



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS, FISCAL YEAR 2008



JUNE 2009

The cover photo depicts women spinning cashmere thread at the Mazar-e-Sharif AgFair and Cashmere Exhibition in Afghanistan. Afghan cashmere production has the potential to increase significantly, bringing wealth and export opportunities to small-scale herdsmen and weavers.

PHOTO COURTESY OF THE USAID PHOTO COLLECTION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Microenterprise Results Reporting (MRR) Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2008 summarizes USAID's investments and priorities in microfinance and microenterprise development.¹ The Report documents USAID funding for microenterprise development through 171 diverse implementing partners, ranging from private voluntary organizations (PVOs) and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to for-profit banks and enterprise development service providers. This year's data show an overall increase in the amount of support to non-profit organizations (PVOs, NGOs, cooperatives, and credit unions), from \$94 million to \$110 million between FY 2007 and FY 2008.

The FY 2008 report reflects USAID's continued commitment to leveraging its investments in microenterprise development. USAID helps strengthen the performance of increasingly commercial microfinance institutions (MFIs), allowing them to attract private investors and grow faster than if they relied solely on donor support. USAID also reduces some of the risk to private investors and lenders by offering partial credit guarantees and other enhancements. FY 2008 saw an increase from FY 2007 in these guarantees. Currently \$7.3 million in USAID funding for credit guarantees is supporting up to \$286 million in private sector credit to microfinance institutions and microenterprises.

This report fulfills the 12 reporting requirements included in the Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-484). Key findings include:

1. In FY 2008, USAID provided \$259.4 million in funding for microenterprise development through

176 new and existing grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts in 69 countries, as well as several with a regional or worldwide focus.

2. USAID provided \$17.9 million in funding through central mechanisms in FY 2008.
3. Through the use of credit guarantees, \$7.3 million in USAID funding leveraged up to \$286 million in private sector lending to institutions serving microfinance clients since 2002.
4. USAID provided \$145.3 million in funding through contracts in FY 2008. Just over \$117 million in microenterprise funding was sub-granted or sub-contracted in FY 2008, with local partners receiving 79 percent of this funding.
5. In FY 2008, USAID missions and operating units reported that \$21 million in USAID funds were matched by an additional \$9.5 million from sources outside the U.S. Government.
6. Eighteen USAID-assisted partners in 10 countries used USAID-certified poverty assessment tools to measure and report the share of their clients who are "very poor", defined as people living on less than \$1/day at purchasing power parity, or those among the poorest 50 percent of people living below their country's poverty line. Based on their reports, USAID estimates that 26.9 percent of microenterprise funds directly benefited "very poor" clients as defined in that legislation.
7. An estimated 1.58 million very poor people directly benefited from microenterprise programs in FY 2008, including microfinance clients and owners and employees of microenterprises benefiting from USAID-supported enterprise development interventions. This estimate assumes that the percentage of "very poor" clients reported by the 18 partner institutions cited above applies to the broader range of USAID-supported microenterprise development programs.

¹ The definition of a microenterprise has been revised effective January 2008. The new definition as per USAID's Automated Directives System (ADS) 219 on Microenterprise Development now includes crop production activities as long as they otherwise qualify on the basis of size and the economic status of the owner-operator and employees.

8. In FY 2008 and early FY 2009, USAID continued to develop additional poverty assessment tools. By the end of FY 2009, USAID expects to have certified tools for use in 29 countries, representing more than 70 percent of USAID microenterprise funding excluding several countries where security conditions preclude developing or applying poverty tools.
9. Approximately \$9 million of USAID's microenterprise funding in FY 2008 assisted victims of trafficking in persons and women who are particularly vulnerable to other forms of exploitation and violence.
10. In FY 2008, 28 percent of borrowers, 20 percent of savers, and 13 percent of enterprise development clients were located in countries where a relationship between poverty and race or ethnicity has been demonstrated.
11. USAID exceeded many of its performance goals relating to microfinance, including numbers of borrowers, proportion of women clients, proportion of rural clients, and financial sustainability. USAID did not meet its goals for the number of savers and the percentage of funds benefiting the very poor. In the area of enterprise development, performance exceeded all goals except percentage of funds benefiting the very poor.

ABBREVIATIONS

ADS	Automated Directives System
DCA	Development Credit Authority
EE	Europe and Eurasia
FVP	Funds Benefiting the Very Poor
FY	Fiscal Year
GDA	Global Development Alliance
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean
LC	Local currency
MD	USAID Office of Microenterprise Development
MFI	Microfinance Institution
MFIC	Microfinance International Corporation
MRAA	Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004
MRR	Microenterprise Results Reporting
MSED	Micro and Small Enterprise Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PAT	Poverty Assessment Tool
PPI	Progress Out of Poverty Index
PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
RDM/A	Regional Development Mission/Asia
STRIVE	Supporting Transformation by Reducing Insecurity and Vulnerability with Economic Strengthening
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

INTRODUCTION

This report fulfills the requirement of the Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-484) that each year, “the Administrator of the Agency, acting through the Director of the office, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains a detailed description of the implementation of this title for the previous fiscal year.”

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) is a leader among donors in the field of microenterprise development and microfinance. USAID provides competitive awards to hundreds of diverse partners, ranging from non-governmental organizations to business associations to consulting firms to commercial banks. USAID supports innovations in financial services, enterprise development, and the enabling environment to strengthen the contribution of microenterprises to poor households’ well-being and economic growth.^{2,3}

² **Financial services** include the provision of financial services adapted to the needs of low-income people, especially small loans, facilities for small savings deposits, and simple payments services needed by microentrepreneurs and other poor people. This report uses the term microfinance interchangeably with financial services. **Enterprise development** interventions help microenterprises start, survive, and grow, by helping them acquire skills and knowledge, gain access to financing and other inputs, and develop commercial relationships with other firms (both micro-scale and larger firms) in order to tap into higher-value markets. **Enabling environment** activities promote appropriate laws, policies, regulations, and supervisory and administrative practices, in order to expand access to financial services for low-income people or improve the business environment in which microenterprises operate.

³ This report summarizes results achieved by partner institutions with USAID assistance, consistent with the Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 and with USAID’s own policies on results reporting. Wherever possible, USAID partners have reported only those results attributable to USAID technical and financial assistance. However, many partners receive complementary assistance from other donors and, increasingly,

FY 2008 marks the largest investment in microenterprise development to date by USAID and its implementing partners.

Financial services and enterprise development interventions expand economic opportunities for poor households and businesses, while helping them to respond to those opportunities, build household assets, and cope with emergencies. Improvements in the enabling environment for microfinance encourage investment and innovation by microfinance institutions of all types, while improvements in the business enabling environment help microentrepreneurs participate in markets, increase their earnings, and realize the benefits of international trade.

USAID also identifies best practices, develops analytical tools, and provides technical assistance to missions and implementers to strengthen their programs, and coordinates with other donors to promote good practices and aid effectiveness in microfinance and microenterprise development.

Microenterprise Results Reporting (MRR), USAID’s system for tracking microenterprise obligations and implementing partner results, has prepared Annual Reports on USAID’s funding patterns and partner level results since 1996.⁴ MRR gathered and summarized data obtained from USAID missions and implementing partners for the production of this Annual Report.

from the private sector. Leveraging such additional resources is essential to maximize the reach, effectiveness, and sustainability of USAID assistance, and also typically leads to results that would not be possible without USAID assistance. Nevertheless, identifying the portion of partners’ results attributable to USAID’s own assistance is often difficult or impossible.

⁴ To view Annual Reports from previous years, visit www.mrreporting.org.

This report is structured to give readers a clear sense of USAID's implementation of the Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004. The

following table provides a guide to the reporting requirements and the pages where they are addressed:

SUMMARY OF REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Reporting Requirement	Location
<p>1 Funding: The number of grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, contributions, or other form of assistance provided under section 252 [the section of the law authorizing USAID to provide microenterprise assistance], with a listing of:</p> <p>(A) the amount of each grant, cooperative agreement, contract, contribution or other form of assistance;</p> <p>(B) the name of each recipient and each developing country with respect to which projects or activities under the grant, cooperative agreement, contract, contribution, or other form of assistance were carried out; and</p> <p>(C) a listing of the number of countries receiving assistance authorized by section 252.</p>	Page 7 and Annex A, pages 22-31
<p>2 Central Mechanisms: The amount of assistance provided under section 252 through central mechanisms.</p>	Page 8; Table 2
<p>3 Development Credit Authority: The name of each country that receives assistance under section 256 [the section of the law pertaining to the Development Credit Authority and credit instruments] and the amount of such assistance.</p>	Page 8-9; Table 3
<p>4 Contracts and Sub-Obligations: The level of funding provided through contracts,</p> <p>the level of funding provided through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements that is estimated to be subgranted or subcontracted, as the case may be, to direct service providers, and</p> <p>an analysis of the comparative cost-effectiveness and sustainability of projects carried out under these mechanisms.</p>	Page 10; Table 4 Page 10-11; Table 5 Page 10
<p>5 Matching Assistance: It is the sense of Congress that USAID should include in the report required by section 258 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 [as added by section 6 of this Act] a description of all matching assistance [as described in paragraph (1)] provided for the prior year by recipients of microenterprise development assistance under such title.</p>	Page 12
<p>6 Funds for Very Poor Clients: The percentage of assistance furnished under section 252 that was allocated to the very poor based on the data collected using the certified methods required by section 254 [the section of the law outlining the requirement for USAID to develop client poverty assessment methods and require their use by awardees by October 2006].</p>	Page 12
<p>7 Estimated Number of the Very Poor reached with assistance provided under section 252.</p>	Page 15
<p>8 Poverty Assessment Methods: The process of developing and applying poverty assessment procedures required under section 254.</p>	Page 15

