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## SECTION I

## AN INTRODUCTION TO ATD ANALYSIS

Foreign aid, since its comparatively recent inception, continually has been the subject of polemics. Though volumes have been written concerning its rationale, implementation, burden, impact, etc., only recently, with the concept of grants economics, have assessments of economic aid on a quantitative subsidy basis been possible. These pioneering efforts have led the way toward a clearer understanding of foreign aid by identifying the real transfers involved.

The object of the following analysis is to ferret out the grant component of official United States economic aid to less-developed countries from 1953 to 1969. The United States is chosen due to availabillty of data and because U.S. aid historically has contributed over fifty percent of net global foreign aid. Economic aid is defined as "all flows to less-developed countries and multilateral institutions provided by governmental agencies,"1 which meet the two following tests:
a. their prime objective is to promote economic welfare and development in less-developed countries; and
b. their financial terms are intended to be concessional.
${ }^{1}$ O.E.C.D., Resources for the Developing World, Paris, 1970, p. 323.

## SECTION II

THE MODEL OF GRANTE ECONOMICS
"Grants economics identifies the bilateral exchange versus the unilateral transfer components in the varying admixture of market and nonmarket economic activity. "I A grant is an outright gift for which no repayment or favor is expected. Certain portions of U.S. aid are one hundred percent grant (e.g., Peace Corps expenditures, contributions to multinational organizations, surplus food donations, etc.). In addition, portions of development and Eximbanke loans, due to their varying concessionary terms, are conventionally labeled grants. A loan, however, at or above the prevailing market rate of interest and without concessions in repayment terms contains zero, or occasionally negative, percent grant. As the loan terms "soften" from this point, the proportion of grant increases, approaching one hundred percent. 3

Concessionary Pactors

The analysis of the grant equivalent embodied in foreign economic aid loans is the crux of this research. At the outset the
${ }^{1}$ Janos florvath, "On the Evaluation of International Grants Policy," Public Finance, No. 2, 1971, (forthcoming).
$2_{\text {ixport-Import Bank }}$ of the United States.
$3_{\text {But }}$ never reaching it as long as repaymont or some kind, regardless of how concessional ("soft"), is due.
contract terms to be considered are interest rates, years of maturity and moratorium (grace) periods. The basic formula proposed for the analysis was published by Professor Ohlin ${ }^{4}$ in 1966 and recently expanded by Professor Horvath. 5 This formula calculates the discounted present value of the loan principal and interest repayments. These repayments are deducted from the face value of the loan, resulting in the grant equivalent. The grant equivalent can be considered to be the resources sacrificed by the donor country because of its aid loan at comparetively "soft" terms as opposed to the return which could be earned if invested domestically. During the grace years, only interest is repaid. Interest and principal repayments are made during the remainder of the Loan (the interest during the grace and nongrace years may differ). Professor olin ${ }^{6}$ presents the grace years interest repayments as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{I}=\int_{0}^{G} i_{G} L e^{-d t} d t=\frac{\dot{i}_{G}}{d} L\left(I-e^{-d G}\right) \tag{I}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the nongrace years principal and interest repayments as:

$$
\begin{align*}
P_{2}= & \int_{G}^{T}\left[\frac{L}{T-G}+i_{T} L\left(1-\frac{t-G}{T-G}\right)\right] e^{-d T} d t= \\
& \frac{i_{T}}{d} I e^{-d G}+\left(1-\frac{i_{T}}{d}\right) L \frac{e^{-d G}-e^{-d T}}{d(T-G)} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

[^0]where
L. face value of loan

P present value
$i_{G}$ interest during grace years
$i_{T}$ interest during nongrace years
d comparative rate of discount (opportunity cost)
T maturity of loan (in years)
t individual years within the loan maturity
G grace period (in years)
e base of natural logarithm, 2.718
The grant ratio, $g$, is given as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
g=\frac{L-\left(P_{1}+P_{2}\right)}{I} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Inserting the $P_{1}$ and $P_{2}$ values,

$$
g=\frac{L-\left[\frac{i_{G}}{d} L\left(I-e^{-d G}\right)+\frac{i_{T}}{d} L e^{-d G}+\left(1-\frac{i_{T}}{d}\right) I \frac{e^{-d G}-e^{-d T}}{d(T-G)}\right](4)}{I}
$$

which reduces to,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g=1-\left[\frac{i_{G}}{d}\left(1-e^{-d G}\right)+\frac{i_{T}}{d} e^{-d G}+\left(1-\frac{i_{T}}{d}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{e^{-d G}-e^{-d T}}{d(T-G)}\right)\right] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

For example, a loan which has a l0-year grace period at $2 \%$ interest and a total maturity of 40 years at $3 \%$ interest (the $3 \%$ interest is applied to the last 30 years of the loan) and using a comparative discount rate (d) of $10 \%$ gives,

$$
g=1-\left[\frac{.02}{.10}\left(1-e^{-(.1) 10}\right)+\frac{.03}{.10} e^{-(.1) 10}+\left(1-\frac{.03}{.10}\right) \cdot\left(\frac{e^{-(.1) 10}-e^{-(.1) 40}}{.1(40-10)}\right)\right]
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =1-\left[.2\left(1-e^{-1}\right)+.3 e^{-1}+(1-.3) \cdot\left(\frac{e^{-1}-e^{-4}}{3}\right)\right] \\
& =1-\left[.2(1-0.357879)+.3(0.367879)+.7\left(\frac{0.367879-0.018316}{3}\right)\right] \\
& =1-[0.126424+0.110363+0.031554] \\
& =1-[0.318351]=0.6816 \text { (or } 68.16 \% \text { grant) }
\end{aligned}
$$

The discount rate of 10 is utilized throughout the following arialysis and represents the rate of return private investors want to earn in developing countries.? This rate also is used in Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (O. F.C.D.) calculations and, therefore, will provide a comparison basis.

## Trading Factors

To account for three additional factors which are inherent in grant ratio aralysis, Professor Horvath ${ }^{8}$ includes the following trading factors: (1) $s_{1}-$-tied aid; (2) $g_{2}-$ loans repayable in local currency; and (3) $\varepsilon_{3}$-surplus commodities.

1. The tying of aid to purchases in the donor country tends to reduce the aid value to the recipient. This results if the prices paid for equipment or commodities in the donor country are higher

7 John Fincus, "The Cost of Forejegn Aid," Review of Economics and Statistics, November, 1963, p. 361. Dr. Pincus also uses 5\% and 5-3/4/ to approximate the domestic opportunity cost and the World Bank Iending rate, respectively. (If the U.S. Treasury borrowing rate were utilized, the grant component would reflect the cost of foreign aid loans to the United States government. Due to periodic fluctuations in the discount rate, this latter procedure would result in varying grant ratios for similar loan terms.)

$$
8_{\text {Horvath }} \text { op. cit. }
$$

than world market prices, or if such equipment is designed inappropriately for the recipient's economy. 9 Because the recipient country cannot import comodities from the cheapest source, this extra cost clearly reduces the grant element of transfers. ${ }^{10}$ This computation can be done with the following general formula:

$$
g_{I}=\frac{P_{W}-P_{U . S}}{P_{W}} \times \text { percent of aid tied }
$$

where,
$P_{\mathrm{w}}$ the price index on the world market

$$
\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S} .} \quad \text { the U.S. price index }{ }^{I 1}
$$

Tied aid is, in a sense, a "negative grant" which is acceptable to recipient countries as "tied aid is better than no aia."l2 There are cases where the direct costs alone offset the concessionary value of the loan terms. The U.S. initiated tied aid to reduce balance of payments deficits. In 1958, when foreign aid-financed materials (except for Eximbank loans) could be purchased anywhere in the free world wherever the price was lowest, less than half of U.S. aid dollars were spent in American markets. Restrictions on such expenditures in

9 For a more complete discussion of the ramifications of aid tying, see I.M.D. Little and J.M. Clifford, International Aid: A Discussion of the Flow of Public Resources from Rich to Poor Countries, Chap. VII (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1966).
$10_{\text {The }}$ U.N. Conference on Trade and Development Secretariat has estimated that the reduction in the value of a loan due to tying is at least 10 to 20 percent.
${ }^{11}$ For the tied aid trading factor index calculation, see Appendix B, Table 1, p. 137.

$$
12_{\text {Ohlin, }} \text { op. cit., p. } 94
$$

foreign markets were imposed in late 1959. The balance of payments gain from tied aid, however, is less than the face value of the aid because, even if aid were offered untied, it is likely that the U.S. would sell at least a few commodities. The true U.S. gain is the difference between the exports resulting from tied aid and those exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid. 13 Forty percent of U.S. aid-financed, domestically purchased commodities is assumed to be attributable to equivalent amounts of aid, had it been offered on an untied basis. This percentage is a conservative assumption used because, in 1959, before aid-tying restrictions were initiated, and in the following two years, when a "backlash" is apparent, the percents of U.S. aid-financed commodities purchased domestically are 47.41c, 4I. $00^{\prime}$, and $44.17 \%$, respectively. Tied aid is defined as development loans under tying restrictions and all Eximbank loans. 14
2. Loan repayment terms may be offered in local currency. Since restrictions prevent the conversion of this currency to U.S. dollars (or any other currency), repayments eventually return to the recipient country. Specifically, the U.S. retains part of the proceeds for its own uses within the recipient country (e.g., payment of embassy personnel) and returns the remainder in the form of loans and grants. The O.E.C.D. treats local currency loans as grant-like-

[^1]flows which is technically inaccurate. Dr. Pincus ${ }^{15}$ has estimated them as 80 percent grant and 20 percent loan. To identify precisely the Pincus estimate, local currency loans are analyzed by the following procedure:

Initially they are submitted to the grant ratio formula described above. From the exchange equivalent (the grant equivalent complement) the funds designated for U.S.-use are deducted. The remaining exchange equivalent then is treated as follows: (a) the portion designated for grants is valued as $100 \%$ grant, and (b) the loan portion is submitted to the grant ratio formula a second time. 16 The second exchange equivalent is subject to one final manipulation (the $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ factor). These funds are blocked except for U.S.-use in the recipient country. "The trick is to value the blocked local currency at its true worth to the donor country by use of what is called a 'shadow' rate of exchange, as opposed to the nominal rate; in other words, the rate at which the donor would be willing to buy the blocked balances. 117 The calculation of this "shadow exchange rate" index is presented in Appendix B, page 136. The index is multiplied by the percent of total aid the blocked local currency loans represent. The product reflects the official (higher) exchange rate versus the market rate and, there-

15 pincus, op. cit., p. 362 .
$16_{\text {For }}$ the local currency loan grant ratio calculations, see the yearly Trading Factor and Local Currency Grant Ratio Calculations tables in Appendix A.
$17_{\text {Charles }}$ P. Kindleberger, Power and Money: The Politics of International Economics and the Economics of International Politics (New York: Basic Books, 1970), p. 135.
fore, indicates an additional grant component. Due to occasional currency depreciation, the $E_{2}$ trading factor is raised 15.4 percent. 18 The factor is raised an additional 50 percent due to waivers on installments and interest. 19

In the 1950's and early $60^{\prime}$ s, local currency loans comprised the major portion of U.S. development loans and, in 1962, were rapidy converted to dollar loans. Since 1967 , virtually all development loans were on dollar repayment terns. ${ }^{20}$
3. For the third trading factor, Professor Horvath ${ }^{21}$ provides a generalized formula to reduce the domestic, government supported price of surplus agricultural comodities to export market values. However, as the agricultural aid data wes obtained in terms of export market values, 22 the third trading factor formula is not required. 23

18 U.S. Department of Agriculture, P. L. 480 Concessional Sales, Economic Research Service, Foreign Agricultural Economic Report No. 65, September, 1970, p. 36. From 1956 to 1969, of $\$ 5.2$ billion lent, the purchasing power depreciated by $\$ 0.8$ billion. The local currency development loans are assumed to be reduced by approximately the same percentage.

$$
19_{\text {Horvath }} \text { op. cit. }
$$

${ }^{20}$ In some cases, the borrower car be a public agency or a private enterprise within the recipient country. The loan then may involve repayment by the non-governmental borrower to the recipient country government in local currency. The recipient government, in turn, repays the Agency for International Development in dollars. These loans are termed two-step loans.

$$
21_{\text {Horvath, }} \text { op. cit. }
$$

${ }^{22}$ P. L. 480 Concessional Sales, on. cit., p. 7.
23 Dr. Pincus, op. cit., p. 363, analyzed surplus agricultural commodity aid with three methods: (1) valued at U.S. prices, (2) valued at export market prices, and (3) valued at world market prices using estimates of elasticity of demand for U.S. exports.

