

USAID Policy Paper

Urban Development Policy

**Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination
U.S. Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523**

October 1984

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary and Recommendations.....	3
The Main Recommendations of This Paper.....	3
I. Introduction: A Framework for Urban Policy.....	5
A. The Dimensions and Nature of Urban Issues.....	5
B. Urbanization and Economic Development.....	6
II. Urban Development Program and Policy Formulation.....	6
A. The Major Issues USAID Should Address.....	7
B. Urban Programs and Policies USAID Should Consider.....	7
1. Support for Country Economic Development Policies.....	8
2. Support for the Private Sector and Job Creation.....	8
3. Support for Housing Policies and Programs for the Urban Poor.....	8
4. Support for Development of Human Resources.....	8
5. Support for Urban Institutional Development.....	9
6. Support for Hazard Resistant Codes and Enforcement.....	9
C. The Allocation of USAID Resources to Urban Policies and Programs.....	9
1. Country Selection Strategy.....	9
2. Urban Locational Strategy Selection Within a Country.....	10
3. Selection of Developmental Sector Strategies.....	10
4. Allocation and Resources Constraints.....	10
Appendix	

Urban Development Policy Executive Summary and Recommendations

This paper reviews USAID's urban policy and programs and provides a new framework for addressing major urban issues in developing countries.

There are six primary reasons for re-examining USAID's current urban development policy:

- Although world poverty remains concentrated in rural areas, such a characterization is not representative of all the countries in which USAID works;
- Urbanization is increasing at such a rapid pace that by the year 2010 the majority of people living in LDCs will live in cities;
- Despite our perception of ourselves as an Agency concentrating on rural development we already have a very large, if somewhat imbalanced, urban portfolio;
- Our focus on private enterprise development, economic policy reform, institutional development, and technology transfer provides us with an opportunity to re-examine the linkages between the development of rural areas and rural peoples and the growth of urban areas;
- Urban centers are now consuming large amounts of country resources, the management of which can have substantial positive or negative effects on the achievement of overall national and development objectives.
- Due to population and economic pressures urban populations are locating increasingly in areas and structures which are vulnerable to natural disasters, presenting a significant increase in economic as well as social risk.

Although our re-examination is concerned with all economic and social activities that take place in urban areas, it is not limited to activities which could only take place in urban areas. That is, we are concerned with urban links to the rest of the national economy and to rural areas through the national settlement system.

The Urban Development Policy recognizes that USAID's urban programs should focus on activities where we have a comparative advantage in terms of our skills and expertise.

The Main Recommendations Of This Paper Are:

1. That USAID Missions, in planning a development strategy, consider programs located in urban areas as part of a total development effort. Before developing such programs, USAID Missions using available analytical methodologies and resources should assess broadly the urban context in which policy reforms and institutional development activities are to be implemented. In view of Mission resource constraints, Missions are encouraged to use USAID/W skills, expertise, and funding to the greatest extent possible. USAID/W has a variety of tools and approaches that can be applied to urban problems and issues.
2. That the issues involving the allocation of resources to urban areas be decided on a country-

by-country basis, based on sound socioeconomic criteria and a better understanding of the processes of urbanization and economic growth.

3. That USAID program activities could include:
 - a. Support for the preparation of country development policies which lead to the appropriate allocation of resources between urban and rural areas in support of national development objectives.
 - b. Promotion of the growth of the non-farm private sector through activities that improve the working of capital and labor markets so as to enhance the productivity of the private sector in providing employment opportunities and thereby alleviating urban poverty.
 - c. Shelter policies and programs for the urban poor (particularly sites and services and settlement upgrading programs) which stress affordability and cost recovery.
 - d. Support for education, health, and community development programs which develop human resources and promote an overall urban development strategy.
 - e. Support for urban institutional development at the national and local levels of government through programs to increase efficiency, training to strengthen capacity, and modification of policies to better respond to the needs of the urban poor and enhance the private sector contribution to development.
 - f. As a general rule, USAID does not undertake substantial urban infrastructure investments with DA funds. Limited availability of DA funds and the need to utilize such resources in other priority areas require that HG funds and ESF (when appropriate) should be the principal USAID resources for such projects.