9	<p>Funds to Assist Victims of Trafficking and Exploitation: Information on the efforts of the Agency to ensure that recipients of United States microenterprise and microfinance development assistance work closely with non-governmental organizations and foreign governments to identify and assist victims or potential victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and women who are victims of or susceptible to other forms of exploitation and violence.</p>	Page 17; Table 6
10	<p>Poverty and Race/Ethnicity: An estimate of the percentage of beneficiaries of assistance under this title in countries where a strong relationship between poverty and race or ethnicity has been demonstrated.</p>	Page 17-18; Table 7
11	<p>Performance Monitoring System: The results of the monitoring system required under section 253 [see A-D below].</p>	Pages 18
	<p>(A) The monitoring system shall include performance goals for the assistance and expresses such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the extent feasible.</p>	Page 19; Table 8
	<p>(B) The monitoring system shall include performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the achievement of the performance goals described in paragraph (A) and the objective of the assistance authorized under section 252.</p>	
	<p>(C) The monitoring system provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to the assistance to enhance the sustainability and the impact of the assistance, particularly the impact of such assistance on the very poor, particularly poor women.</p>	
<p>(D) The monitoring system adopts the widespread use of proven and effective poverty assessment tools to successfully identify the very poor and ensure that they receive adequate access to microenterprise loans, savings, and assistance.</p>		
12	<p>Additional Information: Any additional information relating to the provision of assistance authorized by this title, including the use of poverty assessment methods required by section 254, or additional information on assistance provided by the United States to support microenterprise development under this title or any other provision of law.</p>	Page 20

REPORTING REQUIREMENT I A, B, AND C FUNDING

In FY 2008, USAID provided a total of \$259.4 million in microenterprise development assistance through 176 new and existing agreements, including grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts with 171 implementing partners in 69 countries. Reported microenterprise funding increased significantly from the level recorded in FY 2007. The FY 2008 total is the largest investment in microenterprise development since MRR began tracking data in 1996. There was a concerted effort to capture more agricultural related microenterprise development programs this year. In

addition more central offices reported on cross-cutting programs with microenterprise development components. These are discussed in more detail under Reporting Requirement 12 of the report.

Annex A provides detailed information on USAID microenterprise funding, including the name of each country receiving assistance, the amount of each award, and the name of each implementing partner. Annex B includes information on FY 2008 funding by USAID Bureau. Table 1 shows the sources of FY 2008 USAID funds for microenterprise by appropriation account.

Table I. Sources of USAID Funds for Microenterprise by Appropriation Account (\$ million), FY 1998 – 2008

Account ⁵	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
DA	\$79.9	\$74.1	\$88.3	\$85.3	\$80.7	\$87.8	\$91.2	\$87.9	\$82.8	\$70.9	\$82.2
ESF	\$33.9	\$33.0	\$25.2	\$27.9	\$48.1	\$28.4	\$17.7	\$37.3	\$78.0	\$44.5	\$132.3
INC and ACI						\$2.1	\$21.4	\$14.8	\$7.0	\$32.1	
FSA	\$14.3	\$12.8	\$30.3	\$19.6	\$33.4	\$41.0	\$35.1	\$21.0	\$18.6	\$11.5	\$18.2
SAI/SEED	\$4.6	\$13.0	\$9.2	\$7.6	\$6.7	\$14.5	\$13.9	\$14.2	\$8.5	\$10.9	\$17.9
P.L.-480 ⁶	\$12.4	\$17.3	\$8.8	\$13.7	\$18.6	\$4.8	\$10.0	\$6.7	\$9.0	\$9.5	\$4.6
IRRF							\$7.2	\$28.9	\$11.3	\$8.1	
CSH/HIV			\$0.8	\$0.5	\$0.5	\$1.0	\$0.6	\$0.4		\$4.9	\$2.6
GHAI										\$0.7	\$1.6
IDFA								\$0.2	\$1.4		
CACEDRF		\$3.2	\$8.0								
Total	\$145.1	\$153.4	\$170.6	\$154.6	\$188.0	\$179.6	\$197.1	\$211.4	\$216.0	\$193.1	\$259.4

⁵ DA – Development Assistance

ESF – Economic Support Funds

INC – International Narcotics Control

ACI – Andean Counternarcotics Initiative

FSA – Freedom Support Act

SAI/SEED – Special Assistance Initiatives includes Support for Eastern European Democracy

P.L.-480 – Local currency from monetization of Public Law 480 (Title II) food aid

IRRF – Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund

CSH/HIV – Child Survival and Health/Human Immunodeficiency Virus

GHAI – Global Health AIDS Initiative

IDFA – International Disaster and Famine Assistance

CACEDRF – Central American and Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery Fund

⁶ P.L.-480 and LC funds in the amount of \$4.6 million are USDA funds managed by USAID. Program results were collected on these programs and are included in the USAID partner data in this report.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 2

CENTRAL MECHANISMS

USAID provided \$17.9 million in funding through central mechanisms from USAID/Washington in FY 2008, as shown in table 2. This total includes the first-ever microenterprise funding from the Population and Reproductive Health Office and the Natural Resources Management Office. In contrast, the table excludes support for microenterprise development through local currency generated through sale of Public Law 480 food aid, previously reported by the central Food for Peace office, but currently reported by individual country missions.

Table 2. Central Mechanism Funding by Office (U.S.\$ millions)

Microenterprise Development	\$12.5
Private Voluntary Cooperation	\$2.1
Population and Reproductive Health	\$1.4
Natural Resources Management	\$1.0
Democracy and Governance	\$.7
Women in Development	\$0.2
Total	\$17.9

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 3

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT AUTHORITY

Since 1999, USAID's Office of Development Credit has enabled USAID missions to expand the capital base for microfinance by providing partial guarantees rather than grants. Such guarantees encourage mainstream financial institutions, such as commercial banks, to lend to MFIs and thus enable the latter to expand their portfolios. Many missions have used this

vehicle successfully to support market leaders and increase funding to the sector.

Table 3 summarizes active guarantees supporting microfinance in FY 2008. Guarantees include the Development Credit Authority (DCA) and the Micro and Small Enterprise Development (MSED) program, both managed by the Office of Development Credit. The column labeled "Guarantee Subsidy" shows the budgetary costs of providing guarantees. Subsidy costs vary according to country, lender, and borrower and transaction risk. The amounts shown under "Lending Guaranteed" indicate funds available for lending to microfinance institutions as a result of partial guarantees provided by USAID. Since FY 2002, \$7.3 million in USAID funding for credit guarantees leveraged up to \$286 million in private sector credit to MFIs and microenterprises.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 4

In an effort to provide support to microenterprise development initiatives worldwide, USAID uses a variety of assistance mechanisms and implementing partners to maximize such efforts. The Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act of 2004 (MRAA) requires USAID to report on the following levels of funding provided through:

- Contracts (with direct obligation recipients);
- Grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements that is estimated to be sub-granted or sub-contracted, as the case may be, to direct service providers; and
- An analysis of the comparative cost-effectiveness and sustainability of projects carried out under these mechanisms.

Table 3. Active USAID Credit Guarantees Related to Microfinance since FY 2002 (U.S.\$ thousands)

Country	Guarantee Subsidy	Lending Guaranteed	Fiscal Year
Morocco	\$10	\$400	2002
Peru	\$74	\$2,000	2002
Honduras	\$162	\$3,500	2003
Morocco	\$69	\$8,000	2003
Worldwide	\$75	\$10,000	2003
Ecuador	\$884	\$12,400	2004
Guatemala	\$116	\$5,000	2004
Jamaica	\$244	\$8,500	2004
Morocco	\$211	\$10,600	2004
South Africa	\$76	\$8,333	2004
Honduras	\$115	\$2,000	2005
Indonesia	\$1,209	\$16,400	2005
Peru	\$300	\$8,000	2005
Uganda	\$653	\$11,700	2005
Georgia	\$77	\$1,500	2006
Worldwide	\$142	\$82,100	2006
Bulgaria	\$57	\$1,500	2007
Haiti	\$152	\$2,500	2007
Colombia	\$93	\$8,000	2008
Dominican Republic	\$385	\$10,000	2008
El Salvador	\$97	\$4,800	2008
Guyana	\$99	\$5,800	2008
Haiti	\$139	\$2,000	2008
Jamaica	\$154	\$5,060	2008
Kenya	\$250	\$15,000	2008
Sri Lanka	\$106	\$5,000	2008
Worldwide	\$1,400	\$36,260	2008
TOTAL	\$7,349	\$286,353	

CONTRACTS

Table 4 summarizes USAID microenterprise funding provided through contracts by partner type in FY 2008. Of the total FY 2008 obligation amount of \$259.4 million, \$145.3 million (56 percent) was directly obligated to implementing partners through contracts.