From the preceding discussion of the grant ratio, the comprehensive grant ratio formula is presented,

$$
\begin{align*}
g^{\prime}= & 1-\left[\frac{i_{G}}{d}\left(1-e^{-d G}\right)+\frac{i_{T}}{d} e^{-d G}+\left(1-\frac{i_{T}}{d}\right)\right. \\
& \left(\frac{e^{-d G}-e^{-d T}}{d(T-G)}\right]+B_{1}+g_{2} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where,
$g^{\prime}$ the comprehensive grant ratio
$i_{G}$ the interest rate during the grace period
$i_{T}$ the interest rate during the nongrace period
d the comparative rate of discount (10\%)
$e$ the base of the natural logarithm, 2.718
G the grace period
I maturity of the loan
$g_{1}$ tied aid trading factor
$g_{2}$ local currency loans trading factor

Stated verbally, the comprehensive grant ratio measures initially the Ioan terms (the interest rate both during grace and nongrace years, the comparative rate of discount, the length of repayment, and the erace period) plus incorporates two trading factor adjustments (tied aid and local currency repayment provisions). ${ }^{24}$

24
For a thorough mathematical discussion of additional factors and refinements to the comprehensive grant ratio formula, see Janos Horvath and Donald P. Minassian, "A Mathematical Exposition of International Grants," Mimeographed, 1970.

## A Note on the Grant Ratio Base

The grant ratio concept has been discussed and analyzed concerning the cost of aid to the donor country and the benefit of such aid to the recipient country. The grant ratio inherent in an aid flow, however, may differ from either. For example, an aid flow consisting of a Public Law 480 (P.I. 480) dollar sale contains the following grant element considerations:
a. The aid cost to the U.S. Is valued at domestic prices and, therefore, must be reduced to world market rates, thus reducing the grant ratio. Also, the surplus goods sold were not produced for the aid program originally, but constituted a part of the U.S. exchange economy during initial economic transactions. Their cost to the government necessarily would be affected. If the surplus commodities merely were being stored, giving them away to save storage costs might be economically advantageous (the prospect of domestic usage being quite dim), resulting in a grant ratio of zero.
b. From a benefit-to-the-recipient standpoint, the surplus commodities could be valued in the local economy, thus reducing, or possibly increasing, the grant ratio. A decrease also may occur if the recipient is not able to utilize the surplus commodities in an efficient manner. In addition, the commodities could upset the balance of the recipient economy's agricultural price structure, creating a negative trading factor effect.
c. Finally, the contract terms of repayment analyzed by the grant ratio formula (discounted at a chosen rate) could result in a different figure.

To sumarize, the "pure" grant ratio, calculated on a contract terms basis, may be equivalent to the ratio based on the donor's cost or the recipient's benefit. In certain cases, however, the "pure" grant ratio may vary from either. This is an important fact to bear in mind in future grant discussions and research.

## SECIION III

## U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

The period covered in this grant analysis in 1953 through 1969. The post World War II years through 1952 are considered the Marshall Plan era when the majority of aid was directed toward European countries in a recovery effort. 1953 was selected as the first year aid was extended primarily on a world-wide basis. Direct military aid, by definition, is excluded from the scope of research.

## Program Evolution

From 1948 to 1952, the Economic Cooperation Administration (E.C.A.) administered U.S. foreign aid. The Mutual Security Act was passed in 1951 and reported on aid transactions through 1953. Whe Foreign Operations Administration (F.O.A.) was the official agency from 1953 to 1955. At that tine, the International Cooperation Administration (I.C.A.) was organized and operated until 1961. The Development Loan Fund was established and operated concurrently from 1957 to 1961. In 1961, all predecessor agency functions were taken over by the present Agency for International Development (A.I.I.). Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, was passed in 1954, and administered surplus agricultural commodities under the Food for Freedom program. The Peace Corps was created in 1961 and the Export-Import Bank has existed since 1934. IThrough the
above asencies the U.S. has contributed annually 55 to 60 percent of all O.E.C.D. D.A.C. ${ }^{I}$ aid.

## Aid Channels

U.S. aid is administered through four channels: the Agency for International Development, the Peace Corps, the Export-Import Eank, and the F.L. 480 program. Each aid flow is presented briefly.

## Agency for International Development

A.I.D. administers funds under the folloring caterories:
a. Development Loans--Loans are offered in both dollar and r Iocal currency. They are authorized at similar terms on the basis of project, program and sector loans. Dollar repayable loans are submitted to the grant ratio formula for analysis, while local currency loans are treated by the procedure described on page 8 .
b. Supporting Assistance-The majority of this aid is valued as $100 \%$ grant, but does include some loans. Supporting assistance is designed to help overcome economic or political instability whether internal or external, and may include project technical assistance. This aid primarily is granted to countries ongaced in a major defense effort and, in the $1950^{\prime}$ s, was termed Defense Support. Approximately 10 percent of supporting assistance is termed counterpart funds. ${ }^{2}$

This portion, designated for U.S.-use in the recipient country,

[^2]constitutes an exchange element and is deducted from the supporting assistance categories in the Appendix A grant ratio calculations.
c. Technical Cooperation (also termed Technical Assistance)-This type of aid is considered 100 percent grant and consists of (I) students, trainees, experts, and volunteers in foreign countries, (2) the supply of equipment for research or training, and (3) the support of educational programs. The Peace Corps is considered a special form of technical assistance.
d. Multinational Assistance---Iwo types of aid are covered by this category: (1) contributions to the development effort of the U.N. and its associate organizations, and (2) capital subscriptions to multilateral financial institutions. These funds are treated as full grants.
e. Contingency Fund--These funds are reserved for emergency situations resulting from economic or political crises. They also are treated as full grants.
f. Administrative Expenses--These appropriations, considered part of the cost of assistance, are treated as full grants.

## The Peace Corps

See (c) Technical Cooperation above.

## Export-Import Bank

This institution, to promote U.S. domestic exports, is not financed by the Federal budget. Although Eximbank has the possibility of borrowing from the U.S. Treasury, its resources are obtained through Ioan repayments.

Eximbank is in a sense two institutions: one issues insurance
and guarantees, and the other authorized various types of loans. The former transactions are not considered foreign aid. The latter consists of (a) long term loans, (b) commodity credits, (c) exporter credits, (d) special foreign trade (emergency) credits, and (e) discount credits, all of which are treated in the following manner:
a. Long Term Loans--The loan terms are analyzed by the grant ratio formula, as U.S. capital equipnent and defense support articles and services are financed by these funds.
b. Commodity Credits--These funds are not considered aid as they primarily are designated for the exportation of raw cotton at terms of twelve months or less, and, therefore, constitute an exchange transaction.
c. Exporter Credits--These loans are available to U.S. export firms to finance commodity shipments. The loan terms, which are analyzed by the grant ratio formula, are generally "harder" than the long term loans (see (a) above).
d. Emergency Credits-These credits are not considered aid as they primarily are used for military purposes or for stabilizing local currency crises. Credits for the latter are usually canceled without being utilized.
e. Discount Credits--Initiated in 1966, these credits are lent to commercial U.S. banks against their holding of export debt obligations to make export financing more attractive. These loans are not treated as aid and are at or near private interest rates.

In summary, Eximbank aid appropriations consist of long term loans and exporter credits and are treated as loans. However, some conflict of definition does arise; for example, Mexico does not
consider any Eximbank transactions as foreign aid. ${ }^{3}$

## Food for Peace

In 1954, P.I. 480 initiated three aid categories: Title I (sales for local currencies), Title II (donations for emergency relief and economic assistance), and Title III (donations to U.S. voluntary agencies). Title IV (sales for dollars) was introduced in 1959. In 1966, the earlier programs were replaced by P.L. 808 (the Food for Peace Act) which provided two categories: Title I (sales for dollars and local currencies) and Title II (donations). The program still is referred to as P.L. 480 in spite of the legislative change. Barter also is included and consists of the exchange of agricultural comodities for (1) materials for which the U.S. is a consistent net importer, (2) commodities required for foreign aid programs, and (3) materials or equipment required for off-shore construction programs. In Appendix A the Food for Peace program is analyzed in the following manner:
a. Local Currency Sales--treated as local currency loans, see page 8.
b. Dollar Sales--treated as loans.
c. Emergency Assistance and Economic Development Donations-treated as 100 percent grants.
d. Donations--treated as 100 percent grants.
e. Barter...as part of these funds are designated for U.S.-use, 74.3 percent are treated as full grants to recipient countries and the

3I.M.D. Little and J.M. Clifford, op. cit., p. 233 .
remaining 25.7 percent as an exchange element. ${ }^{4}$
A Note on the Private Sector

In addition to the official U.S. aid program, the private sector of the economy extends export credits and investments, accounting for approximately one-third of net global financial resource movements. As these financial flows are in the mainstream of the exchange economy, being motivated by profit considerations, the concepts of the grants economy do not apply.
${ }^{4}$ p. L. 480 Concessional Sales, op cit., p. 32.25 .67 percent of all P. L. 480 agreements from 1954 to mid- 1969 are earmarked for U.S. use. This gross percentage, in the absence of specific data, is assumed for the barter category.

## SECTION IV

COMPUIING THE GRANI RATIO

In the computation of the grant ratio, grants are valued as aid at nominal value, and the grant equivalent in loans is calculated by the grant ratio formula using a lo, comparative discount rate. 'Io reviou briefly the criteria presented earlier:

1. The following categories are considered 100 percent grant: Technical Cooperation

Defense Support
Multinational Assistance
Contingency Fund
Administrative (or other) Expenses
Peace Corps
Food for Peace
a. Emergency Assistance and Economic Development Donations
b. Donations
2. The following authorizations are considered dollar loans:

Development Loans (in dollars)
Export-Import Bank
a. Long Term Loans
b. Exporter Credits

Food for Peace
a. Dollar Sales
3. The following categories are considered local currency loans with the U.S.-use funds deducted from the exchange component and the remaining funds granted or reloaned to the recipient country. The exchange equivalent of the reloaned funds is analyzed by tradtag factor $g_{2}$--the shadow rate of exchange index.

Development Loans (local currency)
Food for Peace
a. Local Currency Sales
4. Food for Peace Barter is considered 74.3 percent grant.
5. Supporting (Development) Assistance is treated as 90 percent grant.
6. Tied aid, consisting of portions of A.I.D. commitments and all Eximbank loan authorizations, is analyzed by trading factor $\mathrm{g}_{1}--$ the difference in exports due to tied aid and exports attributable to equivalent flows of untied aid--multiplied by a U.S. versus World Price Index.
7. The $g_{2}$ trading factor (in No. 3 above) is adjusted upward, due to local currency depreciations and installment and interest waivers, $15.4 \%$ and $50 \%$, respectively.

From 1964 to 1969, the development loans were calculated on an individual basis resulting in detailed grant equivalent information. Prior to 1964, due to unavailable data, loan terms applied to the respective total loan figures are yearly averages. Average terms also are applied to all Eximbank loans and Food for Peace sales.

In local currency P.L. 480 sales and local currency development loans, a percentage of the exchange equivalent is designated for U.S.use (in the recipient country) with the remainder termed country-use
funds, returned to the recipient in the form of loans and grants. The percentage designated for U.S.-use is assumed to be the same in both P.L. 480 sales and development loans for a given year. ${ }^{1}$

Two data problems should be noted:
(a) All data is presented on the basis of aid commitments as opposed to actual deliveries. Commitments, defined as firm obligations, are the best means to assess comparatively donor aid policies and are a useful indication of the direction the programs may be expected to take. Dr. Pincus aptly sums up this point in the following quotation:
. . . data are expressed on the basis of aid commitments .... at in terms of actual flow of funds . . . The 7 totalsare. . . greater than those shown in the O.E.C.D. . . . [It is] necessary to present the data on a commitment basis . . . because data on loan terms and conditions were not available on a flow-of-funds basis.
(b) The assumed portions of loan repayment terms are based on multiple resources and are composite estimates. Actual loan computations were programmed anc run on an electronic computer.

The Grant Data and Calculation Tables

Before proceeding to the summary of results, Appendix $A$, which contains the calculations and supporting data for the grant ratio, should be discussed briefly. Appendix A contains three main tables.
$I_{\text {This }}$ is assumed because detailed information is available concerning U.S. and country-use funds for Food for Peace local currency sales. The bulk of countries receiving Food for Peace sales also receive local currency development loans.
${ }^{2}$ John Pincus, Economic Aid and International Cost Sharing (Baltimore, Ma.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), p. 134.

1. Fiscal Year Grant Ratio of U.S. Economic Aid Commitments. These tables summarize the aid commitments by category and present the grant ratio. In the second and third columns, the grant and loan portion of the total aid, shown in the first column, is calculated. The grant and loan portions of the aid may not equal the total aid commitments as an exchange element may be present. This exchange element is omitted since it does not affect the grant ratio results. The fourth column gives the grant equivalent (determined by the grant ratio formula) of the loan portion. The fifth column gives the total grant equivalent of the aid by adding the grant portion (second column) and the grant equivalent of the loans (fourth column). Dividing the total grant equivalent (fifth column) by the total aid commitment (first column) results in the summary grant ratio, shown in the final column.
2. Fiscal Year Grant Element and Trading Factors Data.

These tables contain the supporting information specifying the data utilized in the grant ratio calculations on the preceding table (e.g., loan terms, amount of tied aid, etc.).
3. Fiscal Year Trading Factor and Local Currency Loan Grant Ratio Calculations.