An exception may be justified if the level of continued emphasis on rural development and increased agricultural production. A foreign assistance (DA and ESF) exceeds the absorptive capacity of the country in USAID's typical technical assistance oriented program other exceptions to the general rule include: (i) urban infrastructure which supports in a substantial way the four pillars of the Agency (policy reform, institutional development, technology transfer and private enterprise development); (ii) infrastructure development in support of private productive enterprise which creates new permanent employment opportunities; or (iii) other cases where such infrastructure (water, sewage, waste disposal, roads, and community facilities) are part of a comprehensive strategy for achieving effective policies, managing urban resources, and responding to the needs of the lower income population.

Agency policy requires that the cost of operation and maintenance of urban infrastructure be recovered by some combination of consumers, local organizations and government. Provision for recovery by an urban authority for the capital costs of urban services and facilities financed by DA funds in a predominant USAID goal. Accountability of all costs must be an integral part of any project.¹

¹ Specific guidance on cost recovery should be sought in other Agency policy papers, including in particular, USAID's Recurrent Cost Policy and the Domestic Water and Sanitation Policy.

ESF funding of urban infrastructure and facilities would be appropriate on a less restrictive basis in cases where substantial development goals can be achieved by applying ESF funds to such projects while still meeting the other political/economic requirements justifying such assistance.

- g. If a host government attributes high priority to infrastructure components of development projects in urban areas and wants to finance these capital facilities with the local currency proceeds of DA, ESF or PL-480 financed commodity import programs, the Mission concerned may concur in such uses if they are generally consistent with the criteria described above and with mutually agreed country development objectives.
- h. In disaster prone areas, promotion of national and metropolitan policies which encourage the establishment of safe settlements and buildings.

I. Introduction: A Framework For Urban Policy

It is important to define our framework for urban policy. There is no analytical unit called an "urban sector,"²; rather there is a set of activities that take place in urban locations. These activities are usually associated with the traditional development sectors such as industry, agriculture, or transportation, which are of concern in both urban and rural areas. The appropriate policies, programs, and projects within these traditional development sectors are selected in response to city size and growth rates, city economic development functions, and the present deficits and future needs.

That leaves the problem of defining what is meant by the term "urban." It turns out this definitional problem is largely intractable. Urban definitions are country specific and range from "main towns, including suburbs" (Zimbabwe), to "all townships and town-planning areas and all district centers" (Malawi).

There is no universally accepted definition of what constitutes an urban area. For the purposes of this paper we will call "urban" any separately administered population agglomeration in which at least two-thirds of the households derive their main income from economic activities other than farming.

A. The Dimensions And Nature Of Urban Issues

The less developed world has become an increasingly more urbanized society. In 1960, there were three rural people for every urban person in the non-Communist LDCs. By 1980, that ratio had dropped to two to one. In the year 2000, according to current projections, there will be six rural dwellers for every five urbanites. The development challenge and implications of this shift in population are enormous.

² "Urban" and Urban development are basically spatial rather than sectoral concepts. To the extent that reference is made to an "urban sector", it is intended to include the analytical, institutional, policy and related aspects of urban development, which normally would not be included in describing traditional development sectors.

In response to the massive dimension of LDC urbanization, there has been a tendency to postulate strategies to slow the urbanization process. This paper argues that this negative view is incorrect and that positive approaches to urbanization are required concurrently with development strategy that seeks balanced urban and rural economic growth (determined on a country-by-country basis) will reinforce the present USAID rural focus and enhance its potential for success. This view is supported by two key principles which have been well established by research:

Urban economies and rural economies are interdependent; and
Migration from rural to urban areas in countries that have surplus rural populations and very high person/land ratios is, overall, advantageous both to the rural and urban economies.

B. Urbanization And Economic Development

Although there are many reasons for the development of urban areas (military defense, public administration, religious and cultural activity), the primary motive force is economic. Populations tend to concentrate because perceived economic incentives lead to such a concentration.

Economic growth and development are almost certainly accompanied by increased urbanization. Indeed, the growth of urban areas has been traditionally linked to the growth of agricultural surpluses and the increased commercialization of agriculture. Urban growth, due to economics of increased agglomeration, lowers the cost of production of most goods and services which are not location specific. Thus, urbanization is not only inevitable but also beneficial to the economy.

On the other hand, urbanization can be accompanied by excess demand for housing, water, sewerage, and other urban services, and by increasing levels of urban unemployment. These problems may be compounded by poor public policy, such as deep subsidization of services and interference in labor markets. Caps on producer prices for agricultural commodities for the benefit of urban populations reduce incentives to agricultural production.