Table 4. Recipients of USAID Funding for Microenterprise, FY 2008 (U.S.\$ millions)

Partner Type	Total Microenterprise Funding	Funding Through Contracts
Non-Profits ⁷	\$109.6	\$6.2
Consulting Firms	\$97.0	\$94.9
Other For-Profits ⁸	\$22.7	\$20.9
Other Entities ⁹	\$30.1	\$23.3
Total	\$254.8	\$145.3

In FY 2008, non-profit partners were the direct recipients of 42.2 percent (\$109.6 million) of total microenterprise funding, while consulting firms were the direct recipients of 37.4 percent (\$97 million). Funds obligated to non-profit partners include those obligated to U.S.-based PVOs (\$63.5 million or 24.5 percent of FY 2008 microenterprise funding), local NGOs (\$44.7 million or 17.2 percent), cooperatives (\$0.8 million or 0.3 percent) and credit unions (\$0.5 million or 0.2 percent).¹⁰

⁷ Non-Profits include PVOs, NGOs, cooperatives and credit unions.

⁸ Other For-Profits include banks, non-bank financial institutions, finance companies, and other for-profit institutions.

⁹ All Other Entities includes business associations, government agencies, research and educational organizations, obligations to USAID for microenterprise project management, pending agreements and institutions marked "other."

¹⁰ Funding amounts are rounded to the nearest hundred thousand, which explains the discrepancy between the breakdown of amounts by non-profit institution type and the total amount of funds obligated to non-profits.

SUB-OBLIGATIONS

Table 5 shows the estimated level of funding that was sub-granted or sub-contracted to direct service providers in FY 2008 in the form of grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements. Funding for sub-recipients is an important indication of USAID's ability to involve local partners in the Agency's microenterprise development efforts. In FY 2008, approximately \$117.2 million was sub-granted or sub-contracted to 538 primarily local partner institutions. Approximately 79 percent of sub-granted or sub-contracted funds were directed to local partners in host countries, including cooperatives, credit unions, local NGOs, business associations, research/educational institutions, and non-bank financial institutions.

This is a substantial increase in both funding and number of sub-recipient partners. This reflects both the increase in overall microenterprise development funding as well as intensive review efforts implemented as part of MRR data collection this year. It should also be noted that the sub-recipient funding reported by USAID's partners does not all originate from FY 2008 USAID obligations, as funds are disbursed and expended by partners on a timeline that often differs from USAID's fiscal year obligations. Therefore some of these funds may come from previous year obligations.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS AND SUSTAINABILITY

To track the comparative cost-effectiveness and sustainability of programs, MRR collects data on the financial and operational sustainability of partner institutions in implementing microfinance programs.¹¹ In FY 2008, 86 percent of USAID-funded MFIs were operationally self-sustaining, whereas 75 percent

¹¹ Operational sustainability measures the degree to which an institution generates sufficient revenue from operations to cover all of its operating costs, including loan losses and the costs of capital. Financial sustainability measures the degree to which the institution's revenues from operations also covers the costs of its funds calculated at market rates, adjusted for the effects of inflation and subsidies.

attained the more demanding goal of full financial sustainability. As USAID considers an institution's sustainability to be related to its cost-effectiveness, the Agency uses a number of methods to assist microfinance institutions to become self-sustaining. These methods include: 1) requiring that implementing partners develop concrete plans to achieve financial sustainability, so that their revenues cover all their costs; 2) providing funds and technical assistance to build strong institutions that can continue serving their clients after USAID support ends; 3) identifying best practices and business models to achieve sustainability; and 4) providing credit guarantees to help microfinance institutions access private capital for financing future growth.

The MRAA also called for an analysis of the comparative cost-effectiveness and sustainability of projects carried out under different funding mechanisms. Measures of cost-effectiveness and sustainability for any given project are derived from the specific objectives to be achieved by the project, the context in which it operates, and the duration of support. Given the broad application of microenterprise programs to meet development objectives, it is not possible to calculate and compare these measures using only the results data tracked by MRR. Nevertheless, USAID continues to examine the cost-effectiveness and sustainability of microenterprise projects in evaluations of individual projects.

In addition, in July 2006 USAID published a comparative study of the performance of "umbrella projects" -- integrated programs that include a substantial microenterprise component. As reported in the FY 2006 MRR, the study examined microfinance umbrella programs led by both for-profit and non-profit institutions, and funded through a variety of assistance mechanisms, including contracts. The study concluded that, for microfinance umbrella programs as well as for other USAID programs, the choice of assistance instrument is not a factor in determining sustainability. Contracts are used to procure services needed to achieve USAID's

Table 5. Reported Sub-Obligations (U.S.\$ millions)

Partner Type¹²	Funding for Subgrants and Subcontracts
Business Associations	\$1.8
Consulting Firms	\$7.6
Cooperatives	\$2.2
Credit Unions	\$23.5
Other For-Profits ¹³	\$5.4
NGOs	\$65.0
Non-Bank Financial Institutions	\$0.9
PVOs	\$7.1
Research/Educational	\$0.7
Other Entities ¹⁴	\$3.2
Total	\$117.2

development objectives, whereas grants and cooperative agreements are used to support existing activities of USAID's partners, where those activities advance USAID's goals and objectives. As USAID moves into new regions where there is a need for microenterprise services—for example, in post-conflict areas—it relies on the existing institutional capacity of both contractors and grantees to implement new programs.

¹² In general, partner types are added and verified by USAID missions and partner institutions. However, due to the increased number of new sub-recipients entered into the system in FY 08, many of the partner types were verified through web sites or other means, such as individual project document review, when direct partner verification was not available.

¹³ Other For-Profits include banks, finance companies, and other for-profit institutions.

¹⁴ Other entities include Chambers of Commerce, government agencies and other types of institutions.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 5 MATCHING ASSISTANCE

USAID frequently requires that its funds for a particular purpose be matched by funds from other sources, including the partner institution itself. In FY 2008, \$21 million of USAID microenterprise funds were matched by an additional \$9.5 million from other sources. Matching funds from these sources may include private donations, multilateral funding, commercial and concessional borrowing, savings, and program income.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 6 FUNDS BENEFITING THE VERY POOR

Both the Microenterprise for Self Reliance Act of 2000 (henceforth, the 2000 Act) and the MRAA mandate that at least half of all USAID funding for microenterprise development directly benefit the very poor. The 2000 Act initially defined the “very poor” as the bottom [poorest] half of those living below each country’s national poverty line. The law instructed USAID to support “poverty lending” as the principal means of targeting the very poor. Poverty lending is based on the assumption that only very poor people would seek to take out very small loans. In that case, an institution’s outreach to the very poor could be inferred from the share of its clients with loans smaller than a certain threshold value. Accordingly, the original 2000 Act set a “poverty loan threshold” for each region where USAID operates. For microfinance institutions, the share of each MFI’s services that benefit the very poor would be estimated from the share of its loan portfolio consisting of loans smaller than the threshold value. Similarly, the share of an enterprise development program’s services that benefit the very poor would be estimated from its reported share of clients who currently hold poverty loans.

The 2000 Act set the following poverty loan thresholds, stated in 1995 U.S. dollars:

- \$300 in Asia, the Near East, and Africa;
- \$400 in Latin America and the Caribbean; and
- \$1,000 in Europe and Eurasia.

In FY 2007, the poverty loan proxy amounts were corrected for inflation since 1995, thus providing more accurate thresholds for reporting. The poverty loan thresholds for Fiscal Year 2008 remained at the adjusted levels of \$404, \$538, and \$1,346 respectively.

Subsequent amendments to the 2000 Act mandated a second, much more ambitious approach to estimating the share of USAID-supported microenterprise benefits that reach the very poor. First, the amended law created a second definition of the “very poor” -- those living on less than the equivalent of \$1 per day, calculated using purchasing power parity (PPP) exchange rates. The law made clear that, for any given country, the applicable definition of the very poor would be the more inclusive one. Second, those amendments directed USAID to develop and certify at least two “low-cost methods” to allow partner institutions to measure the share of their clients who are very poor as defined in the law, and, “with reasonable exceptions,” to require non-profit recipients of USAID grants or cooperative agreements for microenterprise development to use those methods to measure and report the share of their very poor clients. These changes are reiterated in the MRAA.

The process of developing, certifying, and applying poverty assessment tools is discussed in Reporting Requirement 8. By the end of FY 2008, USAID had certified Poverty Assessment Tools for 26 countries. Because implementing the tools involves substantial costs, USAID exempted partners that spent less than \$100,000 in USAID microenterprise funds in FY 2008, considering these to be “reasonable exceptions” as cited in the law. In all, 18 partner institutions in 10 countries reported poverty assessments in FY 2008. Of these 18 partner institutions, four offered only financial services, 10 offered only enterprise development support, and four offered both. Together, these 18 partner institutions received 20 percent of total USAID microenterprise funding in FY 2008, or 22 percent excluding support for policy reform.

Because partner institutions that actually implemented the poverty tools represent a relatively modest share of

total USAID microenterprise funding, this section provides two estimates of the share of those funds benefiting the very poor – one based on the results of the poverty tools, and a second based on the poverty loan proxy used in previous Annual Reports.