These tables first present the $g_{1}$ (tied aid) calculations. Secondy, the local currency grant ratio is calculated for P.L. 480 and/or development loans. Finally, the exchange equivalent, a by-product of the preceding calculation, is submitted to the $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ (shadow exchange rate) calculation.

As previously noted, during the 1964-1969 period, detailed information concerning development loans has been obtained. For these
years, a fourth table, fiscal Year Loan Data and Grant Ratios, is included in Appendix A. These tables present the individual loan comitments, country by country, with their respective loan terms and the innerent grant ratios.

AM ASSESSETT OR THE GRATT COHFOBETS

Summery

Yearly I. S. Aid comitments, respective mrart equivelents, and prant matios are shom in rable 1 . The total aid commitrort is $\$ 65.9$ bilitor, the ment equivalent is $p 47.9$ bilitor, and the comespondine weighted averace rrant ret.jo is . 7269.

Details of the comprehencive prant ratios are shom in Thble
2. The retios have been fairly constart with the exception of the lest three years considered. Durine the full period analyred, the ratio has veried from a himb of. 8542 in 7953 to a 10 m of 499 in 1967. The effect of $F_{1}$ (aid tyine) hes variod from zero in bese year 1953 to -9.67 in 7968. This treding factor's effect has been increasine, althourh fluctuetions have ocourred. The effect of 9 (soft curm rency lons), with minor variations, hes been relatively neglicible. The trend of the comprehensive grent ratio has shown a slow decline. This can be seen oraphically in Graph 1 , thich also depicts the increasing trend of total official aid. official aid reached an all time peak of 36.191 billion in 1967.

A glance at Graph 1 reveals that ma for fluctuations in the comprehensive grant retio ocurred in four periods: 1955-56, +.0934 ; 1.956-57, -. 1244; 1959-60, $+.0818 ;$ and $1966-67,-.1382$. In the 1955-56 perjod, the increase is due primarily to tho factors:
(a) the Food for Peace commitnents (having, in general, high grant ratios), inereased approximately three-fold, and (b) Eximbank funds (which have low grant ratios), decreased by roughly one-third. Eximbank fluctuations are also the prime influence in the remaining three periods. In the 1956-57 grant ratio increase, Eximbank funds increased roughly five-fold; in the 1959-60 decrease, Eximbank funds were cut by approximately one-half; and in the $1966-67$ decrease, Eximbank funds were decreased by a factor of nearly two and one-half. Decreases in the comprehensive grant ratio reflect a widening gap between total official aid and the grant equivalent.

Table 3 contains grant ratios of the various types of dollar and local currency loans. The local currency loans generally have higher grant ratios than dollar loans. While the terms of repayment usually are harder in the local currency loans, the majority of their repayments are re-lent or granted back to the recipient country, raising significantly the grant ratio. Yet, in 1961-1964, the grant ratio is higher for dollar development loans than for local currency development loans. The main factor in this interesting paradox is that, in these years, U.S. -use funds constitute more than the inherent exchange equivalent in the local currency loans and even require a portion of the grant equivalent, thus reducing the total grant equivalent in the original loan terms. Table 3 also indicates the decreasing trend of local currency development loans and local currency P.L. L80 sales, while P.L. 480 dollar sales are climbing. 1
$I_{\text {By }} 1971$, all P.L. 480 sales will be on a dollar basis.

The terms of development loans and P.L. 480 sales averaged over $3 \%$ interest in the $1950^{\circ} \mathrm{s}$. In 1961, the majority were at $0.75 \%$ interest. From this extremely generous level, interest rates slowly have grown harder until the levels of $2 \%$ interest during grace years and $3 \%$ interest during nongrace years were reached in 1969 . From completely untied aid prior to 1959 (except for Eximbank loans), the percent of U.S. aid-financed, donestically purchased commodities reached $98.94 \%$ in 1969 .

## Concluding Remarks

Three principal conclusions are drawn from the subject analysis. 1. While total official U.S. aid generally has increased during the 1953-1969 period, the comprehensive grant ratio has experienced a slow decreasing trend. In only three fiscal years during the period analyzed, 1967, 1968, and 1969, has the ratio dropped below 60 percent. However, a significant point is to be made here. The huge increase of Eximbank loans is the prime factor in this recent grant ratio decrease. For example, in 1965, the grant ratio is . 792 and, in 1967 , it is .586 . The exclusion of Eximbank loans from the calculations results in grant ratios of .856 and .840 , respectively, thus eliminating the apparent total grant ratio decrease.
2. The effects of tied aid have been estimated to average approximately 10 to 20 percent, with individual cases as high as 49.3 percent. ${ }^{2}$

2 Robert M. Stern, "International Financial Issues in Foreign Economic Assistance to the Less-Developed Countries," International Seminar on Problems of Econcric Dcrelopment and Structural Change, edited by I.G. Stewart, Edinburgh University Press, 1969, p. 53.

The World Export Index (Appendix B) has shown this figure to average 10. $72 \%$ from 1953 through 1969 ( $14.25 \%$ during the last decade). The effect on the grant ratio during the period analyzed has averaged $-3.69 \%(-4.59 \%$ during the last decade).
3. The grant ratio of local currency development loans and local currency P.L. 480 sales during 1953-1969 is . 7611 and .7588 , respectively. Dr. Pincus's ${ }^{3}$ initial estimate of 80 percent grant and 20 percent loan is substantiated as quite accurate.

Table 1. U.S. AID COMTTMENTS AND GRANT RATIOS, 1953-1969

| Year | Total aid commitment (millions of dollars) | Total grant equivalent (millions of dollars) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grant } \\ & \text { ratio }(g) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969 | 3,789.2 | 2,461.5 | . 6496 |
| 1968 | 5,295.0 | 3.319 .5 | .6269 |
| 1967 | 6,191.0 | 3,626.9 | . 5858 |
| 1966 | 5,075.0 | 3.674 .2 | .7240 |
| 1965 | 4.271 .4 | 3,383.0 | .7920 |
| 1964 | $4,363.7$ | 3.413 .0 | .7821 |
| 1963 | 4.472 .3 | 3,543.4 | .7923 |
| 1962 | 4,649.4 | 3,675.7 | .7906 |
| 1961 | 4.276 .2 | 3,127.2 | . 7313 |
| 1960 | 3,405.7 | 2,576.2 | . 7564 |
| 1959 | 3.791 .7 | 2,557.9 | .6746 |
| 1958 | 3.313 .8 | 2,384.3 | .7195 |
| 1957 | 4,256.1 | 3,045.6 | .7156 |
| 1956 | 2,686.2 | 2,243.3 | . 8400 |
| 1955 | 2,224.3 | 1,660.8 | .7466 |
| 1954 | 1,466.0 | 1,184.3 | . 8078 |
| 1953 | 2,374.9 | 2,026.7 | . 8534 |
| Total | 65,901.9 | 47,903.5 | .7269 |

Source: Appendix A: Tables 1-57.

Table 2. U.S. CONPREAETSIVE GRAMT RATTOS, 1953-1969

| Year | Grant ratio (g) | Trading factor effects |  | Comprehenciv grent ratio ( $\mathrm{c}^{1}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { ind tying } \\ \left(g_{1}\right) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Soft currency } \\ \left(a_{2}\right) \end{gathered}$ |  |
| 1969 | .6496 | -. 0829 | +.0008 | . 5675 |
| 1958 | .6269 | -. 0967 | +.0021 | . 5323 |
| 1957 | .5858 | -. 08666 | $+.0004$ | .4996 |
| 1966 | .7240 | -. 0458 | $+.0008$ | .6790 |
| 2965 | .7920 | -. 0359 | $+.0030$ | . 7591 |
| 1964 | .7821 | -. 0260 | +.0074 | .7575 |
| 1963 | .7923 | -. 0264 | $+.0009$ | . 7668 |
| 1962 | .7906 | -. 0227 | $+.0004$ | .7683 |
| 1961 | .7313 | -. 0247 | -- | .7066 |
| 1960 | . 7564 | -. 0116 | +.0176 | . 7524 |
| 1959 | .6746 | -. 0237 | $+.0033$ | .6542 |
| 1958 | . 7195 | -. 0123 | +.0080 | .7152 |
| 1957 | .7156 | -. 0097 | +.0086 | .7145 |
| 1956 | .8400 | -. 0029 | +.0082 | . 8453 |
| 1955 | .7466 | -. 0088 | +.0043 | . 7421 |
| 1954 | .8078 | -. 0030 | +.0028 | .8076 |
| 1953 | .8534 | $\underline{-}$ | +.0008 | . 8542 |
| Weighted Average | .7269 | -. 0369 | $+.0035$ | .6935 |

Source: Appendix A: Tables 1-57.

Table 3. GRANT RATIOS OF U.S. FOREIGN AID LOANS 1953-1969 (millions of dollars)

| Year | Dollar loans |  |  |  | Local currency loans |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Development | Grant ratio | PI 480 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grant } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ | Development | Grant ratio | PL 480 | Grant <br> ratio |
| 1969 | 722.2 | .6831 | 411.0 | .6099 | -- | -- | 337.0 | .7709 |
| 1968 | 1,044.0 | . 7244 | 306.0 | .6099 | -- | -- | 723.0 | .8076 |
| 1967 | 1,108.6 | .7234 | 178.0 | .6138 | -- | -- | 803.0 | . 7839 |
| 1966 | 1,207.8 | . 7330 | 181.0 | .6138 | 24.6 | .7927 | 866.0 | . 7917 |
| 1965 | 1,128.0 | .7641 | 158.0 | . 6138 | 34.9 | .7937 | 1,142.0 | . 8517 |
| 2964 | 1,249.0 | . 8299 | 46.0 | .6547 | 65.7 | .7991 | 1,056.0 | .8193 |
| 1963 | 1,159.2 | .8172 | 58.0 | .6956 | 128.8 | .7997 | 1,088.0 | .8416 |
| 1962 | 877.1 | .8172 | 19.0 | . 7356 | 219.3 | .7998 | 1,030.0 | . 8181 |
| 1961 | 261.8 | . 8092 | -- | -- | 392.7 | . 8001 | 951.0 | . 7358 |
| 1960 | 177.1 | .5052 | -- | -- | 343.9 | . 7174 | 824.0 | . 6831 |
| 1959 | 15.6 | . 5441 | -- | -- | 505.6 | . 7559 | 724.0 | . 4927 |
| 1958 | 7.6 | . 5164 | -- | -- | 244.5 | .7517 | 658.0 | . 6960 |
| 1957 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 332.7 | .7520 | 908.0 | . 6960 |
| 2956 | 8.4 | . 4904 | -- | -- | 202.4 | . 7446 | 439.0 | . 6877 |
| 1955 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 209.5 | .7913 | 73.0 | . 6877 |
| 1954 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 100.0 | .7330 | -- | -- |
|  |  | -- | -- | -- | 16.4 | .7317 | -- | -- |
|  | 8,966.4 | .7601 | . 357.0 | . 6182 | 2,821.0 | .7611 | 11,622.0 | . 7588 |

Source: Appendix A: Tables 1-57.
Appendix A: Table 1. FISCAL YEAR 1969 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMTMENTS (thousands of dollars)

| Aid category | Total aid commitment | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grant } \\ & \text { portion } \end{aligned}$ | Loan portion | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grant } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Loan | 722,218 | 0 | 722,218 | 493,324 | 493,324 | . 6831 |
| Supporting Assistance | 464,448 | 418,003 | 0 | -- | 418,003 | . 9000 |
| Technical Cooperation | 270,905 | 270,905 | 0 | -- | 270,905 | 1.0000 |
| Multinational | 138,200 | 138,200 | 0 | -- | 138,200 | 1.0000 |
| Contingency Fund | 13,870 | 13,870 | 0 | -- | 13,870 | 1.0000 |
| Administrative | 80,151 | 80,151 | 0 | -- | 80,151 | 1.0000 |
| Food For Peace | 1,014,000 ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Loral currency sales | 337,000 | 0 | 337,000 | 259,793 | 259,793 | . 7709 |
| 2. Dollar sales | 411,000 | 0 | 411,000 | 250,669 | 250,669 | . 6099 |
| 3. Emergency assistance \& economic development | 111,000 | 111,000 | 0 | -- | 111,000 | 1.0000 |
| 4. Donations | 154,000 | 154,000 | 0 | -- | 154,000 | 1.0000 |
| 5. Barter | 1,000 | 743 | 0 | -- | 743 | . 7433 |
| Peace Corps | 100,300 | 100,300 | 0 | -- | 100,300 | 1.0000 |
| Export-Import Bank | 985,100 | 0 | 985,100 | 170,521 | 170,521 | . 1731 |
|  | 3,789,192 | 1,287,172 | 2,455,318 | 1,174,307 | 2,461,479 | .6496 |

Sources: Export-Import Bank of the United States, Fiscal Year 1969 Report; U.S. President, The Foreign Operations Report, June 30, 1969; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, Peace funds, items $1,2,3,4$ and 5. aTotal of Food For $b_{\text {Weighted }}$ average.