USAID's urban policy seeks to remove these distortions from the urbanization process in order to maximize the contribution of urban development to national economic development objectives.

II. Urban Development Program And Policy Formulation

USAID's Urban Development Policy is based on the following operating assumptions:

USAID's urban development initiatives should support the achievement of USAID's overall development objectives.

USAID's urban development policy should be centered around the four areas of Agency policy emphasis: private enterprise development, policy reform, institutional development, and technology transfer.

USAID's urban development strategies will vary country-by-country depending on the role of urbanization in achieving overall national development objectives in each particular case.

USAID's urban development policy should seek to address causes and not symptoms at the national and local levels.

In the context of urban issues affecting most of the developing world, these assumptions lead us to the following conclusions regarding USAID's urban policy.

A. The Major Issues USAID Should Address

There are six basic sets of issues we should be concerned with.

1. National macroeconomic and sectoral policies which affect the efficiency of urban markets and the overall allocation of resources in ways that will achieve a balance between urban and rural development.
2. Policies which hinder the formal and informal private sector in creating the necessary number of jobs to reduce unemployment to a reasonable level.
3. The inability of urban governments to manage efficiently the services they provide and to mobilize the level of revenues necessary to run municipal governments.
4. The inability of urban institutions, both public and private, to provide the level of goods and services (health, education, housing, water and sewerage and transportation) required to meet minimal standards.
5. The fact that the dynamics of population growth and rural-urban migration mean that the requirements for new urban land, shelter, infrastructure, social facilities, and jobs will in many cases exceed the ability of national and local governments to keep pace.
6. Policies which inhibit the potential contribution private sector investments in urban areas can make in stimulating rural productivity.

Some urban problems are the result of low levels of overall development. Countries with per capita income levels of \$200 cannot be expected to provide affordable housing, adequate health care, or formal sector jobs to all, or even a large proportion, of its citizens. But other problems arise from inefficiencies in resource allocation due to institutional weaknesses (including poorly functioning markets) and inappropriate policies on the part of LDC governments at both the national and local levels.

Clearly the urban problem must be solved primarily by the governments and people of the Third World countries themselves. What we need to do is find ways by which USAID can help the people of the Third World channel their energies and resources to resolving their urban problems.

B. Urban Programs and Policies USAID Should Consider

Working with other development agencies, USAID must continue to emphasize policy

reforms at the national and local level that will improve the efficiency of the urbanization process and enhance the contribution of cities to national economic development. The appropriate level and range of urban programming should be determined on a country-by-country basis. The specific content of USAID urban programming should be related to the four policy emphases of the Agency: private enterprise development, policy reform, institutional development; and technology transfer.

The following are among the kinds of urban programming which can be supported:

1. Support for Country Economic Development Policies

The development of country economic development policies which lead to the appropriate allocation of resources between urban and rural areas in support of national development objectives is of critical importance. Of particular importance, in terms of their distorting effects on both urban and rural areas, are policies that have been designed to effect net resource transfers from the rural to the urban sector. These policies often suppress returns to the traditional rural sector in order to: (a) achieve artificial cost-of-living reductions for urban populations; or (b) artificially manipulate returns in favor of specific interest groups in urban areas.

2. Support for the Private Sector and Job Creation

Programming designed to improve the working of capital, labor, production process, and consumer markets so as to enhance the productivity of the private sector in providing employment opportunities is appropriate. This could include improvement of local credit institutions, including cooperative efforts among small-sale enterprises that will decrease the transaction costs of lending, assistance to local administrations in removing administrative and regulatory constraints on smaller enterprises in the context of on-going programs such as local tax and administrative reform, and creation of increased opportunities for private participation in urban development, including the provision of urban services and those activities supportive of agricultural and rural enterprise.

3. Support for Housing Policies and Programs for the Urban Poor

USAID's Housing Guaranty Program is an interesting example of the way in which the four policy emphases of the Agency have been integrated into a comprehensive urban development program that improves the efficiency of urban markets while meeting the needs of the urban poor. By introducing innovative techniques for low-cost housing (sites and services and settlement upgrading programs), and by encouraging governments to adopt standards for such shelter that is affordable by the poor, the HG program makes it possible to reduce housing subsidies and thereby turn over low-cost housing finance and construction to the private sector. This program also illustrates USAID's policy preference for avoiding general subsidization of urban infrastructure while ensuring that our assistance will support private enterprise and alleviate problems not adequately addressed through private organizations (e.g., the prevention of disease and the improvement of health conditions through the provision of water and sanitation

facilities and services).