Among the eight microfinance institutions that applied and reported on the Poverty Assessment Tools, the average share of Funds Benefiting the Very Poor (FVP) is estimated at 28.5 percent, up from 16.3 percent in FY 2007. This average is based on the share of very poor clients reported by each MFI, weighted by the value of USAID microfinance funding that MFI received in FY 2008. For the 14 enterprise development programs that applied and reported on the Poverty Assessment Tools, average FVP is estimated at 26.0 percent, up from 20.5 percent in FY 2007; this average is weighted by each program's FY 2008 funding for enterprise development. A weighted average of these two estimates yields an overall estimate of 26.9 percent of USAID funds benefiting the very poor, up from 19.1 percent in FY 2007.¹⁵ Programs pursuing policy reforms cannot report client-level data, and so are excluded from the calculations.

Measuring FVP using the poverty loan proxy, as in previous Reports, yields somewhat different results. Based on the share of each reporting MFI's loan portfolio held as poverty loans, an estimated 22 percent of USAID funding for microfinance institutions directly benefited the very poor. The share of poverty loans was much higher in Sub-Saharan Africa (83 percent) and much lower in Latin America and the Caribbean and in the Middle East (6 percent and 7 percent, respectively). However, the overall average was dominated by the 24 percent prevalence of poverty lending among microfinance programs in the Asia region, which absorbed nearly three-quarters of the total funds provided to microfinance institutions that reported on their poverty lending. In contrast to last year's report, the poverty assessment

tools provide a slightly higher estimated share of FVP among USAID-supported microfinance programs than does the poverty loan proxy. The reasons for this change are not clear.

Meanwhile, 30 percent of funding for enterprise development programs was found to directly benefit the very poor, based on each reporting program's estimated share of clients who hold outstanding poverty loans from any source. This figure is exactly double the one reported in the FY 2007 Annual Report. USAID views these estimates as particularly susceptible to error, because enterprise development programs do not dispense loans themselves and have often little or no basis for knowing how many of their clients hold such loans from other sources; a large share of programs in each region simply leave this question blank.

Combining the estimated share of FVP from each type of program yields an overall average of 27.2 percent of funds directly benefiting the very poor, based on the poverty loan proxy. This estimate is very close to the 26.9 percent obtained using the poverty assessment tools. USAID views the closeness of these figures as coincidental, rather than as evidence that the two methods provides equally valid results; the large changes in the FVP estimates obtained by using the poverty loan proxy between FY 2007 and FY 2008 suggest the very limited reliability of this method.

Based on either method, the share of benefits directly flowing to the very poor fell short of the 50 percent FVP target set by the 2000 Act – just over half the target, in the case of the 26.9 percent FVP estimated using the poverty assessment tools. Although this figure is higher than the 19.1 percent reported in Fiscal Year 2007, the overall pattern of results lend further weight to the point that USAID raised in last year's Annual Report – that current law imposes too low a threshold for being “very poor.”¹⁶ This very narrow definition makes it impossible for USAID to allocate its microfinance and microenterprise funding so as to

¹⁵ In computing this average, the weights are set equal to the percentage of total funds used for microfinance and enterprise development.

¹⁶ For example, the \$1 per day line is less than 10 percent of the current poverty line in the United States.

reach the legislative target of directing 50 percent of the benefits of microenterprise funding to the “very poor,” without undermining other goals emphasized in the same legislation, such as sustainability and support for broad-based economic growth. Unfortunately, this definition of being “very poor” was adopted without any evidence that a 50 percent FVP target based on this definition could be reached. Two years of results using the poverty assessment tools strongly suggest that the target *cannot* be reached without inflicting undesirable side effects on sustainability and economic development. In short, USAID sees no realistic prospect of reaching the target contained in the law, and urges prompt and serious consideration of changes in the law.

As matters stand, USAID sees no promising options for meeting the FVP target. It cannot do so by reallocating funds among its existing partners, because with the exception of one small program, none had more than 50 percent “very poor” clients. It cannot do so by shifting funds to established microenterprise organizations that are not already receiving USAID funding, because few if any such organizations are voluntarily applying the USAID-certified poverty assessment tools, and no such organization has offered solid evidence that it has more than 50 percent “very poor” clients. Likewise, with hundreds of millions of dollars at stake, offering to shift substantial funding to newly emergent microenterprise organizations based on unverifiable claims that they are reaching large numbers of “very poor” clients might create an unintended incentive for some organizations to manipulate data to gain access to funding.

Finally, USAID discourages its partner organizations from using the kinds of poverty assessment methods required by the legislation to screen out potential clients who are “not poor enough.” This position is based on three considerations. First, whereas low-cost poverty assessment methods like the USAID Poverty Assessment Tools (PATs) and the Grameen Foundation’s Progress Out of Poverty Index (PPI) can achieve reasonable accuracy in assessing the poverty status of a large group of clients (e.g., 300 households), they are highly inaccurate in assessing the poverty

status of *individual* households. Second, placing responsibility for screening potential clients in the hands of individual fieldworkers or loan officers creates strong incentives to manipulate client data in an effort to conform with the institution’s policy, potentially making the resulting data highly unreliable. There is strong circumstantial evidence that such misreporting is common in practice, and little reason to believe that it can be avoided.¹⁷ Third, the great majority of clients served by USAID-supported microenterprise programs *are* very poor, at least in commonly used terms: their families suffer high rates of infant and child mortality and malnutrition, their life expectancy is low, and very few have access to formal financial services. It seems hard to justify excluding potential clients like these from USAID-supported programs because they earn a few pennies more than a dollar a day, especially for programs that seek to support sustained progress out of poverty.

USAID strongly believes that microenterprise organizations should use appropriate methods to assess the socioeconomic conditions of their clients, and that low-cost poverty assessment tools can play a useful role in helping them do so. Unfortunately, the law as currently written fails to set a feasible target for outreach to the very poor, by defining “very poor” too narrowly and by adopting too high a target for the percentage of “very poor” clients so defined. This situation is reflected both in the results from USAID partners reported in this Annual Report, and in the continuing failure of microfinance and microenterprise organizations not funded by USAID to document major programs with more than 50 percent “very poor” clients, based on rigorous measurement of clients’ living standards against the \$1/day line or a similarly low poverty line as required by current law.

¹⁷ See for instance “A Critique of Grameen Bank II’s Means Test for Membership,” MicroSave Briefing Note on Grameen II #9, 2000. A 2009 working paper from the Center for Global Development, “The Impact of Microcredit on the Poor in Bangladesh: Revisiting the Evidence,” by Jonathan Morduch and David Roodman, offers further evidence that screening mechanisms intended to limit program access to very poor households tend to be ignored in practice, even among highly reputable MFIs.

Shifting the focus of USAID’s poverty assessment tools to more realistic poverty lines, developed in collaboration with the microenterprise community and Congress, would enable USAID to better target its programs toward the very poor. For its part, USAID will endeavor to ensure that its microfinance and microenterprise programs benefit the greatest possible share of very poor clients, consistent with the need to ensure financial sustainability among USAID-supported microfinance institutions and impact and cost-effectiveness among its enterprise development programs.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 7

NUMBER OF VERY POOR REACHED

The Microenterprise for Self-Reliance Act directs USAID to use the poverty assessment tools called for in that Act to estimate the number of very poor clients who benefit from USAID microenterprise programs.

As noted in the previous section, the partner institutions that applied the certified poverty assessment tools together received approximately one-fifth of USAID microenterprise funding in FY 2008. Using those partners’ reported results to estimate the total number of very poor clients reached by all USAID-funded microenterprise partners requires assuming that the share of very poor clients of all partner institutions resembles that of the partners that applied the poverty assessment tools.

For USAID-supported microfinance institutions, multiplying the 28.5 percent share of “very poor” microfinance clients, calculated from the poverty assessment tool data, by the total number of borrowers from all supported MFIs – 4.14 million – implies that approximately 1.18 million very poor clients directly benefited from USAID funding for microfinance in FY 2008.

For enterprise development programs, the most useful approach is to include both owners and employees of microenterprises benefiting from USAID enterprise development programs. On that basis, such programs directly benefited approximately 400,000 very poor people. Combining these two estimates yields an overall estimate of approximately 1.58 million very

poor people who directly benefited from USAID microenterprise programs in FY 2008.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 8

POVERTY ASSESSMENT TOOLS

The MRAA requires this report to address:

- “The process of developing and applying poverty assessment procedures required under section 254 [the section of the law outlining the requirement for USAID to develop client poverty assessment tools and require their use by awardees by October 2006].”

The legislative background that culminated in the development and management of USAID’s Poverty Assessment Tools (PATs) is reviewed under Reporting Requirement 6. Congress required that USAID develop the PATs to allow USAID-supported microenterprise development institutions to measure the share of their clients who are very poor, and to monitor USAID’s fulfillment of the mandate that at least half of USAID microenterprise funding should benefit the very poor. Amendments to the 2000 Act linked this mandate to a very narrow standard of being “very poor” – living on less than \$1 a day at Purchasing Power Parity (PPP), or among the poorest half of those living below the national poverty line. At the time this new standard was adopted, no microenterprise institution was using credible assessment tools, calibrated against a similar standard, to measure and report extreme poverty among its clients. As a result, neither USAID nor the microenterprise community had a clear basis for judging whether or not it would be possible to achieve the poverty targeting mandate once linked to the new standard of extreme poverty. As stressed under Reporting Requirement 6, subsequent results strongly suggest that the standard adopted in the law was too narrow.