Appendix A: Table 2. FTSCAT YFAR 1969 GRAPT ELHETT AMD TRADITG

## Development Loens

Supportine Assistarice
other

Tied Aid $\left(c_{1}\right)$

See Tiscal Year 1969 Loan Data and Grant Ratios (Appendir A: Table 4).

10\% of counterpart funds generated is reserved for U.S.-uses.

All other $A . I . D$. and Peace Corps funds are valued as $100 \%$ srants.
98.944 (see Operations Peport) of A.I.D. financed commodities ( $\$ 1,013.7$ million) purchesed in the U.S., plus Wrimbank loans of $\$ 985.1$ million.

Virtually no local currency Development Fund Lonns.
$\$ 337,000,000$, of which U.S. -use funds are $\% 7 ?, 421,300$ and recipient countryuse funds are $3264,578,700$. Of countryuse funds, $150,254,200(56.8 \%)$ are grants and $\$ 114,324,500(43.2 \%)$ are loans. Average loan terms are $2 \%$ interest during 10 years grace and 3 interest during the remainder of the 40 year maturity ( $68.2 \%$ grant ratio).
Average terms are $6 \%$ interest on 11.2 year maturities with a 1 year grace period.

Average terms are $2.6 \%$ interest on 31 year maturities with 8 years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Appendix A: Table 3. FISCAL YEAR 1969 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATTO CALCULATIONS

$$
g_{1}-\text { Tied Aid }
$$

Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 1,013.7$ miliion ( $98.94 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic comodity purchases) less $\$ 409.8$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{a}$ plus (2) \$985.1 million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 1,589.0$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 3,789.2$ million total aid equals 47.9 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 41.9 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S .}}{P_{\text {World }}}=.419 \times \frac{110.2-132}{110.2}= \\
& .419 \times-.1978=-0.0829
\end{aligned}
$$

## $\mathrm{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

$$
\text { P.L. } 480 \text { Title } 1
$$

\$337.0 million total aid
of which 229.8 grant equivalent ( $68.2 \%$ )
and $\quad$ 107.2 exchange equivalent
minus 72.4 U.S.-use funds
equals 34.8 country-use funds
of which $19.8 \quad 56.8 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 2)
and $\quad 15.0 \quad 43.2 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 2)
of which 10.2 grant equivalent ( $68.2 \%$ )
and 4.8 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

```
Appendix A: Table 3. (continued)
```

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 229.8$ million

$$
19.8
$$

10.2
$\$ 259.8$ divided by $\$ 337.0=.7709$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $.0013(\$ 4.8 / \$ 3,789.2)=.00048$
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by .00007
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of $(a)=$
.00024
Total g2
.00079

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 1 and 2; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. ${ }^{a}$ See page 7.

Appendix A: Table 4. FISCAL YEAR 1969 LOAN DATA AND GRANT RATIOS


Near East \& South Asia

| Afghanistan | 1.25 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ceylon | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| India | 1.94 .00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Pakistan | 71.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 3.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 1.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 20.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 40.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |

Latin America

| Bolivia | 1.70 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Chile | 1.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.40 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 20.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Colombia | 2.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 15.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 60.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.10 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 4. (continued)

| Recioient country | $\begin{gathered} \text { Loan (millions } \\ \text { of dollars) } \end{gathered}$ | Terms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | G | $i_{\text {T }}$ | T |  |
| Costa Rica | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 7.10 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Dominican Republic | 8.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Scuador | 2.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 1.20 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 25 | 0.629845 |
| E1 Salvador | 8.20 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681 .654 |
| Guatemala | 0.63 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Guyana | 12.90 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Honduras | 0.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Jamaice | 0.314 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| Nicaragua | 0.230 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| Panama | 1.30 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 3.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 3.70 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 4.60 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Paraguay | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.60 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Peru | 0.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| Venezuela | 0.027 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| Regional | 30.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 4. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{gathered} \text { Loan (millions } \\ \text { of dollars) } \end{gathered}$ | Terms ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | G |  | T |  |
| Regional (continued) | 7.07 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| Other | 7.07 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| East Asia |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indonesia | 44.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 6.30 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Korea | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |

Africa

| Ethiopia | 3.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Liberia | 0.975 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 4.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 0.65 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Nalagasy Republic | 0.30 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Morocco | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 3.00 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.10 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Nigeria | 2.80 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 2.30 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 6.20 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 3.20 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 4. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loan (mjilions } \\ & \text { of dollars) } \end{aligned}$ | Terms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\bar{i}_{G}$ | G | $\dot{i}_{T}$ | $T$ |  |
| Regional | 7.50 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
|  | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 0.35 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 40 | 0.681654 |
| Miscellaneous | 2.152 | 2 | 10 | 3 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.681654 |
| Total | 722.218 |  |  |  |  | $0.683067^{\text {c }}$ |

Source: U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Frogram, Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1969.
$a_{\dot{i}_{G}}=$ interest during grace years; $G=$ number of grace years; $i_{r n}=$ interest during remainder of loan; and $T=$ total number of years in the loan.
$b_{\text {Assumed }}$ terms, due to unavailable information.
$c_{\text {Weighted average. }}$
Appendix A: Table 5. FISCAL YEAR 1968 CRANI RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of dollars)

| Aid category | Total aid commitment | Grant portion | Loan portion | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Development Loan | 1,043,986 | 0 | 1,043,986 | 756,292 |  |  |
| Supporting Assistance | 594,502 | 535,052 | 1,043,986 | 756,292 | 756,292 | . 7244 |
| Technical Cooperation | 295,744 | 295,744 | 0 | -- | 295,744 |  |
| Multinational | 134,909 | 134,909 | 0 | -- | 295,744 134,909 | 1.0000 1.0000 |
| Contingency Fund | 27,538 | 27,538 | 0 | -- | -37,538 | 1.0000 |
| Administrative Food For Peace | 81,325 $1,287,000^{\text {a }}$ | 81,325 | 0 | -- | 81,325 | 1.0000 1.0000 |
| 1. Local currency sales | 723,000 | 0 | 723,000 |  |  |  |
| 2. Dollar sales | 306,000 | 0 | 306,000 | $\begin{aligned} & 583,895 \\ & 186,629 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 583,895 \\ & 186,629 \end{aligned}$ | .8076 <br> .6099 |
| 4. \& economic development | 100,000 | 100,000 | 0 | -- | 100,000 | 1.0000 |
| 4. Donations | 152,000 | 152,000 | 0 | -- | 152,000 | 1.0000 1.0000 |
| 5. Barter | 6,000 106,800 | 4,460 106,800 | 0 | -- | $4,460$ | . .7433 |
| Export-Import Bank | $\begin{array}{r}106,800 \\ 1,723,200 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 106,800 | 0 | 354, ${ }^{--}$ | 106,800 | 1.0000 |
|  |  |  | 1,723,200 | 354,807 | 354,807 | . 2059 |
|  | 5,295,004 | 1,437,828 | 3,796,186 | 1,881,623 | 3,319,451 | .6269 |

[^3] 6939. TSt'6TC•8
路

Appendix A: Table 6. TISCAL YEAR 1968 GRAM' ELAMENT AND TRADING TACTOBS DATA

| Development Lonns | See Fiscal Year 1968 Loan Data and Grart Patios (Appendix A: Table 8). |
| :---: | :---: |
| Supporting Assistance | 10\% of counterpart funds generated is reserved for U.S.-uses. |
| Other | A11 other A.I.D. and Feace Corps funds are valued as loot grants. |
| Tied Aid ( $\mathrm{m}_{1}$ ) | 98.41, (see Operations Report) of A.I.D. financed commodities ( $\$ 1,142.7$ million) purchased in the U.S., plus Eximbank loans of $\$ 1,723.2$ million. |
| Local Currency Loans ( $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ ) |  |
| 2. Development | Virtually no local currency Development Fund Loans. |
| 2. PI 480 | p723,000,000, of which U.S.-use funds are 121,174,800 and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 601,825,200$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 248,914,900(41.4 \%)$ are grants and $\$ 352,910,300(58.6 \%)$ are loans. Average loan terms are $2 \%$ interest during 10 years grace and $2 \frac{1}{2} \%$ interest during the remainder of the 40 year maturity ( $69.4 \%$ grant ratio). |
| Erimbank | Average terms are 6\% interest on 12.7 year maturities, and 2.6 years grace. |
| PL 480 Dollar Sales | Average terms are 2.60 interest on 31 year maturities and 8 years grace. |
| PL 480 Earter | 74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use. |

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Program, Annual Report to the Congress, Eiscal Year 1968; Afency for International Development, Cperations Report, June 30, 1968; ExportImport Bank of the United States, Fiscal Year 1968 Report; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{2}$ See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 4.

Appendix A: Table 7. FISCAL YEAR 1968 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$g_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) \$1,142.7 million ( $98.41 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic conmodity purchases) less $\$ 464.5$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent anount of untied aid) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ plus (2) $\$ 1,723.2$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 2,401.4$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 5,295.0$ million total aid equals 45.4 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 45.4 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.454 \times \frac{104.7-127}{104.7}= \\
& .454 \times-.2130=-0.0967
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## P.L. 480 Title I

$\$ 723.0$ million total aid
of which 501.8 grant equivalent (69.4\%)
and 221.2 exchange equivalent
minus 121.2 U.S.-use funds
equals 100.0 country-use funds
of which 41.4 4. $4 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 6)
and $\quad 58.6 \quad 58.6 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 6)
of which 40.7 grant equivalent ( $69.4 \%$ )
and $\quad 17.9$ exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 501.8$ milion

$$
41.4
$$

40.7
$\$ 583.9$ divided by $\$ 723.0=.8076$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $0.00338(\$ 17.9 / \$ 5,295.0)=$
.00125
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by
.00019
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately 50\% of $(a)=$ .00063

Total $g_{2}$
.00079

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 5 and 6; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. ${ }^{a^{2}}$ See page 7.

Appendiy $A$ : Table 8. FISCAL YEAR 1968 LOAN DATA AND GRANT RATIOS


Hear East 3 South Asia

| Afghanistan | 0.711 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Indonesia | 225.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Pakistan | 23.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 37.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 115.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 2.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Turkey | 6.80 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 0.97 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 0.42 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 40.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 7.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |

## Latin America

Argentina
Brazil

| 1.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0.717 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 10.3 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| 75.0 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| 15.4 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| 32.0 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 8. (continued)



Appendix A: Table 8. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loan (millions } \\ & \text { of dollars) } \end{aligned}$ | Terms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\mathrm{i}_{G}$ |  | $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | T |  |
| Nicaragua | 1.864 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 10.20 | -- | -- | 2.5 | 35 | 0.542189 |
|  | 2.20 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 9.40 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Panama | 0.33 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 0.50 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 15.00 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 30 | 0.505248 |
| Paraguay | 1.00 | 2 |  | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Jruguay | 15.00 | 2 |  | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Other | 0.325 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | _- ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.748911 |

East Asia

| Indonesia | 7.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Korea | 12.50 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 10.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Philippines | 15.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 2.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 2.00 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |
|  | 1.10 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |

Africa

| Ethiopia | 1.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ghana | 15.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |

[^4]Appendix A: Table 8. (continued)

| Recipient country | ```Loan (millions of dollars)``` | $\text { Terms }{ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | G $i_{\text {ri }}$ | T |  |
| Liberia | 0.525 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Valawi | 7.0 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Mali | 0.855 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Norocco | 8.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 5.00 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.604222 |
| Niger | 0.90 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Nigeria | 4.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 5.10 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Tunisia | 10.002 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
|  | 0.2652 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Regional | 13.60 2 | 2 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.694222 |
| Miscellaneous | 64.9042 |  | 10 | 2.5 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.694222 |
| Total | 1,043.986 |  |  |  |  | $0.724427^{\text {d }}$ |

Source: U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Program, Annual Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 1968.
${ }^{2} i_{0}=$ interest during grace years; $G=$ number of grace years; $i_{T}=$ interest during remainder of loan; and $T=$ total number of years in the loan.

Assumed terms, due to unavailable information.
${ }^{c}$ Indefinite maturity; 99 years used for grant ratio calculation.
$\mathrm{d}_{\text {Weighted }}$ average.

IO


$$
1,108,622
$$

Development Loan

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Development Loan } \\
& \text { Supporting Assistance } \\
& \text { Technical Cooperation } \\
& \text { Multinational } \\
& \text { Contingency Fund } \\
& \text { Administrative } \\
& \text { Food For Peace } \\
& \hline \text { I. Local currency } \\
& \text { sales } \\
& \text { 2. Dollar sales } \\
& \text { 3. Emergency assistance } \\
& \text { \& economic development } \\
& \text { 4. Donations } \\
& \text { 5. Barter } \\
& \text { Peace Corps } \\
& \text { Export-Import Bank }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1,108,622 \\
718,350 \\
215,521
\end{array}
$$


$1,108,622$
718,350
315,534
143,636
49,772
79,504
$1,270,000$
803,000
178,000
110,000 157,000 12,000


$$
5
$$

 $\frac{2}{6}$

$$
6,191,018
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
0 \\
646,515
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{r}
1,108,622
\end{array}
$$

[^5]Appondix A: Tablo 10. FISCAL YEAR 1967 GRAMT ELEMENT AND TruDIMG pactors data

Development Louns

Supporting Assistance
other

Tied Aid $\left(E_{1}\right)$

Local Currency Loans (g2)

1. Development
2. PL 480

Eximbank

PL 480 Dollar Sales

PL 480 Barter

See Fiscal Year 1967 Loan Data and Grant Ratios (Appendix A: Table 12).