4. Support for Development of Human Resources

Activities to improve the productivity, efficiency and capacity of human resources may be appropriate for achieving the objectives of the urban development policy. Such programs may include education, health, nutrition, family planning, and vocational training.

5. Support for Urban Institutional Development

The ultimate success of LDCs in responding to their urban development requirements will depend on the capacity and capability of those institutions responsible for the policy, planning, management and delivery of urban services. Selective support for critical urban institutions is an appropriate USAID program activity. USAID activities can usefully be targeted at the modification of institutional policies in order to use capital and human resources more effectively to better respond to the needs of the private sector and the urban poor; to improve institutional efficiency in planning and provision of services, including improved methods of cost recovery through appropriately structured user charges and equitably administered taxes; and to strengthen institutional capacity through appropriately designed training programs.

6. Support for Hazard Resistant Codes

The increasing tendency of national and local governments to allow development in areas prone to high risk from natural disasters, particularly flood, severe storm and earthquake, not only places lives in jeopardy, but also multiplies the potential for economic loss. USAID assistance should encourage settlement and building regulations which will increase the survival rate of buildings and populations in disaster prone areas.

C. The Allocation of USAID Resources to Urban Policies and Programs

The allocation of agency resources to urban development should be guided by agency skills and expertise and our comparative advantage, relative to other institutions, in addressing urban problems within the constraints of USAID's mandates and development priorities.

This paper suggests a few generalizations to guide the allocation of resources among countries, between rural and urban activities within countries and cities, and among the developmental sectors supported by USAID. In general, our conclusion that most resource allocation decisions should be decided on a country-specific case-by-case basis is supported by four observations.

1. Country Selection Strategy

With respect to country selection strategies, it is obvious that countries with large populations of urban poor (as a percentage of total poverty level households) are good

candidates, as are countries with increasing land pressure and increasing numbers of people entering the non-agricultural labor force. Countries in which future gains in economic growth will depend on diversification of the economy away from traditional subsistence agriculture are also appropriate candidates. For example, the Sahel countries have very small urban populations but, given the problems with rainfall and transportation costs, it may be that a long-run development strategy that concentrates on the abundant resource (human labor) and not the scarce resource (good agricultural land) would be appropriate, and consequently the development of urban enterprises might be encouraged.

In short, then, our urban programs should be concentrated in countries where the returns (in terms of poverty alleviation and broadly-based sustainable economic growth) are greater when our programs include an urban component.

2. Urban Location Strategy Selection Within a Country

With respect to an urban strategy within any country, it has frequently been suggested that development assistance be used to stem the rapid growth of large metropolitan cities. In the past USAID has in fact tended to support regional strategies that would favor secondary cities and market towns in an effort to stem the rapid migration of rural populations to the largest cities. There is little evidence supporting the idea that, by themselves, urban development investments affect migration decisions.

The guiding principle should be to support productive investments in industry, commerce, and services in those urban centers which provide comparative advantage and to ensure that the supporting investments in shelter, infrastructure, and social services are provided in those same locations using appropriate standards which are affordable and provide access to the urban poor.

3. Selection of Developmental Sector Strategies

The selection of the development sectors most appropriate for urban programming should be dependent on the priority needs as identified on a country-by-country basis. In general, the selection of a given development sector strategy will depend on the current deficits and likely future requirements for urban employment, shelter, infrastructure, and social services as compared to expected levels of domestic resources and capacity and/or prevailing levels of international support from other donors in the particular sector. USAID's urban programs should also be developed in a manner consistent with our policies on recurrent costs and our sector policies in such areas as education, health, nutrition, and water.

4. Allocation and Resource Constraints

Because urban development encompasses various activities within urban areas, a range of funding options is applicable to urban projects. ESF, local currency proceeds from commodity import or PL 480 programs, HG loans as well as Development Assistance grant and loan funds can be used for urban investments. In addition, where urban projects promote rural development (for example market town development, rural electrification and credit programs), funds

authorized under section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act may be used.