The amended 2000 Act called for USAID to develop and certify at least two “low-cost methods” for measuring extreme poverty by October 2004. As explained in last year’s Annual Report, this deadline could not be met, because poverty assessment tools

that meet the law's requirements must be developed and tested on a country-by-country basis, using country-specific data. In particular, each USAID-certified poverty assessment tool has been developed through statistical analysis of data drawn from an integrated household budget survey for the country in question, to identify which household characteristics are most highly correlated with extreme poverty in that country.

In developing poverty assessment tools, USAID has prioritized those countries with the highest levels of USAID microenterprise funding. Priorities are further refined by the availability of recent household survey data, allowing tools to be developed relatively quickly. Developing tools for countries where household survey data are not already available requires that USAID gather the data itself. Because doing so is very time-consuming and expensive, USAID has treated it as a last resort. Moreover, security conditions or government policy make it impossible to collect household survey data in some countries with substantial USAID microenterprise programs, notably Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan, Lebanon, and Egypt.

By September 30, 2008 – the deadline for use in gathering poverty data for this Annual Report -- USAID had developed and certified poverty assessment tools for 26 countries, which together accounted for 45 percent of USAID microenterprise funding for programs in specific countries, and 61 percent of such funding excluding the five “out of reach” countries cited above. These 26 tools provide the basis for the estimates of Funds Benefiting the Very Poor contained in Sections 6 and 7. USAID sought poverty assessment data from all partner institutions that spent at least \$100,000 in USAID microenterprise support in FY 2008 in any of those 26 countries. Several of those partners sought and received waivers from reporting, including some focused on policy reform and others that had already completed operations and withdrawn their project personnel from the country in question. USAID expects to achieve better coverage in the future by taking advantage of forward-looking funding data.

During FY 2008 and into FY 2009, USAID continued to develop and certify country-specific poverty assessment tools, including one based on an in-country household survey carried out in Liberia. USAID also provided training to ensure that affected partner institutions can use those tools to gather the required information, and launched a new online training module to permit USAID partners and other microenterprise organizations to gain the skills needed to apply the PATs from anywhere in the world. USAID expects that the total number of countries with certified tools will reach 29 by September 30, 2009. If those expectations are realized, USAID-certified poverty assessment tools should cover countries accounting for 72 percent of projected FY 2009 USAID microenterprise funding in specific countries, excluding the five noted above.¹⁸

Poverty assessment tools have already been developed in most countries with substantial USAID microenterprise funding and available household surveys. Therefore, future progress will increasingly require USAID to conduct its own household surveys, in especially challenging environments, at roughly five times the cost per country required to produce tools using existing survey data. This will slow the further expansion of country coverage. Meanwhile, in addition to further efforts to develop new country tools, USAID intends to work to improve existing tools so that they provide microenterprise organizations as much information about their clients as possible, rather than focusing only on generating the single number of percent of very poor clients, as required by the law. By providing organizations with more useful information about their clients, USAID hopes to promote greater voluntary use of the poverty assessment tools.

¹⁸ Funding patterns shift from one year to another, which will also change the share of microenterprise funding going to countries with certified poverty assessment tools.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 9

FUNDS TO ASSIST VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING AND EXPLOITATION

The MRAA requires USAID to report information from its missions on their efforts to ensure that recipients of USAID microenterprise and microfinance development assistance work closely with NGOs and foreign governments to identify and assist victims of potential or severe forms of trafficking in persons and women who are victims of or susceptible to other forms of exploitation and violence. Table 6 shows, by USAID Regional Bureau, microenterprise funding obligated to microenterprise institutions targeting these groups.

In FY 2008, the total value of such funding increased from the level reported in FY 2007. This is largely due to the substantial increase in such funds in the Europe & Eurasia region. Armenia obligated \$1.8 million to programs assisting these beneficiaries. Serbia showed the largest amount of such funding in the region with \$4.6 million. The notable decline in centrally funded programs meeting this criteria is mainly due to the Office of Democracy and Governance’s Supporting Transformation by Reducing Insecurity and Vulnerability with Economic Strengthening (STRIVE) program continuing operations under FY 2007 obligations with no new FY 2008 obligation.

Other missions that reported funding for partners serving these groups in FY 2008 include the Democratic Republic of Congo, Rwanda and Senegal in the Africa region; Mongolia, Pakistan and the Regional Development Mission in the Asia region; Belarus, Kosovo, Moldova and Ukraine in the Europe and Eurasia region; and Jordan in the Middle East Region.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 10

POVERTY AND RACE/ETHNICITY

The MRAA requires that USAID report “[a]n estimate of the percentage of beneficiaries of assistance under this title in countries where a strong relationship between poverty and race or ethnicity has been demonstrated.” MRR requested information in FY 2008 from USAID field missions in relation to this requirement. Table 7 reports on the number of microenterprise clients in countries where missions cite a relationship between poverty and race or ethnicity.

The number of borrowers and savers in countries where this relationship was reported dropped significantly in FY 2008 from FY 2007. This can be largely attributed to absence of reporting from a microfinance program in Mexico that ended in FY 2007. Conversely, in FY 2008 the overall numbers of enterprise development clients in countries reported to

Table 6. USAID Microenterprise Funding to Assist Victims of Trafficking and Exploitation, FY 2008 (U.S.\$ millions)

Bureau	Financial Services & Related Enabling Environment	Enterprise Development & Related Enabling Environment	Total
Asia	\$1.0	\$0.3	\$1.3
Europe & Eurasia	\$0.6	\$6.2	\$6.8
Middle East	-	\$0.1	\$0.1
Sub-Saharan Africa	\$0.15	\$0.12	\$0.27
Centrally Funded	-	\$0.52	\$0.52
Total	\$1.75	\$7.24	\$8.99

Table 7. Estimated Number of Clients in Countries Where a Relationship Has Been Demonstrated Between Poverty and Race or Ethnicity

Region	Country	Borrowers	Savers	Enterprise Development Clients
Asia	Nepal	9,524	17,323	22,654
	Tibet	90	-	180
Europe and Eurasia	Kazakhstan	35,785	-	-
	Montenegro	-	-	398
	Serbia	-	-	75
Latin America and the Caribbean Basin	Bolivia	-	-	28,239
	Colombia	426,529	146,148	37,852
	Ecuador	-	-	4,615
	Guatemala	4,071	4,071	562
	Mexico	569,032	378,474	13
	Peru	99,533	5,564	1,554
Sub-Saharan Africa	Mali	-	-	7,800
	Nigeria	-	-	447
Total		1,144,564	551,580	104,389

have a relationship between poverty and race or ethnicity increased by over 77,000. The largest increases were in Bolivia, Colombia, Nepal and Mali.

REPORTING REQUIREMENT I I

PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM

Several provisions of the MRAA address performance monitoring:

1. “The monitoring system shall include performance goals for the assistance and express such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the extent feasible.”
2. “The monitoring system shall include performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the achievement of the performance goals described in paragraph (1) and the objective of the assistance authorized under section 252 [of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended].”
3. “The monitoring system provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to the assistance to enhance the sustainability and the impact of the assistance, particularly the

impact of such assistance on the very poor, particularly poor women.”

4. “The monitoring system adopts the widespread use of proven and effective poverty assessment tools to successfully identify the very poor and ensure that they receive adequate access to microenterprise loans, savings, and assistance.”

Table 8 shows the performance goals and indicators that USAID set for FY 2008, along with reported results.

On a worldwide basis, USAID and its implementing partners strongly exceeded the Agency’s goals in most, but not all areas.

USAID-supported microfinance programs exceeded the Agency’s goals for total number of borrowers and for targeting rural clients and women. The share of MFIs achieving full financial sustainability exceeded USAID’s goal, rising substantially from FY 2007. USAID’s Microfinance program did not reach the goal for number of savers. This is largely due to the loss of nearly one million savers reported last year under a now expired agreement with a large finance company in Ethiopia as well as the loss of 1.2 million savers

related to the expired agreement in Mexico cited under Reporting Requirement 10.

USAID exceeded all of its performance goals for enterprise development, with the exception of

percentage of funds benefiting the very poor, discussed in detail under Reporting Requirement 6. The number of microenterprises assisted and number of employees were areas of especially strong performance.

Table 8. Performance Goals and Results, FY 2008

	FY 2008 Results	FY 2008 Goal
Microfinance		
Borrowers	4.14 million	4 million
Savers	2.74 million	4 million
Women Clients	62%	60%
Rural Clients	63%	40%
Funds Benefiting the Very Poor		
Per Poverty Assessment Tools	28.5%	
Per Poverty Loan Proxy	22%	50%
Financially Sustainable MFIs	75%	50%
Enterprise Development		
Microenterprises Assisted	791,000	250,000
Owners and Employees of Microenterprises Assisted	1.5 million	750,000
Women Clients	36%	30%
Rural Clients	91%	75%
Funds Benefiting the Very Poor		
Per Poverty Assessment Tools	26%	
Per Poverty Loan Proxy	30%	50%

REPORTING REQUIREMENT 12

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

In FY 2008 USAID funded its Microenterprise Development Office (MD), leveraged investments to meet the evolving and diverse needs for microenterprise development around the world, and supported key central programs designed to promote innovation and strengthen the ability of its missions and partners to meet the Agency's development objectives.