10\% of counterpart funds generated is reserved for U.S.-uses. ${ }^{2}$

All other A.I.D. and Peace Corps funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
$96.23 \%$ (see Operations Report) of A.I.D. finonced commodities ( $\$ 1,349.5 \mathrm{million}$ ) purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank loans of $\$ 2,401.1$ million.

Virtually no local currency Develoment Fund Loans.

8803,000,000, of which U.S.-use funds are $\$ 169,433,000$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 633,567,000$. Of country-use funds, 214,715,900 (33.97) are grants and $\$ 418,851,100(66.1 \%)$ are loans. Average loan terms are approximately $1 \%$ interest during 10 years grace and $2 \frac{1}{2}$, interest during the remainder of the 40 year maturity (75.7\% grant ratio).

Average terms are $6 \%$ interest on 12 year maturities and 2 years grace.

Approximate average terms are 2.5 萨 interest on 30 year maturities and 8 years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of FL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Froceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Program, Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1967; Agency for International Development, Operations Report, June 30, 1967; Export-Import Eank of the United States, Fiscal Year 1967 Report; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. } 4 .}$

Appendix A: Table 11. FISCAL YEAR 1967 TRADIHG FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCUIATIONS
$\mathrm{g}_{1}$-Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 1,349.5$ million ( $96.23 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic comodity purchases) less $\$ 560.9$ million (40\% of A.J.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{a}$ plus (2) $\$ 2,401.1$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 3,189.7$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 6,191.0$ million total aid equals 51.5 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 51.5 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.515 \times \frac{105.3-123}{105.3}= \\
& .515 \times-.1681=-0.0866
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

$$
\text { P.L. } 480 \text { Title I }
$$

$\$ 803.0$ million total aid
of which 607.9 grant equivalent (75.7\%)
and 195.1 exchange equivalent
minus 169.4 U.S.-use funds
equals 25.7 country-use funds
of which $8.733 .9 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 10)
and $\quad 17.0 \quad 66.1 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 10)
of "which 12.9 grant equivalent (75.7\%)
and 4.1 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 607.9$ million

$$
8.7
$$

12.9
$\$ 629.5$ divided by $\$ 803.0=.7839$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $0.00066(\$ 4.1 / \$ 6,191.0)=\quad .00024$
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by . 00003
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of (a) =

Total E2
.00039

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 9 and 10; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. $a^{\text {See }}$ page 7 .

Appendix A: Table 12. EISCAL YEAR 1967 IOAN DATA AND GRANT RATIOS


## Near East \& South Asia

| Afghanistan | 4.60 | 1 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12.00 | 1 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.40 | 1 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Ceylon | 7.50 | 1 |  | 5 | 2.5 | 25 | 0.612357 |
| India | 12.00 | 1 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 9.30 | 1. |  | 102 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 132.00 | 1 |  | 102 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 50.00 | 1 |  | 102 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Israel | 5.50 | 3.5 |  | 53. | . 5 | 20 | 0.445817 |
| Jordan | 1.80 | 1 | 10 | 02. | . 5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Pakistan | 4.00 | 1 | 10 | 02. | . 5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 10.70 | 1 | 10 | 2. | 5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.70 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 5 | 0 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.40 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 |  | 0 | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 |  | 0 | 0.757434 |
|  | 13.10 |  | 10 | 2.5 |  |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 70.00 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 5 |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 25.00 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 4 |  | 0.757434 |
| Turkey | 65.00 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 30.50 |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.00 |  | 102 | 2.5 | 40 |  | 0.757434 |

Appendix A: Table 12. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loan (millions } \\ & \text { of dollars) } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { Terms }{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Grant rati |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Turkey (continued) | 22.40 | 1 | $10 \quad 2.5$ | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 4.50 | 1 | $10 \quad 2.5$ | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.60 | 1. | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.40 | 1 | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 4.50 | 1 | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Latin America |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 livia | 9.50 | 1 | 102 | 40 | 0.770002 |
|  | 1. 50 | 1 | $10 \quad 2.5$ | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Brazil | 31.60 I |  | 33.5 | 15 | 0.434382 |
|  | 42.201 |  | 56 | 20 | 0.471084 |
|  | 8.40 I | 10 | 10.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 100.00 I | 10 | O 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 14.80 I |  | 55.5 | 15 | 0.454532 |
|  | 1.80 I | 6 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.603130 |
|  | 0.101 | 10 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.757434 |
| Chile | $10.00 \quad 1$ | 10 | 2.54 | 0 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.50 I | 10 | 2.54 | 0 | 0.757434 |
| Colombia | $100.00 \quad 1$ | 10 | 2.540 |  | $0.75742 / 4$ |
| Costa Rica | 5.00 I | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |
| Dominican Republic | 5.00 I | 5 | 2.520 |  | 0.573425 |
|  | 1.40 I | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 8.70 I | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |

Appendix A: Table 12. (continued)

| Recipient <br> country | Loan (millions <br> of dollars) | $\dot{\mathrm{I}}_{\mathrm{G}}$ | $\mathrm{Terms}_{\mathrm{G}} \dot{\underline{i}}_{\mathrm{T}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$\quad$ Grant ratio


| Dominican Republic (continued) | 2.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| El Salvador | 0.40 | 1 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.577926 |
| Guatemala | 2.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 5.00 | 1 | 5 | 2.5 | 20 | 0.573425 |
|  | 0.758 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Guyana | 7.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Honduras | 7.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Nicaragua | 2.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 30 | 0.725535 |
|  | 2.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 30 | 0.725535 |
|  | 5.00 | 1 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.577926 |
| Fanama | 3.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.056 | 1 | 5 | 3.5 | 30 | 0.603616 |
|  | 4.10 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 6.60 | 1 | 5 | 3.5 | 30 | 0.603616 |
|  | 3.10 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Paraguay | 1.90 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Peru | 7.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 5.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 12. (continued)


| Peru (continued) | 1.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Uruguay | 0.775 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Regional | 20.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

East isia

| Korea | 12.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 12.70 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 17.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Philippines | 4.70 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |
|  | 2.00 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |
| Thailand | 3.50 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |

Africa

| Congo | 2.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 22 | 0.684147 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dahomey | 0.85 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Ethiopia | 5.80 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Ghana | 20.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Konya | 0.35 | -- | -- | 1 | 40 | 0.679126 |
| Liberia | 0.85 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.09 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 12. (continued)


Appondix A: Table 12. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loan (millions } \\ & \text { of dollars) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Terms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $i_{\text {ir }}$ | T |  |
| Regional (continued) | 0.50 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 0.411523 |
|  | 1.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.125 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Miscellaneous | 1.623 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.757434 |
| Total | 1,108.622 |  |  |  |  | $0.723355^{\text {c }}$ |

Source: U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Program, Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1967.
${ }^{2} i_{0}=$ interest during grace years; $G=$ number of grace years; $i_{T}=$ interest during remainder of loan; and $T=$ total number of years in the loan.
$b_{\text {Assurned terms, }}$ due to unavailable information.
$c_{\text {Weighted average. }}$
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10 of counterpart funds renerated is reserved for U. 3.-use3.

All other A.I.D. and Peace Corps funds are valued as $100 \%$ erants.
90.17 (see Operntions Report) of A.I.D. financed commodities (B1,710.5 million) purchased in I.S., plus Eximbant loons of 6950.8 million.

Sources: Alexis t. Lachman, The Local Currency Procesds of Foreign Aid, O.B.C.D., Paris, 1969; U.S. President, The Foreien Assistance Proeram, Annual. Report to the Conrress, Biscal Year 1gb; Acency for Intermational Bevelopment, Operations Report, June 30, 1966; Bxport-Import Eank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1960; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concossional Sales, September, 1970.
asee Lachman, The Local Currency Froceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 4. bsee Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 16.

Appendix A: Table 15. FISCAL YEAR 1966 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$\mathrm{E}_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (I) \$1, 110.5 million ( $90.17 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic commodity purchases) less $\$ 492.6$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{a}$ plus (2) $\$ 950.8$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 1,568.7$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 5,075.0$ million total aid equals 30.9 (percent of tied aid).
$30.9 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{\text {U.S. }}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.309 \times \frac{104.5-120}{104.5}=$ $.309 \mathrm{x}-.1483=-0.0458$
$g_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## PoL. 480 Title I

$\$ 866.0$ million total aid
of which 655.6 grant equivalent ( $75.7 \%$ )
and 210.4 exchange equivalent
minus $\quad 173.5$ U.S. -use funds
equals 36.9 country-use funds
of which $8.5 \quad 23.0 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 14)
and $28.4 \quad 77.0 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 14)
of which 21.5 grant equivalent ( $75.7 \%$ )
and
6.9 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 15. (continued)
The total srant ratio is: $\begin{gathered}\$ 655.6 \\ 8.5\end{gathered}$
21.5
$\$ 685.6$ divided by $\$ 866.0=.7917$

## Development Loans

$\$ 24.6$ million total aid
of which 18.6 grant equivalent (75.7\%)
and $\quad 6.0$ exchange equivalent
minus 4.9 U.S.-use funds
equals 1.I country-use funds
of which $0.3 \quad 23.0 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 14)
and
$0.877 .0 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 14)
of which
0.6 grant equivalent (75.7.)
and 0.2 exchange oquivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 18.6$ million
0.3
0.6
$\$ 19.5$ divided by $\$ 24.6=.7927$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation
and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchance rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $.00139\left(\$ 7.1^{b} / 35.075 .0\right)=$ .00051
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by .00007
(c) Naiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \frac{7}{3}$ of (a) $=$

$$
\begin{array}{ll} 
& .00026 \\
\operatorname{rotal} r_{2} & .00084
\end{array}
$$

Sources: Appondix A: Tables 13 and 14 ; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2.

Appendix A: Table 15. (continued)
${ }^{\text {a }}$ See page 7.
b $\$ 6.9$ million plus $\$ 0.2$ million.

Appendix A: Table 16. FISCAL YEAR 1966 LOAN DATA AND GRANT RATIOS


Near East \& South Asia

| Afghanistan | 0.80 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| India | 50.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 100.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 150.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Iran | 6.50 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |
| Israel | 10.00 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 25 | 0.479558 |
| Jordan | 1.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 6.30 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Pakistan | 50.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 70.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 70.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Turkey | 3.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 12.30 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 28.10 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 15.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

Latin America
Bolivia

| 5.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 4.30 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 2.10 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 1.10 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

Appendix A: Table 16. (continued)


See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 16. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loan (millions } \\ & \text { of dollars) } \end{aligned}$ | Terms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guyana | 2.00 | 1 | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.00 | 1 10 | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Honduras | 5.20 | 110 | $10 \quad 2.5$ | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.17 | 1 | $10 \quad 2.5$ | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.50 | 1 | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.00 | 110 | 102.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Micaragua | 2.07 | 10 | 12.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.50 | 10 | 10.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.00 I | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 5.00 I | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.70 I | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Fanama | 1.70 I | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 4.00 I | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.10 3. | 10 | 2.5 | 0 | 0.757434 |
| Paraguay | 4.68 I | 10 | 2.54 | 0 | 0.757434 |
|  | $4.70 \quad 1$ | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |
| Peru | 2.10 I | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.60 I |  | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |
|  | 9.00 I | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |
| Uruguay | 5.00 I | 10 | 2.540 |  | 0.757434 |

## Par East

Korea

$$
2.00 \quad 1 \quad 10 \quad 2.5 \quad 40 \quad 0.757434
$$

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 16. (continued)


## Africa

| Cameroon | 0.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| East Africa Regjonal | 0.85 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.70 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Ethiopia | 21.70 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 8.00 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 0.411523 |
|  | 0.225 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Cuinea | 0.15 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.14 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 1.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Kenya | 0.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Liberia |  |  |  |  |  |  |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 16. (continued)


| Moroceo | 2.40 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Migeria | 0.15 | 5.5 | 3 | 5.5 | 15 | 0.255868 |
| Sudan | 1.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Tanzania | 5.90 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Tunisia | 3.325 | 5.5 | 3 | 5.5 | 15 | 0.255868 |
| Uganda | 1.30 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Miscellaneous | 0.14 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 15.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.65 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 0.264 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

Source: U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Frogram, Annual Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 1966.
${ }^{a_{i}}=$ interest during grace years; $G=$ number of grace years; $i_{T}=$ interest during remainder of loan; and $T=$ total number of years in the loan.