In short, USAID commits substantial resources to urban areas. As in several other issue areas considered in this paper, it is suggested that we adjust policy to new circumstances, while ensuring that urban programs are conceived and designed within a broader socio-economic context, taking full account of the concrete realities of the urbanization process in developing countries. This will require that USAID expand its conceptual horizons and that Missions understand that their development strategies may include an urban development dimension where such a dimension is justified.

In the future, USAID/W will work to improve analytical methodologies in support of the urban policies and programs set forth in this paper. In addition, other policy papers (e.g., on local organizations) will deal at more length with specific issues of urban finance and management as well as policy reforms that will be needed to support more efficient and equitable patterns of urban growth in the developing world.

Appendix

This appendix provides additional background on:

quantitative dimensions of the problems facing urban populations in developing countries; and
USAID's present policy and programs affecting the urban sector.

A. Quantitative Dimensions of the Urban Problem

As shown in Table 1 below, the less developed world has become an increasingly urbanized society.

Table 1
Urban and Rural Population Projections
Non-Communist LDCs
(millions)

	1960		1980		2000	
	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural
Africa	22.9	169.8	72.8	258.9	221.0	394.4
Near East	38.0	83.1	101.1	106.3	223.3	130.9
Latin America	105.9	109.8	237.7	126.0	428.4	137.4
Indian						
Subcon	102.6	489.2	212.7	731.5	476.8	909.5
Other						
Asia	43.5	170.2	95.9	244.7	194.7	288.3
Total	312.9	1,022.1	720.2	1,467.4	1,544.2	1,860.5

Source: United Nations: "Estimates and Projections of Urban, Rural and City Populations, 1950-2025 (New York, 1982)."

While urbanization is taking place throughout the world, it is occurring more rapidly in the relatively more developed Third World countries. Thus, while the urban population is currently

only about one-fifth of the total population in Africa and the Indian subcontinent, it is more than a quarter in the rest of Asia, roughly 50 percent in the Near East, and two-thirds in Latin America. But the rate of growth of urban areas is so great that by the year 2000 there will be almost as many urbanites in sub-Saharan Africa as there are currently rural dwellers. The urban populations of the Indian subcontinent will equal the urban populations of Latin America, and 30 of 66 USAID country recipients will have urban populations comprising more than 50 percent of their total populations.

Just as the urban population has been growing more rapidly than the rural population, the number of urban poor has also been growing faster than the number of rural poor. By 1980, there were four USAID recipient countries (Tunisia, Panama, Jordan, and the Dominican Republic) where there were more poor people in the cities than in the rural areas. By the year 2000, according to some estimates, there will be more poor families in the urban areas of LDCs than in the rural areas.

The continued population pressure on the land coupled with the perception of better income-earning possibilities in urban areas will likely lead to urbanization growth rates no lower than current rates. For this reason, USAID must increasingly focus on the problems of the majority in urban areas.

B. USAID's Existing Urban Policy and Program

1. USAID's Legislative Mandate

The foundation of our policy is the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, (FAA). The major emphasis in that legislation is that:

The principal purpose of United States bilateral development assistance is to help the poor majority in developing countries... (Sec. 102)

A fundamental question then is "Who constitutes the poor majority?" Both Congress and the Agency have tended to state that the "poor majority" are largely concentrated in rural areas. For example, Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act states:

In recognition of the fact that the great majority of the people of developing countries live in rural areas and are dependent on agriculture and agriculture related pursuits for this livelihood...

Similarly, PD 67, entitled "Urbanization and the Urban Poor", which previously represented the official statement of USAID's urban development policy, states:

The needs of the poor majority are enormous, and USAID's resources are limited. Programs are focused on the rural poor, the most numerous and generally the least advantaged of the poor majority.

However, the FAA goes on to say:

The President is authorized to furnish assistance,... for the following articles...

(5) Programs of urban development with particular emphasis on small, labor-intensive enterprises, marketing systems for small producers, and other institutions which enable the urban poor to participate in the economic and social development of their country. (Sec. 106[c])

Moreover, Congress has from time to time recognized that the problems of rural development are inextricably linked with those of urban development. For example, the 1978 Senate Report on the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriation Bill states:

...The Committee has found that much of the discussion to date on development efforts to help the rural poor has shown an inadequate appreciation of the relationship between rural dwellers and urban centers located in rural areas.