LEVERAGING INVESTMENTS IN MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT

USAID's investments in microenterprise development have stimulated a diversity of effective approaches, capable partners, strong local service providers, and responsive funding mechanisms to meet evolving needs for microenterprise development around the world. In FY 2008, USAID continued to leverage these investments to address new development challenges, reach out to poorer and more vulnerable populations, and build the capacity of partner institutions to sustain and grow beyond USAID support.

In continuing its use of credit guarantees to bolster additional sources of support for microenterprise development, USAID spent \$7.3 million to leverage \$286.4 million in private financing for microenterprises and microfinance institutions since FY 2002 through USAID's Development Credit Authority (DCA). In FY 2008, USAID partnered with ten private financial institutions in eight countries. USAID also created a partnership with Oikocredit, a global lender to microfinance institutions, to reach microenterprises worldwide.

Not only did USAID form these partnerships in 2008, but credit has already been extended. Through USAID's partnership with Microfinance International Corporation (MFIC), USAID is providing credit guarantees to two microfinance institutions in El Salvador for an innovative transnational housing loan program. By collaborating with the Financial Sector Deepening Trust of Kenya, a partnership of bilateral and multilateral donors, USAID was able to quickly

implement a credit guarantee to stimulate \$10 million in loans to microfinance institutions in response to Kenya's post-election crisis of 2007. The guarantee enabled microfinance institutions facing liquidity issues to access financing and continue to service households and microenterprises crippled by the violence following the election.

USAID also leverages its investments through its state-of-the-art microenterprise knowledge management program and web site, www.microLINKS.org, which connects practitioners with each other and sources the latest learning in microenterprise development. This investment facilitates collaboration and peer assistance to identify promising innovations, refine and disseminate lessons learned and best practices, and adapt them for application in the field. Through a state-of-the-art, award-winning program of facilitated learning networks, virtual conferences and communities of practice, audio interviews with leading experts, and in-person seminars enhanced by virtual access, the Agency brings its technical leadership to bear on microenterprise activities well beyond those that it directly supports.

KEY CENTRAL PROGRAMS

This year the Agency increased its efforts to capture data from more cross-cutting programs in such technical areas as health, agriculture and natural resource management. For example, for the first time the Office of Population and Reproductive Health in the Bureau for Global Health reported on \$1.4 million to support increased access to financing for the private health sector in order to expand the range and quality of services available, as well as extended services to poor or rural communities. The Office of Natural Resources Management invested over \$1 million to support microenterprise development components of projects in sustainable tourism, property rights and resource governance, conservation and knowledge management. The Office of Democracy and Governance continued its support of poor and vulnerable populations through the STRIVE program and a new program targeting the disabled in the Philippines.

In FY 2008, USAID's microenterprise specialists provided on-site assistance to field programs and missions including those in Albania, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya, Kosovo, Mozambique, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Uganda. Combined with extensive virtual assistance to other countries, this centralized technical assistance helps ensure the effectiveness of the Agency's microenterprise development strategies and programs. An example of this assistance is the work performed by the Microenterprise Development Office (MD) for the USAID Egypt Mission. At their request, the MD Office sent a three person team to review the microfinance sector and ongoing mission programs, and produce a detailed "Egypt Microfinance Assessment." The document described the current state of the sector, one of the largest

USAID-supported programs worldwide, and gave key and detailed recommendations on how to expand and scale up the program, by shifting to commercial capital and engaging the formal financial sector. The Mission is now designing these new activities.

A final central function involves management of the MRR system itself. This year marked a milestone for the Agency's microenterprise data collection system as USAID began the process to modernize and rebuild the database system and on-line user interface. When completed by the end of this fiscal year, the system will provide faster and more expansive access to MRR results data and will improve the overall data collection, validation and reporting process. The new system was applied during the Mission data collection cycle, while the implementing partner interface will be completed later this year.

ANNEX A: FY 2008 FUNDING BY MISSION, PARTNER, AND TECHNICAL AREA

**Annex A was generated from the MRR database with data current as of June 2009.
MRR is a live system that can be updated by missions at any time.**

Annex A: FY 2008 FUNDING BY MISSION, PARTNER, AND TECHNICAL AREA

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
ASIA BUREAU			
Afghanistan	Academy for Educational Development	Financial Services	\$39,732,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$16,014,278
	UN HABITAT	Enterprise Development	\$3,770,980
	UN HABITAT	Financial Services	\$2,262,588
Total Afghanistan			\$61,779,846
Cambodia	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$5,000,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$1,301,565
	Total Cambodia		
East Timor	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$750,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$250,000
	Total East Timor		
India	ACDI/VOCA	Enterprise Development	\$195,000
	World Vision Inc.	Financial Services	\$805,000
	Total India		
Indonesia	Development Alternatives, Inc./SENADA	Policy for Financial Services	\$780,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc./AMARTA	Enterprise Development	\$800,000
	Total Indonesia		
Kazakhstan	CAMFA II Central Asian Microfinance Alliance	Policy for Financial Services	\$223,000
	Pragma Corporation/BEI	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$82,000
	Pragma Corporation/Kazakhstan Small Business Development Project	Enterprise Development	\$490,500
	Total Kazakhstan		
Kyrgyzstan	CAMFA II Central Asian Microfinance Alliance	Financial Services	\$448,000
	Chemonics International, Inc./Land Reform and Development Project	Enterprise Development	\$80,554
	Chemonics International, Inc./Land Reform and Development Project	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$8,950
	Pragma Corporation/BEI	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Winrock International	Enterprise Development	\$81,200
	Total Kyrgyzstan		
Mongolia	Chemonics International, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$1,425,000
	Mercy Corps International	Enterprise Development	\$2,000,000
	Total Mongolia		
Nepal	Agreement Pending	Financial Services	\$2,500,000
	World Education Incorporated	Financial Services	\$322,000
	Winrock International	Enterprise Development	\$1,250,000
	Total Nepal		
Pakistan	Khushhalibank	Financial Services	\$1,500,000
	Shorebank International Ltd.	Financial Services	\$1,000,000
	Total Pakistan		

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
Philippines	Chemonics International, Inc.	Financial Services	\$648,765
	Microenterprise Support	Financial Services	\$51,235
Total Philippines			\$700,000
RDM/A	PACT	Enterprise Development	\$860,000
	The Bridge Fund	Enterprise Development	\$134,000
	Tibet Poverty Alleviation Fund	Enterprise Development	\$300,000
	The Mountain Institute	Enterprise Development	\$350,000
	Winrock International	Enterprise Development	\$150,000
Total RDM/A			\$1,794,000
Tajikistan	CAMFA II Central Asian Microfinance Alliance	Policy for Financial Services	\$25,100
	Chemonics International, Inc./Land Reform and Development Project	Enterprise Development	\$118,526
	Chemonics International, Inc./Land Reform and Development Project	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$13,170
	Development Alternatives, Inc./AgLinks	Enterprise Development	\$503,113
	Pragma Corporation/BEI	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$92,500
	Winrock International	Enterprise Development	\$190,000
Total Tajikistan			\$942,409
Uzbekistan	Development Alternatives, Inc./AgLinks	Enterprise Development	\$323,100
Total Uzbekistan			\$323,100
Total Asia Bureau			\$87,032,124

EUROPE & EURASIA BUREAU

Albania	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$970,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc. - AAC project	Enterprise Development	\$630,000
Total Albania			\$1,600,000
Armenia	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development	Enterprise Development	\$300,000
	Emerging Markets	Policy for Financial Services	\$400,000
	Nathan Associates	Enterprise Development	\$1,100,000
Total Armenia			\$1,800,000
Azerbaijan	ACDI/VOCA	Financial Services	\$500,000
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$2,696,000
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$1,024,406
Total Azerbaijan			\$4,220,406
Belarus	Eurasia Foundation	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$50,000
	International Organization for Migration	Enterprise Development	\$76,500
Total Belarus			\$126,500
Bosnia	Chemonics International, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$2,900,000
Total Bosnia			\$2,900,000
Croatia	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$90,000
Total Croatia			\$90,000
EE Bureau	SEGURA	Enterprise Development	\$160,000