Assumed terms, due to unavailable information.
$c_{\text {Weighted average. }}$
Appendix A: Table 17. FISCAL YEAR 1965 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC ATD COMMTTMENTS (theusend of

| Aid category | Total aid commitment | Grant portion | Loan portion | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Local Currency 1 8 1,128,004 861,908 908 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Loan | 34,887 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical Cooperation | 309,205 | 394,796 309,205 | 0 | -- | 394,796 | $.9000$ |
| Multinational | 134,392 | 134,392 | 0 | -- | 309,205 | $1.0000$ |
| Contingency Fund | 134,392 57,156 | 134,392 57,156 | $0$ | -- | 134,392 | 1.0000 |
| Acministrative | 76,485 | 77,156 76,485 | 0 | -- | $57,156$ | $1.0000$ |
| $\frac{\text { Food For Peace }}{1 . \text { Local Currency }} 1,572,000^{\mathrm{a}} \quad 10,485$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sales |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Dollar sales | 158,000 | 0 | $158,000$ | 972,641 96,980 | 972,641 | .8517 |
| - Emergency assistance |  |  |  |  |  | 6138 |
| \& economic development <br> 4. Donations | 57,000 | 57,000 | 0 | -- |  |  |
| 5. Barter | 183,000 | 183,000 | 0 | -- | 183,000 | 1.0000 |
| Peace Corps | 32,000 | 22,786 | 0 | -- | 23,786 | 1.0000 |
| Export-Import Bank | 85,400 | 85,400 | 0 |  | 85,400 | 1.0000 |
| Export-mport Bank | , | 0 | 435,200 | 102,490 | 102,490 |  |
|  | 4,271,391 | 1,321,220 | 2,898,091 | 2,061,709 | 3,385,929 | $.7920^{\text {b }}$ |
| Sources: Export-Import Bank of Vashington,$\qquad$ Report to the Coneress, June |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Foreign Assistance Program, A | nual Report | the Congre | Fiscal year | 30, 1965; | - President, |  |
| Development aporat Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1965; Agency for International Department of Agriculture, P.I. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970 . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a Total of Foon For Peace funds, items $1,2,3,4$, and 5 .
breighted average.
$\therefore$ Ppendix A: TaOLe 10. GTSCAL YEAR 1965 GRANT ELEMEN AYD TRADIMG TACTORS DATA

Development Loans
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Iocal Currency Loans ( $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ )
I. Development
2. PL 480
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PL 480 Dollar Sales

PL 480 sartor

See Piscal Year 1965 Loan Data and Srant Ratios (Appendix A: Table 20).
$10 \%$ of counterpart fund penerated is reserved for U.S.-uses.

All other A.I.D. and Peace Corps funds are valued as $100 \%$ srants.
92.124 (see Operations Report) of A.I.D. financed commodities (\$1,191.6 million) purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank loans of 435.2 million.
3. of Development Loans ${ }^{b}=34,896,730$ (assumed $20 \%$ retained for U.S.-use). Average terms are 1\% interest on 10 years yrace and 40 years maturity at $2 \%$ interest ( 75.7 grant ratio).

31,142,000,000, of which U. S. -use funds are $\$ 148,574,200$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 993,425,800$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 333,989,800(33.6 \%)$ are rrants and $\$ 659,436,000(66.4 \%)$ are loans. Averace loan terms are approximately 10 years grace at $2 \%$ interest, and 40 year maturities at $2 \frac{1}{2}$ interest ( $75.7 \%$ grant ratio).

Approximate averase terms are $5 \frac{1}{3}$ t interest on 14 year maturities and 2 years grace.

Assumed average terms are $2 \frac{10}{2}$ interest on 30 year maturities and 8 years prace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480
collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis 2. Lachman, The Locel Currency Proceeds of Eoreion Aid, C.E.C.D., Faris, 1969; J.S. President, The Foreim Assistance Frofram, Annual Report to the Conpress, fiscal year 1955 ; Arency for International Development, Operations Report, June 30, 1965; Export-Import Eank of rashinaton, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1965; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.I. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{\text {a See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreion Aid, p. } 4 .}$
$\mathrm{b}_{\text {See }}$ O.E.C.D. Resources for the Developing World, 1962-1968,
Paris, 1970, p. 264.
${ }^{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. } 16 .}$

Appendix A: Table 19. FISCAL YEAR 1965 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$\mathrm{g}_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 1,191.6$ million ( $92.12 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic commodity purchases) less $\$ 517.4$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ plus (2) \$435.2 million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 1,109.4$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 4,271.4$ million total aid equals 26.0 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 26.0 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {World }}}=.260 \times \frac{102.8-117}{102.8}= \\
& .260 \times-.1381=-0.0359
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathfrak{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

$$
\text { P.L. } 480 \text { Title I }
$$

$$
\$ 1,142.0 \text { million total aid }
$$

of which 864.5 grant equivalent ( $75.7 \%$ )
ana 277.5 exchange equivalent
minus 148.6 U.S. -use funds
equals 128.9 country-use funds
of which $43.3 \quad 33.6 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 18)
and $85.6 \quad 66.4 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix $A$ : Table 18)
of which 64.8 grant equivalent (75.7\%)
and 20.8 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 864.5$ million

$$
43 \cdot 3
$$

64.8
$\$ 972.6$ divided by $\$ 1,142.0=.8517$

## Development Loans

$\$ 34.9$ million total aid
of which 26.4 grant equivalent ( $75.7 \%$ )
and 8.5 exchange equivalent
minus $\quad 7.0$ U.S.-use funds
equals 1.5 country-use funds
of which $0.533 .6 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 18)
and $\quad 1.0 \quad 66.4 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 18)
of which 0.8 grant $\epsilon$ quivalent ( $75.7 \%$ )
and $\quad 0.2$ exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 26.4$ million

0.8
$\$ 27.7$ divided by $\$ 34.9=.7937$
Application of the shaciow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of $0.371 \times$ exchange equivalent percentage of $.00491\left(\$ 21.0^{b} / \$ 4,271.4\right)=.00182$
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by . 00028
(c) Waiver on instalments and interest, approximately

$$
50 \% \text { of }(a)=\quad \xrightarrow{.00091}
$$

## Appendix A: Table 19. (continued)

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 17 and 18; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2.
${ }^{\text {See page }} 7$.
$\mathrm{b}_{\$ 20.8}$ million plus $\$ 0.2$ million .

Appendix A: Table 20. PISCAL YEAR 1965 IOAN DATA AMD GRANT RATIOS


Mear East \& South Asia

| Afghanistan |  |  |  | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.30 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 10.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Tndia | 10.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3.80 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 190.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 3.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 32.30 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 16.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  |  | 35 | 5 | 3.5 | 20 | 0.445817 |
| Israel |  |  | 5 | 3.5 | 20 | 0.445817 |
|  | 9.00 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 |  |  |
|  | 4.00 | 3.5 | 5 | 3.5 | 20 | 0.445817 |
|  |  | 7 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Jordan | 1.64 |  |  |  | 40 | 4 |
|  | 1.00 | 1 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 40 | . 154 |
| Nepal |  |  | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Pakistan | 140.00 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | . 757434 |
|  | 15.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  |  | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  |  |  | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 8.20 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4.80 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 8.50 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  |  | I | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| Turkey | 5.90 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 80.00 | I | 10 | , |  |  |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 20. (continued)

| Recipient <br> country | Loan (millions <br> of dollars) |  |  | Terms $^{2}$ | Grant ratio |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Turkey (continued) | 6.40 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 7.69 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 2.75 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 4.0 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
|  | 40.0 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

Latin America
Bolivia
Brazil

Chile

Costa Rica

| 0.60 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 150.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 1.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 0.80 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 40 | 0.795139 |
| 11.40 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 1.96 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 15.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 25.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 15.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 3.30 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 80.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 6.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 3.65 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 3.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 1.30 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 0.65 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 20. (continued)


See notations at end of table.

Appendix $A$ : Table 20. (continued)


Far East
Korea.
$\begin{array}{llllll}24.60 & 1 & 10 & 2.5 & 40 & 0.757434\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}24.20 & 1 & 10 & 2.5 & 40 & 0.757434\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}20.60 & 3.5 & 5 & 3.5 & 25 & 0.479558\end{array}$
Thajland
Africa
Cameroon
Guinea

Kenya
Liberia

Malagasy Republic
Migeria

Somali Republic
Tanzania

Tunisia

| 3.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 1.40 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 0.55 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 7.20 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 1.55 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 0.40 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 0.15 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 2.70 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 7.60 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 2.80 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |
| 0.60 | 5.5 | 3 | 5.5 | 15 | 0.255868 |
| 0.125 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 0.075 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 10.00 | 1 | 10 | 2.5 | 40 | 0.757434 |

Appendix A: Table 20. (continued)


Source: U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Promram, Amual Report to the Congress, Piscal Year 1955.
${ }^{2} i_{G}=$ interest during grace years; $G=$ number of grace years; $i_{r n}=$ interest during remainder of loan; and $T=$ total number of years in the loan.
$b_{\text {Assumed terms, }}$ due to unavailable information.
cieighted average.
Appendix A: Table 21. FISCAL YEAR 1964 GRANP RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMTC AID COMMITMENS (Thousands of dollars)
$\left.\begin{array}{lccccc}\text { Aid category } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Total aid } \\ \text { commitment }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Grant } \\ \text { portion }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Loan } \\ \text { portion }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Grant } \\ \text { equivalent } \\ \text { of loans }\end{array} \\ \text { ratio }\end{array}\right]$
Sources: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1964; U.S. President, The Foreign Assistance Program, Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1964; Agency for International Development, Operations Report, June 30, 1964; Peace Corps, Seventh Annual Report, June 30, 1968; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.I. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.

$$
a_{\text {Total of }} \text { Food For Peace fiunds, items } 1,2,3,4 \text {, and } 5 \text {. }
$$

$$
b_{\text {Weighted }} \text { average. }
$$

Appendix A: Table 22. GISCAL YEAR 1964 GRANT ELIMENT AND TRADING

Development Loans

Supportine Assistance

Other

Tied Aid ( $g_{1}$ )

See Fiscal Year 1964 Loan Data and Grant Ratios (AppendixA: Table 24).

10\% of counterpart funds generated is reserved for U.S.-uses. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
All other A.I.D. and Peace Corps funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
86.38\% (see Operations Report) of A.I.D. financed commodities ( $\$ 993.5$ million) purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank loans of $\$ 601.1$ million.

Locsl Currency Loans ( $g_{2}$ )

1. Development
2. PL 480

Eximbank

PL 480 Dollar Sales

PL 480 Earter
Assumed $5 \%$ Development Loans $=$ 665,734.300 (assumed $20 \%$ retained for U.S.-use). Average terms are $0.75 \%$ interest on 10 years grace, and 40 year maturities at $2 \%$ interest ( $78.6 \%$ grant ratio).
\$1,056,000,000, of which U.S.-use funds are $\$ 180,787,200$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 875,212,800$. of country-use funds, $\$ 398,221,800(45.5 \%)$ are grants and $\$ 476,991,000(54.5 \%)$ are loans. Assumed average loan terms are $1 \%$ interest on 10 years grace and $2 \frac{1}{\%} \%$ interest on 40 years maturity ( 75.7 grant ratio). Approximate average terms are 5-3/4\% interest on 12.5 year maturities and 2.5 years grace.
Assumed average terms are $2 q$ interest on 30 year maturities and 8 years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.
The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid,
Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Phe Assistance Program, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; U.S. President Year 1964; Agency for International Annual Fieport to the Congress, June 30, 1964; Export-Import Bank of Development, Operations Report, Jun June 30, 1964; U.S. Department of Washington, Report to the Congres, Sales, September, 1970. Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concession Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 4.
${ }^{2}$ See Lachman, The Local Currency Proce Mrrency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 16.
$\mathrm{b}_{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign }}$, 16.

Appendix A: Table 23. FISCAL YEAR 1964 TRADING FACIOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$\mathrm{E}_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 993.5$ million ( $86.38 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic commodity purchases) less $\$ 460.1$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{a}$ plus (2) $\$ 601.1$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 1,134.5$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 4,363.7$ million total aid equals 26.0 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 26.0 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.260 \times \frac{101.8-112}{101.8}= \\
& .260 \times-.1002=-0.0260
\end{aligned}
$$

## $\mathrm{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## PD. 480 Title I

$\$ 1,056.0$ million total aid
of which 799.4 grant equivalent (75.7\%) and 256.6 exchange equivalent minus 180.8 U.S.-use funds
equals $\quad 75.8$ country-use funds
of which $34.545 .5 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 22)
and $4.1 .3 \quad 54.5 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 22)
of which 31.3 grant equivalent ( $75.7 \%$ )
and 110 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

```
Appendix A: Table 23. (continued)
```

The total grant ratio is: $\begin{gathered}\$ 799.4 \text { million } \\ 34.5\end{gathered}$

```
                                    34.5
                                    31.3
\(\$ 865.2\) divided by \(\$ 1,056.0=.8193\)
```


## Development Loans

\$65.7 million total aid
of which 51.6 grant equivalent (78.6\%)
and 14.1 exchange equivalent
minus 13.1 U.S.-use funds
equals $\quad 1.0$ country-use funds
of which $0.545 .5 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 22)
and
$0.554 .5 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 22)
of which 0.4 grant equivalent (78.6\%)
and
0.1 exchange equivalent

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 51.6$ million

$$
\frac{0.5}{0.4} 4
$$

Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $.00231\left(\$ 10.1^{b} / \$ 4,363.7\right)=$ .00085
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by .00013
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately

$$
50 \% \text { of }(\mathrm{a})=
$$

Appendix A: Table 23. (continued)
Sources: Appendix $A$ : Tables 21 and 22; Appendix E: Tables 1 and 2. ${ }^{2}$ see page 7. $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{p}} 10.0$ million plus $\$ 0.1$ million.