In examining the legislative basis for USAID's perception of itself as a rural development agency, the General Counsel's Office concludes:

It is clear that beginning with the 1973 New Directions policies USAID has interpreted the new mandate for aid to the poor majority as aid to the rural poor. It is our opinion that this emphasis is largely a matter of Agency policy and in no way a statutory exigency. ...It is our opinion that the Congressional mandate to aid the "poor majority" means aid to whoever is determined by USAID, in its Agency expertise, to be the poor majority, be they urban or rural poor.

2. USAID's Existing Urban Programs

A large portion of USAID's resources are devoted to projects which benefit urban dwellers. The HG program is exclusively devoted to addressing urban problems. In the 1983 CP, the Agency requested from Congress (or in the case of the HG Program guaranty authority from OMB) \$821 million for activities which directly benefit urban dwellers³, as opposed to \$1,234.4 million which directly benefit rural dwellers.⁴ In addition, there is an unspecified portion of the \$2,433.4 million in DA and ESF, and the \$872 million in PL 480 Title I resources which cannot easily be allocated as benefitting either urban or rural peoples. In fact, however, most of the unallocated resources (particularly) PL 480 Title I, commodity import programs, and cash transfers) benefit urban dwellers. Since most nonproject assistance programs are actually programs designed to provide foreign exchange, their primary impact is to expand imports. For most countries, most imports are purchased (and most incomes produced) by urban dwellers. If

³ \$105 million in DA funds, \$555 in ESF funds, and \$150 million in Housing Guaranty authority.

⁴ \$1039 million in DA funds and \$195 million in ESF.

it were possible to track the ultimate direct beneficiary of each USAID dollar, it would not be surprising if there were more urban beneficiaries than rural beneficiaries.

The pattern of USAID's urban expenditures for the year FY83 is presented in Table II. The bulk of our urban programs are in the Near East and Latin America, areas which are the most highly urbanized. There are few DA programs designed to directly benefit the urban poor. However, there are more ESF funds directly allocated to urban programs than to rural programs. Clearly USAID's urban policy should take into account available resources from all accounts (ESF, HG, PL 480 and DA) in the design of effective programs.

The bulk of USAID's urban planning expertise is located in the PRE Bureau's Office of Housing and Urban Programs and its overseas Regional Housing and Urban Development Offices which together with their contractors comprise a pool of about 100 trained urban specialists that are available to support the Missions. In addition, the S&T Bureau's Office of Rural and Institutional Development has methodologies and skills, including a network of contractor specialists, for dealing with regional cities and town systems, rural-urban linkages, regional development, employment and small enterprise, and local development administration and finance.

Finally, consideration should be given to the resources available to USAID Missions in analyzing urban problems and providing institutional support for viable urban institutions.

To date, the Agency has developed useful guidelines and approaches, and will be developing others. Thus, USAID is now prepared to perform:

- urban development assessments designed to facilitate LDC and USAID understanding of the urbanization process;
- a urban management audits designed to assess the managerial problems on a city-wide or agency-wide basis and recommend institutional development programs;
- urban policy studies designed to assist cities in planning to meet the needs caused by rapid urbanization;
- municipal financial analyses designed to assist cities in revenue generation; and
- urban-rural linkage studies to promote the complementary development of urban centers and their rural hinterlands.

Assessment methodologies are being or have been field tested. Missions considering initiatives in the urban area or conducting these assessments are invited to use the planning skills and assessment methodologies of the PRE Bureau's Office of Housing and Urban Programs and S&T Bureau's Office of Rural and Institutional Development as a basis for their follow-on investment decisions, project design, and program and policy development.