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
	Total EE Bureau		\$160,000
Georgia	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development Policy for Enterprise Development	\$23,200 \$48,092
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$4,308
	Community Habitat Finance International	Enterprise Development	\$1,041,670
	International Executive Service Corps	Enterprise Development	\$1,289,830
	International Executive Service Corps	Financial Services	\$25,000
	Winrock International	Enterprise Development	\$475,000
	Total Georgia		\$2,907,100
Kosovo	Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$1,500,000
	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$700,000
	BearingPoint, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$2,900,000
	International Organization for Migration	Enterprise Development	\$100,000
	International Research and Exchange Board	Enterprise Development	\$475,000
	Mercy Corps International	Enterprise Development	\$400,000
	Total Kosovo		\$6,275,000
Macedonia	ARD Inc.	Enterprise Development Policy for Enterprise Development	\$378,000 \$228,000
	Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$129,000
	Carana Corporation	Financial Services	\$71,000
	Carana Corporation	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$111,580
	Microenterprise Support	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$400,000
	World Learning for International Development		
	Total Macedonia		\$1,317,580
Moldova	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$185,999
	Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs	Enterprise Development	\$223,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc./Nathan Group	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$625,000
	International Research and Exchange Board	Enterprise Development	\$380,000
	United Nations Development Programme	Enterprise Development	\$186,001
	Total Moldova		\$1,600,000
Montenegro	Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$1,000,000
	Total Montenegro		\$1,000,000
Russia	ACDI/VOCA	Financial Services	\$1,100,000
	International Rescue Committee	Enterprise Development	\$1,059,963
	Total Russia		\$2,159,963
Serbia	BearingPoint, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$202,000
	Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$600,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$3,781,000
	Total Serbia		\$4,583,000
Ukraine	Abt Associates, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$294,400
	Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$37,000
	Chemonics International, Inc.-LED	Enterprise Development	\$75,146
	Commercial Law Center	Policy for Financial Services	\$262,019
	Eurasia Foundation	Enterprise Development	\$461,700

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
	Eurasia Foundation	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$78,300
	Financial Markets International Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$450,000
	International Organization for Migration	Enterprise Development	\$60,000
	Pragma Corporation	Financial Services	\$750,000
	Total Ukraine		\$2,468,565
	Total Europe and Eurasia Bureau		\$33,208,114

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN BUREAU			
Bolivia	ACDI/VOCA	Enterprise Development	\$1,750,327
	Adventist Development and Relief Agency	Enterprise Development	\$68,878
	CARE	Enterprise Development	\$209,048
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$2,132,538
	Conservation International	Enterprise Development	\$185,840
	Food for the Hungry International	Enterprise Development	\$378,300
	Fundacion para el Desarrollo de Tecnologia Agropecuaria	Enterprise Development	\$206,000
	Save the Children Federation, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$204,050
	World Council of Credit Unions, Inc.	Financial Services	\$784,000
		Total Bolivia	
Brazil	TransFair USA	Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Total Brazil		\$200,000
Colombia	Associates in Rural Development, Inc./ADAM	Enterprise Development	\$27,643,000
	Associates in Rural Development, Inc./ADAM	Financial Services	\$2,147,224
	Associates in Rural Development, Inc./MIDAS Program	Enterprise Development	\$4,119,375
	Associates in Rural Development, Inc./MIDAS Program	Financial Services	\$1,800,000
	Associates in Rural Development, Inc./MIDAS Program	Policy for Financial Services	\$470,000
	Panamerican Development Foundation	Enterprise Development	\$3,752,401
		Total Colombia	
CRP	North-South Institute Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$106,000
	Total CRP		\$106,000
Ecuador	ACDI/VOCA Academy for Educational Development Joint Venture	Enterprise Development	\$1,806,000
	Carana Corporation	Enterprise Development	\$373,000
	Total Ecuador		\$2,179,000
El Salvador	Aid to Artisans	Enterprise Development	\$405,000
	Fintrac Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$1,831,349
	Total El Salvador		\$2,236,349
Guatemala	Catholic Relief Services	Enterprise Development	\$53,712
	Save the Children Federation, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$26,602
	Save the Children Federation, Inc.	Financial Services	\$17,725
	SHARE	Enterprise Development	\$274,267
	Total Guatemala		\$372,306

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
Guyana	Carana Corporation	Enterprise Development Policy for Enterprise Development	\$245,000
	Carana Corporation		\$10,000
	Total Guyana		\$255,000
Haiti	Development Alternatives, Inc./MSME	Financial Services	\$2,384,000
	Total Haiti		\$2,384,000
Jamaica	Citizens Development Corps	Enterprise Development	\$400,000
	Management Systems International Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$699,000
	Microenterprise Support	Enterprise Development	\$266,000
	USDA Forest Service International Programs	Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Total Jamaica		\$1,565,000
Mexico	Abt Associates Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$225,878
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Financial Services	\$1,961,366
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$367,756
	Microenterprise Support	Financial Services	\$400,000
	Total Mexico		\$2,955,000
Nicaragua	Catholic Relief Services	Financial Services	\$240,367
	Total Nicaragua		\$240,367
Panama	International Resources Group/ TETRA TECH Joint Venture	Enterprise Development	\$401,201
			\$401,201
Paraguay	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$700,000
	Total Paraguay		\$700,000
Peru	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$4,700,000
	Total Peru		\$4,700,000
	Total Latin America & Caribbean Bureau		\$64,145,204

MIDDLE EAST BUREAU			
Egypt	Chemonics International, Inc.	Financial Services	\$2,268,000
	First Microfinance Foundation	Financial Services	\$1,115,000
	Total Egypt		\$3,383,000
Iraq	Louis Berger Group / The Services Group Joint Venture	Financial Services	\$6,250,000
	Total Iraq		\$6,250,000
Jordan	AECOM International Development	Enterprise Development	\$100,000
	Total Jordan		\$100,000
Lebanon	Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$4,494,932
	Relief International	Enterprise Development	\$990,000
	Relief International	Financial Services	\$530,000
	Total Lebanon		\$6,014,932
West Bank /Gaza	Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$2,000,000
	Academy for Educational Development	Financial Services	\$4,750,000
	Carana Corporation	Enterprise Development	\$3,000,000
	Total West Bank/Gaza		\$9,750,000
	Total Middle East Bureau		\$25,497,932

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA BUREAU			
Angola	Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs	Enterprise Development	\$419,061
	Cooperative League of the United States	Enterprise Development	\$250,000
	Total Angola		\$669,061
Democratic Republic of the Congo	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture	Enterprise Development	\$1,383,979
	Partners Acting Together	Financial Services	\$150,000
	Total DR Congo		\$1,533,979
Ethiopia	Abt Associates (Formerly IBM)	Financial Services	\$100,000
	Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$500,000
	CARE	Enterprise Development	\$141,488
	Land O'Lakes	Enterprise Development	\$132,000
	Save the Children Federation Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$892,784
	Total Ethiopia		\$1,766,272
Ghana	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$2,650,000
	TechnoServe	Enterprise Development	\$2,392,000
	Total Ghana		\$5,042,000
Kenya	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$1,120,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$700,000
	Land O'Lakes, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$430,000
	Total Kenya		\$2,250,000
Liberia	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$1,880,000
	Total Liberia		\$1,880,000
Madagascar	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$100,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Total Madagascar		\$300,000
Malawi	Catholic Relief Services	Enterprise Development	\$485,000
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Financial Services	\$352,000
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$352,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$600,000
	Land O'Lakes, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$100,000
	Project Concern International	Enterprise Development	\$98,000
	Total Malawi		\$1,987,000
Mali	Abt Associates Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Trickle Up	Enterprise Development	\$300,000
	Total Mali		\$500,000
Mozambique	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$800,000
	Agreement Pending	Financial Services	\$150,000
	Confederation of Business Associations of Mozambique	Policy for Financial Services	\$50,000
	Total Mozambique		\$1,000,000
Namibia	Project HOPE	Financial Services	\$1,585,140
	Total Namibia		\$1,585,140
Nigeria	Abt Associates Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$141,010
	Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$129,990
	Agreement Pending	Policy for Enterprise	\$675,000

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
		Development	
	Chemonics International, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$750,000
	Microenterprise Support	Enterprise Development	\$75,000
	Total Nigeria		\$1,771,000
Rwanda	ACDI/VOCA	Enterprise Development	\$100,000
	International Resources Group	Enterprise Development	\$50,000
	Total Rwanda		\$150,000
Senegal	Counterpart International	Enterprise Development	\$22,700
	International Resources Group	Enterprise Development	\$1,600,000
	Total Senegal		\$1,622,700
Sierra Leone	ACDI/VOCA	Financial Services	\$50,000
	Total Sierra Leone		\$50,000
South Africa	Corporate Council on Africa	Enterprise Development	\$500,000
	Total South Africa		\$500,000
Sudan	Academy for Educational Development	Financial Services	\$4,615,000
	Total Sudan		\$4,615,000
Tanzania	ACDI/VOCA	Enterprise Development	\$816,348
	Africare/Ugalla Community Conservation Project	Enterprise Development	\$166,000
	African Wildlife Foundation	Enterprise Development	\$200,000
	Catholic Relief Services	Enterprise Development	\$50,000
	Enterprise Works	Enterprise Development	\$150,000
	Fintrac, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$370,000
	Microenterprise Support	Enterprise Development	\$217,652
	Microenterprise Support	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$30,000
	Total Tanzania		\$2,000,000
Uganda	Agreement Pending	Enterprise Development	\$23,000
	Associates in Rural Development	Enterprise Development	\$1,050,000
	Heifer Project International	Enterprise Development	\$500,000
	Total Uganda		\$1,573,000
USAID/East Africa	Catholic Relief Services	Enterprise Development	\$95,755
	Total USAID/East Africa		\$95,755
Zambia	Cooperative League of the United States	Enterprise Development	\$600,000
	Cooperative League of the United States	Financial Services	\$140,000
	Total Zambia		\$740,000
	Total Sub-Saharan Africa Bureau		\$31,630,907

CENTRAL FUNDING

Office of Democracy and Governance	Handicap International	Enterprise Development	\$518,750
	Mercy Corps International	Enterprise Development	\$210,000
	Total - Office of Democracy and Governance		\$728,750