Appendix A: Table 24. TISCAL YEAR 1964 LOAN DATA AND GRAMT RATIOS

| Recipient | Loan (millions |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
| country | of dollars) | $\bar{i}_{G}$ |

Hear East \& South Asia
Afghanistan

Greece
India

Iran
Israel

Neral
Pakistan

| 18.10 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 18.10 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 14.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 12.50 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 24. (continued)


| Pakistan (continued) | 10.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 8.50 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 7.53 | 0.75 | 20 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 7.20 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 6.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 3.80 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 3.60 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 3.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.80 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 70.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Turkey | 20.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 18.10 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 4.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 4.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.50 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 1.10 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 0.32 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |

Latin America
Argentina

| 6.80 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 0.75 | 40 | 0.817226 |

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 24. (continued)


| Bolivia | 33.20 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Srazil.

Chile

| 3.70 | -- | -- | 0.75 | 40 | 0.697991 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 0.65 | -- | -- | 5.75 | 10 | 0.156349 |
| 0.60 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 20.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 20.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 16.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 15.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 7.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 7.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 6.50 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 5.50 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 5.30 | 0.75 | 10 | 0.75 | 40 | 0.817226 |
| 4.30 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 2.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 2.40 | -- | -- | 0.75 | 40 | 0.697991 |
| 1.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 0.80 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 55.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 8.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| 7.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 0.75 | 40 | 0.817226 |

Appendix A: Table 24. (continued)


Appendix A: Table 24. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Loan (millions } \\ & \text { of dollars) } \end{aligned}$ | Terms ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $i_{G}$ | G | $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{T}}$ | T |  |
| Jamaica | 1.50 | -- | -- | 0.75 | 40 | 0.697991 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 25 | 0.411344 |
|  | 1.30 | -- | -- | 3.5 | 25 | 0.41134 |
| Mexico | 20.00 | - | -- | 2 | 30 | 0.546610 |
|  | 20.00 |  |  |  | 20 | 0.368985 |
|  | 2.00 | -- | -- | 3.5 | 20 | 0.368985 |
| Panama |  | 0.75 | 10 | 0.75 | 40 | 0.817226 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Paraguay | 00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 49 | 0.805094 |
|  | 12.10 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 4 |  |
| Feru |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 6.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.20 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 0.75 | 40 | 0.817226 |
|  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1.90 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Regional |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 10.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10.00 | -- | -- | 0.75 | 40 | 0.697991 |
| Uruguay |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  |  |  |  | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |


| Far East | 11.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Korea | 2.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 7.75 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 8.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |

Appendix A: Table 24. (continued)

|  | Loan (millions |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Recipient <br> country | of dollars) | Terms $^{\text {a }}$ | Grant ratio |
| $i_{G}$ | $G i_{T}$ |  |  |


| Africa |  |  |  |  | 40 | 0.785805 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Congo | 2.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785005 |
|  |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| East Africa | 1.50 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Ethiopia |  |  | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 5.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 |  |  |
| Ivory Coast | 7.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Liberia | 7.00 |  |  |  | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 0.35 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 |  |
|  |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Mali | 1.10 |  |  |  |  | 0.785805 |
|  | 2.30 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Morocco |  |  | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 1.80 | 0.75 | 10 |  |  |  |
| Niger |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Nigeria |  |  |  | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 8.60 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 380 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 3.80 |  |  |  | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 3.20 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 7.80 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 1.30 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
| Senegal | 190 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Tanganyika |  |  | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 1.00 | 0.75 | 10 |  |  |  |
|  | 0.85 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  |  | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 0.14 | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 70 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Tunisia |  |  | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 7.40 | 0.75 | 10 |  |  |  |

Appendix A: Table 24. (continued)

| Recipient country | $\begin{gathered} \text { Loan (millions } \\ \text { of dollars) } \end{gathered}$ | Terms ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $i_{G}$ | G | ${ }^{i_{T}}$ | $T$ |  |
| Tunisia (continued) | 2.00 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
|  | 0.80 | -- | -- | 5.75 | 17 | 0.220671 |
| Uganda | 0.40 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | 40 | 0.785805 |
| Miscellaneous | 40.696 | 0.75 | 10 | 2 | $40^{\text {b }}$ | 0.785805 |
| Total | 1,314.686 |  |  |  |  | $0.829948^{\text {c }}$ |

Source: U.S. Fresident, The Foreign Assistance Program, Annual Report to the Congress, Fiscal Year 1964.
${ }^{2} \dot{i}_{G}=$ interest during grace years; $G=$ number of grace years; $\dot{i}_{\mathrm{T}}=$ interest during remainder of loan; and $\mathrm{T}=$ total number of years in the loan.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Assumed terms, due to unavailable information.
$c_{\text {Weighted a.verage. }}$
Appendix A: Table 25. FISCAL YEAR 1963 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONONIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of dollars)
Grant
1.0000
.8416
.6956 $0000^{\circ}$ $\begin{array}{r}1.00000 \\ .7433 \\ 1.0000 \\ .2068 \\ \hline\end{array}$
$.7923^{b}$
.7997
.9000
1.0000
1.0000
1.0000

0тұex quәtenţba quәtenţba portion

173


947,276
102,999
369,419
346,796
148,686
149,196
57,572

Sources: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1963: $\begin{array}{r}1,159,173 \\ 128,797 \\ 410,465 \\ 346,796 \\ 148,686 \\ 149,196 \\ 57,572 \\ 1,452,000^{a} \\ \\ 1,088,000 \\ 58,000 \\ 89,000 \\ 170,000 \\ 47,000 \\ 54,700 \\ 564,900 \\ \hline 4,472,285\end{array}$ Total aid
commitment
0!7.10』
$947,276.8172$
3,543,406 .7923
,
\(\left.\begin{array}{c}947,276 <br>
102,999 <br>
-- <br>
-- <br>
-- <br>
915,661 <br>
40,345 <br>
-- <br>
-- <br>
- <br>
-- <br>

116,821\end{array}\right]\)| $2,123,102$ |
| :--- |

$\begin{array}{r}915,661 \\ 40,345 \\ 89,000 \\ 170,000 \\ 34,935 \\ 54,700 \\ 116,821 \\ \hline\end{array}$
2,123,102 3,543,406
$0 L 8^{\prime} 866^{\prime}$ Z


2,998,870 enth Annual Report, June 30, 1968; U.S.
er, 1970 .
${ }^{{ }^{2}}$ Total of Food For Feace funds, items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
$b_{\text {weighted }}$ average.
Aid category
Development Loan Local Currency
Development Loan

Supportive Assistance Technical Cooperation Multinational

Contingency Fund
Administrative
Food For Peace

sales
2. Dollar sales
3. Emergency assistance
\& economic development
4. Donations
5. Barter
Peace Corps
Export-Import Bank

HOE 0 O2t't $\begin{array}{r}89,000 \\ 170,000 \\ 34,935 \\ 54,700 \\ \hline\end{array}$


Appendix A: Table 26. FISCAL YEAR 1963 GRANT ELEMENT AND TRADING FACTORS DATA

Development Loans

Supportine Assistance

Other

Tied Aid ( $g_{1}$ )

Local Currency Loans ( $g_{2}$ )

1. Development
2. PL 480

Eximbank

PL 480 Dollar Sales

FL 480 Earter

Approximate average terms are $0.75 \%$ interest on both 10 years grace and 40 years maturity.

10\% of counterpart funds penerated is reserved for U.S.-uses.

All other A.I.D. and Peace Corps funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
$78.97 \%$ (see Operations Report) of A.I.D. financed commodities ( $\$ 905$ million) purchased in U.S., plus Eximbark Loans of \$564.9 million.

Assumed $10 \%$ of Development Loans $=$ $\$ 128,797,000$ (assumed 20\% retained for U.S.-use). Terms are the same as other Development Loans ( 81.7 F grant ratio). $\$ 1,088,000,000$, of which U.S.-use funds are $\$ 165,702,400$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 922,297,600$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 415,033,900(45.07)$ are grants and $\$ 507,263,700(55.0 \%)$ are loans. Assumed average terms are $0.75 \%$ interest on 10 years grace and $1 \%$ interest on 35 years maturity (79.4 grant ratio).

Approximate average terms are $5.75 \%$ interest on 11.5 year maturities and $2 \frac{1}{3}$ years Erace.

Assumed average terms are $1 \frac{1}{2}$ interest on 30 year maturities and 8 years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Faris, 1969; Agency for International Development, Onerations Report, June 30, 1963; Export-Import Dank of jashington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1963; U.S. Department of Arriculture, P. I. 480 Concessional sales, September, 1970.
$a_{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreimn Aid, p. } 4 .}$ $b_{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreim Aid, }}$. 16 .

Appendix A: Table 27. FISCAL YEAR 1963 TRADING FACTORS AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$G_{1}-$ Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 905.0$ million ( $78.97 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic commodity purchases) less $\$ 458.4$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ plus (2) $\$ 564.9$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 1,011.5$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 4,472.3$ million total aid equals 22.6 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 22.6 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.226 \times \frac{100.3-112}{100.3}= \\
& .226 \times-.1167=-.0264
\end{aligned}
$$

## $\mathrm{g}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

$$
\text { P.I. } 480 \text { Title } 1
$$

\$1,088.0 million total aid
of which 863.9 grant equivalent ( $79.4 \%$ )
and 224.1 exchange equivalent
minus $\quad 165.7$ U.S. -use funds
equals 58.4 country-use funds
of which $26.3 \quad 45.0 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 26)
and $32.155 .0 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix $A$ : Table 26)
of which 25.5 grant equivalent (79.4\%)
and
6.6 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 27. (continued)
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 863.9$ million
25.5
$\$ 915.7$ divided by $\$ 1,088.0=.8416$

## Development Loans

\$128.8 million total aid
of which 105.2 grant equivalent (81.7\%)
and 23.6 exchange equivalent
minus 25.8 U.S.-use funds
equals -2.2
These $\$ 2.2$ million U.S.-use funds must be procured from the grant equivalent funds, therefore equaling a total grant equivalent of $\$ 103.0$ million. The total grant ratio is $\$ 103.0$ divided by $\$ 128.8=.7997$.

Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of $0.371 \times$ exchange equivalent percentage of $.00147(\$ 6.6 / \$ 4,472.3)=$ .00054
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by . 00008
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of $(\mathrm{a})=$ Total $g_{2}$ .00027 .00089

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 25 and 26; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. $a_{\text {See }}$ page 7.
Appendix A: Table 28. FISCAL YEAR 1962 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMTMENTS (thousands of dollars)
Grant
equivalent ratio of loans

716,795
175,383
634,048
457,783
176,197
104,511
842,643
13,995
$\begin{array}{r}88,000 \\ 161,000 \\ 147,173 \\ 29,500 \\ 128,648 \\ \hline\end{array}$
3,675,676
$.7906^{\text {b }}$
 June 30, 1968; U.S.

Report to the Congress, June 30, 1962; Development, Operations Report, June 30 , 1962; Peace Corps, Seventh Annual Report, Department of Aericulture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
$a_{\text {Total of }}$ Food For Peace funds, items 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.
${ }^{b}$ Weighted average.

Appendix A: Table 29. FISCAL YTAR 1962 GGMT ELEHENT AND TRADTHG FACTORS DATA

Tevelopment. Loans

Supportine Ascistance

Other

Tied Ajd ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ )

Approximate averape terms are $0.75 \%$ interest on both 10 yeare arace and 40 years meturity.

10\% of counterpart furds generated is reserved for U.S.-uses.

All other A.I.D. and Peace Corps funds are valued as loos grants.
66.29; (see Operations Report) of A.I.D. financed commodities ( 5586 million) purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank loans of 3584.5 million.

