we are seeing successes after multiple years of engagement, yet they move at glacial speed. How do we implement them without being penalized at the results-reporting level?

D. BUDGET AND OFFICE SPACE

OE budget issues, specifically travel costs: WARP requires continuing access to program funds converted to OE to cover the huge travel costs incurred by WARP staffers covering region-wide programs. Without it, WARP cannot fulfill its regional function.

More Office Space: The WARP Annex was constructed when staffing was projected to be 25 (maximum). With the need for additional initiative-related staff and others, such as the planned Global Development Alliance Builder, a 3rd floor should be seriously considered.

V. Our Final Word

We at WARP believe that we now have a plausible, well-constructed program. Our objectives are feasible and our results are measurable, and we are intent on implementing our program to the best of our ability. Barring major gyrations in our program objectives and funding, we believe that we will meet our programmatic expectations.
### REGIONAL ECONOMIC INTEGRATION FUNDING TRENDS

#### Fiscal Year (FY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY</th>
<th>DA/EG/Energy</th>
<th>DA/EG/Trade</th>
<th>DA/Trade initiative</th>
<th>DA/AG initiative</th>
<th>DA/ENV/Energy</th>
<th>c/o DA/EG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>8,299</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Amount

- **AMOUNT**
- **Fiscal Year (FY)**

#### Charts

- **Attachment 2a**
- **REGIONAL ECONOMIC INTEGRATION FUNDING TRENDS**

#### Notes

- The chart shows the funding trends for different initiatives over the fiscal years 2001 to 2006.
- Each initiative has a distinct color for easy identification.
- The amount for each initiative is listed in the table below the chart.
## Attachment 2b

### HEALTH FUNDING TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR (FY)</th>
<th>CSH/POP</th>
<th>CSH/CSMH</th>
<th>CHS/ID</th>
<th>CSH/HIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>8,195</td>
<td>12,064</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>8,981</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>8,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>8,603</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>9,136</td>
<td>2,228</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart and table above show the trends in health funding across different categories from FY 2001 to FY 2006.
Attachment 2c

FOOD SECURITY/NRM & AGRICULTURE FUNDING TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR (FY)</th>
<th>DA/ENV</th>
<th>DA/AG</th>
<th>DA/AG initiative</th>
<th>NOA/DA/IEHA/Biotech</th>
<th>NOA/DA/EG</th>
<th>c/o DA/ENV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>2,559</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2004</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2006</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment 2d

CONFLICT PREVENTION & ANTI CORRUPTION FUNDING TRENDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FISCAL YEAR (FY)</th>
<th>DA/DG</th>
<th>DA/EG/ PD&amp;L</th>
<th>DA/Transitions</th>
<th>DA/VOT</th>
<th>DA/TIP</th>
<th>Anti-corruption initiative</th>
<th>Conflict initiative</th>
<th>c/o DA/EG</th>
<th>c/o CSH</th>
<th>TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2001</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2002</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2003</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2004 control</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2005 levels</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY2006 levels</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>