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT	
Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation	ACDI/VOCA	Enterprise Development	\$420,300	
	Cooperative Housing Foundation	Enterprise Development	\$303,180	
	National Cooperative Business Association/Communications Cooperative International	Enterprise Development	\$58,713	
	National Cooperative Business Association	Enterprise Development	\$17,500	
	The Americas Association of Cooperative/Mutual Insurance Societies	Enterprise Development	\$664,864	
	The Americas Association of Cooperative/Mutual Insurance Societies	Policy for Financial Services	\$45,000	
	World Council of Credit Unions, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$359,642	
	World Council of Credit Unions, Inc.	Financial Services	\$155,806	
	World Council of Credit Unions, Inc.	Policy for Financial Services	\$32,927	
	Total - Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation			\$2,057,932
	Office of Microenterprise Development	ACDI/VOCA	Enterprise Development	\$750,000
		Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$350,000
Center for Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector		Financial Services	\$350,000	
Center for Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector		Policy for Enterprise Development	\$50,000	
Center for Institutional Reform and the Informal Sector		Policy for Financial Services	\$79,878	
Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest		Policy for Financial Services	\$300,000	
Institute for Liberty and Democracy		Policy for Enterprise Development	\$3,379,000	
Microenterprise Support		Enterprise Development	\$412,795	
Microenterprise Support		Financial Services	\$687,992	
Microenterprise Support		Policy for Enterprise Development	\$137,598	
Microenterprise Support		Policy for Financial Services	\$137,598	
The QED Group, LLC		Financial Services	\$2,295,363	
The QED Group, LLC		Policy for Enterprise Development	\$1,002,000	
The QED Group, LLC		Policy for Financial Services	\$2,582,443	
Total - Office of Microenterprise Development			\$12,514,667	
Office of Natural Resources Management		Academy for Educational Development	Enterprise Development	\$100,000
		Associates in Rural Development	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$341,000
	Development Alternatives, Inc.	Enterprise Development	\$43,000	

MISSION OR OFFICE	IMPLEMENTING PARTNER	TECHNICAL AREA	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
	Microenterprise Support	Enterprise Development	\$186,000
	Wildlife Conservation Society	Enterprise Development	\$50,000
	Wildlife Conservation Society	Policy for Financial Services	\$115,000
	World Wildlife Fund	Enterprise Development	\$175,000
	Total - Office of Natural Resources Management		\$1,010,000
Women in Development	Agreement Pending	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$39,680
	Development & Training Services, Inc.	Policy for Enterprise Development	\$144,687
	Total - Women in Development		\$184,367
Office of Population and Reproductive Health	Abt Associates (Formerly IBM)	Financial Services	\$1,370,000
	Total - Office of Population and Reproductive Health		\$1,370,000
	Total - Central Funding		\$17,865,716
	TOTAL FY08 FUNDING		\$259,379,997

ANNEX B: MICROENTERPRISE FUNDING BY USAID BUREAU, FY 2008

**Annex B was generated from the MRR database with data current as of June 2009.
MRR is a live system that can be updated by missions at any time.**

Annex B: MICROENTERPRISE FUNDING BY USAID BUREAU, FY 2008

MISSION OR OFFICE	ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	FINANCIAL SERVICES	POLICY FOR ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	POLICY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
ASIA BUREAU					
Afghanistan	\$19,785,258	\$41,994,588			\$61,779,846
Cambodia	\$5,000,000		\$1,301,565		\$6,301,565
East Timor	\$750,000		\$250,000		\$1,000,000
India	\$195,000	\$805,000			\$1,000,000
Indonesia	\$800,000			\$780,000	\$1,580,000
Kazakhstan	\$490,500		\$82,000	\$223,000	\$795,500
Kyrgyzstan	\$161,754	\$448,000	\$208,950		\$818,704
Mongolia	\$2,000,000		\$1,425,000		\$3,425,000
Nepal	\$1,250,000	\$2,822,000			\$4,072,000
Pakistan		\$2,500,000			\$2,500,000
Philippines		\$700,000			\$700,000
RDM/A	\$1,794,000				\$1,794,000
Tajikistan	\$811,639		\$105,670	\$25,100	\$942,409
Uzbekistan	\$323,100				\$323,100
Total Asia	\$33,361,251	\$49,269,588	\$3,373,185	\$1,028,100	\$87,032,124
EUROPE & EURASIA BUREAU					
Albania	\$1,600,000				\$1,600,000
Armenia	\$1,400,000			\$400,000	\$1,800,000
Azerbaijan	\$2,696,000	\$500,000	\$1,024,406		\$4,220,406
Belarus	\$76,500		\$50,000		\$126,500
Bosnia			\$2,900,000		\$2,900,000
Croatia	\$90,000				\$90,000
EE Bureau	\$160,000				\$160,000
Georgia	\$2,829,700	\$25,000	\$48,092	\$4,308	\$2,907,100
Kosovo	\$6,275,000				\$6,275,000
Macedonia	\$507,000	\$71,000	\$739,580		\$1,317,580
Moldova	\$975,000		\$625,000		\$1,600,000
Montenegro	\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000
Russia	\$1,059,963	\$1,100,000			\$2,159,963
Serbia	\$4,381,000			\$202,000	\$4,583,000
Ukraine	\$633,846	\$750,000	\$78,300	\$1,006,419	\$2,468,565
Total Europe & Eurasia	\$23,684,009	\$2,446,000	\$5,465,378	\$1,612,727	\$33,208,114
LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN BUREAU					
Bolivia	\$5,134,981	\$784,000			\$5,918,981
Brazil	\$200,000				\$200,000
Colombia	\$35,514,776	\$3,947,224		\$470,000	\$39,932,000
CRP	\$106,000				\$106,000
Ecuador	\$2,179,000				\$2,179,000
El Salvador	\$2,236,349				\$2,236,349
Guatemala	\$354,581	\$17,725			\$372,306
Guyana	\$245,000		\$10,000		\$255,000

MISSION OR OFFICE	ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	FINANCIAL SERVICES	POLICY FOR ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	POLICY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
Haiti		\$2,384,000			\$2,384,000
Jamaica	\$1,565,000				\$1,565,000
Mexico		\$2,361,366		\$593,634	\$2,955,000
Nicaragua		\$240,367			\$240,367
Panama	\$401,201				\$401,201
Paraguay	\$700,000				\$700,000
Peru	\$4,700,000				\$4,700,000
Total Latin America & Caribbean	\$53,336,888	\$9,734,682	\$10,000	\$1,063,634	\$64,145,204
MIDDLE EAST BUREAU					
Egypt		\$3,383,000			\$3,383,000
Iraq		\$6,250,000			\$6,250,000
Jordan	\$100,000				\$100,000
Lebanon	\$5,484,932	\$530,000			\$6,014,932
West Bank /Gaza	\$5,000,000	\$4,750,000			\$9,750,000
Total Middle East	\$10,584,932	\$14,913,000	\$0	\$0	\$25,497,932
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA BUREAU					
Angola	\$669,061				\$669,061
DR Congo	\$1,383,979	\$150,000			\$1,533,979
Ethiopia	\$1,666,272	\$100,000			\$1,766,272
Ghana	\$5,042,000				\$5,042,000
Kenya	\$1,550,000			\$700,000	\$2,250,000
Liberia	\$1,880,000				\$1,880,000
Madagascar	\$300,000				\$300,000
Malawi	\$1,283,000	\$352,000		\$352,000	\$1,987,000
Mali	\$500,000				\$500,000
Mozambique	\$800,000	\$150,000		\$50,000	\$1,000,000
Namibia		\$1,585,140			\$1,585,140
Nigeria	\$1,096,000		\$675,000		\$1,771,000
Rwanda	\$150,000				\$150,000
Senegal	\$1,622,700				\$1,622,700
Sierra Leone		\$50,000			\$50,000
South Africa	\$500,000				\$500,000
Sudan		\$4,615,000			\$4,615,000
Tanzania	\$1,970,000		\$30,000		\$2,000,000
Uganda	\$1,573,000				\$1,573,000
USAID/East Africa	\$95,755				\$95,755
Zambia	\$600,000	\$140,000			\$740,000
Total Sub-Saharan Africa	\$22,681,767	\$7,142,140	\$705,000	\$1,102,000	\$31,630,907

MISSION OR OFFICE	ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	FINANCIAL SERVICES	POLICY FOR ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT	POLICY FOR FINANCIAL SERVICES	OBLIGATION AMOUNT
CENTRAL FUNDING					
Democracy and Governance	\$728,750				\$728,750
Private Voluntary Cooperation	\$1,824,199	\$155,806		\$77,927	\$2,057,932
Microenterprise Development	\$1,162,795	\$3,333,355	\$4,918,598	\$3,099,919	\$12,514,667
Natural Resources Management	\$554,000		\$341,000	\$115,000	\$1,010,000
Women in Development			\$184,367		\$184,367
Population and Reproductive Health		\$1,370,000			\$1,370,000
Total Central Funding	\$4,269,744	\$4,859,161	\$5,443,965	\$3,292,846	\$17,865,716
TOTAL FUNDING	\$147,918,591	\$88,364,571	\$14,997,528	\$8,099,307	\$259,379,997

U.S. Agency for International Development

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

www.usaid.gov