Table 2
Allocation of USAID Assistance Between
Rural and Urban Beneficiaries*

	Rural		Urban		Unallocable		Total
	Million	Percent	Million	Percent	Million	Percent	
Asia	\$555.1	71.9	87.7	11.4	129.0	16.7	771.8
DA	409.6	75.3	19.7	3.6	114.5	21.1	543.8
ESF	145.5	75.4	33.0	17.1	14.5	7.5	193.0
HG	-0-	0.0	35.0	100.0	-0-	0.0	35.0
Afr	351.2	50.2	168.8	24.2	179.0	25.6	699.0
DA	254.4	78.3	3.8	1.2	66.8	20.6	325.0
ESF	96.8	29.9	115.0	35.5	112.2	34.6	324.0
HG	-0-	0.0	50.0	100.0	-0-	0.0	50.0
N.E.	113.0	5.6	344.5	17.1	1,560.8	77.3	2,018.4
DA	23.0	50.7	0.4	0.9	22.0	48.5	45.4
ESF	90.0	4.6	334.2	17.0	1,538.8	78.4	1,963.0
HG	-0-	0.0	10.0	100.0	-0-	0.00	10.0
L.A.	125.0	19.1	188.4	28.8	342.0	52.1	655.4
DA	123.5	45.1	31.9	11.6	119.0	43.4	274.4
ESF	1.5	0.5	101.5	31.1	223.0	68.4	326.0
HG	-0-	0.0	55.0	100.0	-0-	0.0	55.0
Centrally Funded	90.6	27.3	19.0	5.7	222.6	67.0	332.2
Total	1,234.9	27.6	808.5	18.1	2,433.4	54.3	4,476.8
Lower Income (1980 per capita income of \$500 or less)							
DA	626.0	79.0	13.5	1.7	152.8	19.3	792.3
ESF	194.5	57.4	65.0	19.2	79.5	23.5	339.0
HG	-0-	0.0	25.0	100.0	-0-	0.0	25.0
Total	820.5	71.0	103.5	8.9	232.3	20.1	1,156.3
Middle Income (1980 per capita income greater than \$500)							
DA	184.2	46.5	42.3	10.7	169.5	42.8	396.0
ESF	139.3	5.7	485.7	19.7	1,838.0	74.6	2,463.0
HG	-0-	0.0	125.0	100.0	-0-	0.0	125.0

Total	323.5	10.8	653.0	21.9	2,007.5	67.3	2,984.0
--------------	-------	------	-------	------	---------	------	---------

* Numbers approximated from FY 84 Congressional presentation.

USAID Policy Papers and Policy Determinations

The following reports have been issued in a series. These documents with an identification code (e.g. PN-AAM-323) may be ordered in microfiche or paper copy. Please direct inquiries regarding orders to:

USAID Document and Information Handling Facility
7222 47th Street
Suite 100
Chevy Chase, MD 20815

<u>Title Policy Paper</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Fiche #</u>
Bureau for Private Enterprise	May 1982	PN-AAM-325
Domestic Water and Sanitation	May 1982	PN-AAM-323
Food and Agricultural Development	May 1982	PN-AAM-322
Nutrition	May 1982	PN-AAM-321
Private Enterprise Development	May 1982	PN-AAM-324
Recurrent Costs	May 1982	PN-AAM-319
Population Assistance	September 1982	PN-AAM-320
Private and Voluntary Organizations	September 1982	PN-AAM-318
Women in Development	October 1982	PN-AAL-777
Pricing, Subsidies, and Related Policies in Food and Agriculture	November 1982	PN-AAN-373
Approaches to the Policy Dialogue	December 1982	PN-AAM-431
Basic Education and Technical Training	December 1982	PN-AAM-190
Health Assistance	December 1982	PN-AAL-817
Institutional Development	March 1983	PN-AAN-108
Co-Financing	May 1983	PN-AAN-457
Local Organizations in Development	March 1984	PN-AAQ-157
Energy	July 1984	PN-AAQ-160
Urban Development Policy	October 1984	PN-AAQ-158

<u>Title Policy Determination</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Fiche #</u>
PD #1 Narcotics	August 5, 1982	PN-AAM-443
PD #2 Mixed Credits	September 29, 1982	PN-AAM-444
PD #3 Voluntary Sterilization	September 1982	PN-AAM-445
PD #4 Title XII	October 5, 1982	PN-AAM-446
PD #5 Programming PL 480 Local Currency Generations	February 22, 1983	PN-AAM-591
PD #6 Environmental and Natural Resources Aspects of Development Assistance	April 26, 1983	PN-AAN-375
PD #7 Forestry Policy and Programs	May 16, 1983	PN-AAN-376
PD #8 Participant Training	July 13, 1983	PN-AAP-273
PD #9 Loan Terms Under PL 480 Title I	September 27, 1983	PN-AAN-753
PD #10 Development Communications	February 17, 1984	PN-AAP-616
PD #11 Using PL 480 Title II Food Aid for Emergency or Refugee Relief	July 26, 1984	PN-AAQ-159