Local Currency Loans ( $g_{2}$ )

1. Developrnent
2. PL 480

Eximbank

PI 480 Dollar salos

PI 480 Earter

Assumed 20\% of Development Loans = TV19,283.880 (assumed 20, retained for II. S.-use). Terms are the same as other Development Loans (81.7 rrant ratio).
$\$ 1,030,000,000$, of which U.S. -use funds are
$\$ 184,370,000$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 345,630,000$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 402,097,100(47.69)$ are grants and \$443,532,900 (52.4 ) are loans. Assumed averace terrns are 0.75 interest on 10 years grace and 10 interest on 35 years maturity (79.4, prant ratio).
Aporoximate average terms are 5,75 interest on 13 year meturities and $2 \frac{1}{6}$ years rrace.
Assumed averace terms are $1 \%$ interest on 30 year maturities and 8 years srace.
74.3 is the average percent of PI 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Eoreign Aid, O.Z.C.D., Paris, 1969; Agency for International Develop, Report to the Renort, June 30, 1962; Export-Import Eank of uriculture, F.L. 480 the Congress, June 30, 1952; U.S. Department of Asrisurner Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{3}$ See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreion Aid, p. 4. See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreirn Aid, p. 16.

Appendix A: Table 30. FISCAL YEAR 1962 TRADING FACTORS AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$E_{1}-$ Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 586.0$ million ( $66.29 \%$ of A.I.D. funds used for domestic commodity purchases) less $\$ 353.6$ million ( $40 \%$ of A.I.D. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ plus (2) $\$ 584.5$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 816.9$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 4,649.4$ million total aid equals 17.6 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 17.6 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {worn } 1 d}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.176 \times \frac{99.2-112}{99.2}= \\
& .176 \times-.1290=-0.0227
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

$$
\text { P.L. } 480 \text { Title } 1
$$

\$1,030.0 million total aid
of which 817.8 grant equivalent (79.4\%)
and 212.2 exchange equivalent
minus $\quad$ 184.4 U.S. -use funds
equals 27.8 country-use funds
of which $13.2 \quad 47.6 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 29)
and $14.652 .4 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 29)
of which 11.6 grant equivalent (79.4\%)
and 3.0 exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

## Appendix A: Table 30. (continued)

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 817.8$ million
13.2
11.6
$\$ 842.6$ divided by $\$ 1,030.0=.8181$
Development Loans
\$219.3 million total aid
of which 179.2 grant equivalent (81.7\%)
and 40.1 exchange equivalent
minus 43.9 U.S. -use funds
equals $\quad-3.8$
These $\$ 3.8$ million U.S. -use funds must be procured from the grant equivalent funds, therefore equaling a total grant equivalent of $\$ 175.4$ million. The total grant ratio is $\$ 175.4$ divided by $\$ 219.3=.7998$.

Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of .00064 (\$3.0/\$4,649.4) =
.00023
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by .00003
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of $(a)=$

Sources: Appendix $A$ : Tables 28 and 29; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ See page 7.
ғO spuesnoq.
$a_{\text {Total }}$ of Food For Peace funds, items 1, 2, 3, anda 4.
$b_{\text {Weighteã }}$ average.

Appendix A: Table 32. FISCAL YEAR 1961 GRANT EIEMENT AND TRADIRG FACTORS DATA

Development Loans

Supporting Assistance

Other

Tied Aid ( $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{L}}$ )

Local Currency Loans ( $g_{2}$ ) 1. Development
2. PI 480

## Eximbank

Approximate average terms are $0.75 \%$ interest on both 10 years grace and 37.5 years maturity.
10\% of counterpart funds senerated is reserved for U.S.-uses. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
All other I.C.A. ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
$44.17 \%$ (see Operations Report) of I.C.A. financed commodities ( $\$ 463$ million) purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank Loans of $\$ 852.0$ million.

Assumed 60 of Development Loans $=$ \$392,664,000 (assumed 20\% retained for U.S.-use) ${ }^{\text {c }}$ at the same terms as other Development Loans ( $80.9 \%$ grant ratio). \$951,000,000, of which U.S.-use funds are $\$ 250,303,200$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 700,696,800$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 325,543,700(46.5 \%)$ are grants and $\$ 375,153,100(53.5 \%)$ are loans. Assumed average terms are 0.75 interest during 10 years grace and 14 interest on 30 years maturity ( $77.3 \%$ grant ratio).
Approximate average terms are $5.75{ }^{\circ}$ interest on 10.5 year maturities and $1 \frac{1}{2}$ years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; Intermational Cooperation Administration, Overations Report, June 30, 1961; Export-Import Bank of Washington, M. L. 480 Cone Congress. June 30, 1961; U.S. Department of Hgriculture, . . Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 4. $\mathrm{b}_{\text {International Cooperation Administration. }}$
$c_{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. } 16 . ~}^{\text {. }}$

Appendix A: Table 33. FISCAL YEAR 1961 TRADING FACTORS AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$\mathrm{g}_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) $\$ 466.0$ million ( $44.17 \%$ of I.C.A. funds used for domestic commodity purchases) less $\$ 422.0$ million ( $40 \%$ of I.C.A. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{a}$ plus (2) $\$ 852.0$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 896.0$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 4,276.2$ million total aid equals 21.0 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 21.0 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=0.210 \times \frac{100.2-112}{100.2}= \\
& .210 \times-.1178=-0.0247
\end{aligned}
$$

$g_{2}$--Local Currency Loans
P.L. 480 Title I
$\$ 951.0$ million total aid
of which 735.1 grant equivalent (77.3\%)
and
215.9 exchange equivalent
minus
250.3 U.S. -use funds
equals $\quad-34.4$
These $\$ 34.4$ million U.S. -use funds must be procured from the grant equivalent funds, therefore equaling a total grant equivalent of $\$ 700.7$ million, which divided by $\$ 951.0$ million $=.7368$ See notations at end of table.

Development Loans
$\$ 392.7$ million total aid
of which 317.7 grant equivalent ( $80.9 \%$ )
and $\quad 75.0$ exchange equivalent
minus $\quad 78.5$ U.S. -use funds
equals -3.5
These $\$ 3.5$ million U.S. -use funds must be procured from the grant equivalent funds therefore equaling a total grant equivalent of $\$ 314.2$ million, which divided by $\$ 392.7$ million $=.8001$. There is no exchange equivalent for the application of the shadow exchange ratio.

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 31 and 32; Appendix 2 : Tables J and 2. ${ }^{2}$ See p. 7.
Appendix A: Table 34. FISCAL YEAR 1960 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of dollars)
Total grant Grant
ratio
$89,491 \quad .5052$ .1 .000
.9000 888
888
$\cdot i$
8
8
8
$-i$
.6831
$\overline{8 G T 2 D^{\circ}}$
$\varepsilon \varepsilon+L^{\circ}$
$0000^{\circ} \cdot{ }^{\circ}$
$0000 \cdot \tau$
$.7564^{\text {b }}$


${ }^{\text {a Trotal of }}$ Food For Peace funds, items 1, 2, 3, and 4.
$b_{\text {Weighted }}$ average.

Appendix A: Table 35. PISCAL VEAR 1960 GRANT ELEMENT AND TRADIMG PACTORS DATA

Development Loans

Supporting Assistance

Other

Tied Aid $\left(g_{1}\right)$

Approximate average terms are $3 \frac{1}{2}$, interest on both 5 years grace and 30 years moturity.

10\% of counterpart funds generated is reserved for U.S.-uses.

All other I.C.A. funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
$40.67 \%$ (see Operations Report) of I.C.A. financed commodities ( 6423 million) are purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank loans of \$ 405.0 million .

Local Currency Loans ( $g_{2}$ )
I. Development
2. PL 480

Eximbank

FL 480 Barter
$66 \%$ of Development Loans ${ }^{b}=\$ 3+3,860,000$
(assumed $20 \%$ retained for U.S. use). Terms are the same as other Development Loans (50.5\% grant ratio). $\$ 824,000,000$, of which U.S. -use funds are \$191,497.600 and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 632,502,400$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 275,265,000(43.5 \%)$ are grants and \$357,237,400 (56.56) are loans. Assumed average terms are $3 \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ interest on both 5 years grace and 25 years maturity ( 48.0 : grant ratio).

Approximate avorage terms are $5.755^{\circ}$ interest on 12.5 year maturities and $2 \frac{1}{7}$ years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; International Cooperation Administration, Operations Report, June 30, 1960; Export-Import Bank of Nashineton, Report to the Congress, June 30. 1960; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, Septomber, 1970.
${ }^{\text {a See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreion Aid, p. } 4 .}$
$\mathrm{b}_{\text {See O.E.C.D., The Flow of Financial Resources to Countries in the }}$ Course of Economic Development in 1960, Paris, 1962, p. 16.
$\mathrm{c}_{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Froceeds of Foreign Aid, p. } 16 . ~}^{\text {L }}$

Appendix A: Table 36. FISCAL YEAR 1960 TRADING FACTORS AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANI RATIO CALCULATIONS
$\mathrm{g}_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of (1) \$423.0 million ( $40.67 \%$ ) of I.C.A. funds used for domestic comodity purchases) less $\$ 416.0$ million ( $40 \%$ of I.C.A. funds which is assumed to be the "normal" amount of exports attributable to an equivalent amount of untied aid) ${ }^{a}$ plus (2) $\$ 405.0$ million of Eximbank loans which equals $\$ 412.0$ million. This tied aid divided by $\$ 3,405.7$ million total aid equals 12.1 (percent of tied aid).
$12.1 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S .}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.121 \times \frac{101.3-111}{101.3}=$ $.121 \times-.0958=-0.0116$
$\mathrm{g}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## P.I. 480 Title 1

\$824.0 million total aid
of which 395.5 grant equivalent (48.0\%)
and 428.5 exchange equivalent
minus 191.5 U.S.-use funds
equals 237.0 country-use funds
of which 103.1 43.5\% grants (see Appendix A: Table 35)
and $\quad 133.9 \quad 56.5 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 35)
of which 64.3 grant equivalent (48.0\%)
and $\quad 69.6$ exchange equivalent

See notations at end of table.

Appendix A: Table 36. (continued)

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 395.5$ million
103.1
64.3
$\$ 562.9$ divided by $3824.0=.6031$


Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $.02877\left(\$ 98.0^{\mathrm{b}} / \$ 3,405.7\right)=$ .01067
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by .001 .64
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of $(a)=$ .00533

Total $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ .01764

Appendix A: Table 36. (continued)
Sources: Appendix A: Tables 34 and 35; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. $\mathrm{a}_{\text {See }}$ page 7.
$\mathrm{b}_{\$ 69.6 \text { million plus } \$ 28.4 \text { million. }}$
Appendix A: Table 37. FISCAL YEAR 1959 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of

Appendix A: Table 38. FISCAL YEAR 1959 GRANT ELeMENT AND TRADING FACTORS DATA

Development Loans

Supporting Assistance

Other

Tied Aid (g)

Approximate average terms are 3 interest on both 5 years grace and 30 years maturity.

10\% of counterpart funds generated is reserved for U.S. -uses.
All other I.C.A. funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
47.41\% (see Operations Report) of I.C.A. financed commodities ( $\$ 475$ million) are purchased in U.S., plus Eximbank loans of $\$ 890.4$ million.

97 of Development Loans ${ }^{\text {b }}=3505.569,800$ (assumed $20 \%$ retained for U.S. -use) at same terms as other Development Loans ( $54.4 \%$ grant ratio).
$\$ 724,000,000$, of which U.S. -use funds are $\$ 367,285,200$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 356,714,800$. Of country-use funds, assume $\$ 231,864,620(65)^{\text {c }}$, are loans and $\$ 124,850,180$ are grants. Assumed average terms are $3 \%$ interest on both 5 years grace and 25 years maturity ( $51.6 \%$ grant ratio).
Approximate average terms are 5 interest on 11.5 year maturities and $2 \frac{1}{7}$ years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 74.3 is the average percent country-use.
collections earmarked for count

## PL 480 Barter

The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid,
Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, Rational Cooperation Rank of Washington, Report O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; Internatio; Export-Import Bank of Washing Operations Report, June 30 , 1959, Part II, p. 128; , September, 1970.
Agriculture, P.I. 480 Concessional proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 4.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Calculation based on information from Charles R. Frank, Jr., Debt and Terms of Aid,
${ }^{\text {C See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. } 16 . ~}$ $\mathrm{d}_{\text {Calculation based on data in U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. }}$ 480 Concessional sales, Table 2, p. 32. p. 8 .
gr --Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of $\$ 890.4$ million of Eximbank loans. This tied aid divided by $\$ 3,791.7$ million total aid equals 23.5 (percent of total aid).
$23.5 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{\text {U.S. }}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.235 \times \frac{99.0-109}{99.0}=$ $.235 \times-.1010=-0.0237$
$\mathrm{E}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## P. L. 480 Title I

\$724.0 million total aid
of which 373.6 grant equivalent (51.6\%)
and $\quad 350.4$ exchange equivalent
minus 367.3 U.S.-use funds
equals $\quad-16.9$
These $\$ 16.9$ million U.S. -use funds must be procured from the grant equivalent funds therefore equaling a total grant equivalent of $\$ 356.7$ million, which divided by $\$ 724.0$ million $=.4927$.

Development Loans
\$505.6 million total aid
of which 275.0 grant equivalent (54.14)
and 230.6 exchange equivalent
minus lol.1 U.S.-use funds
equals 129.5 country-use funds

Appendix A: Table 39. (continued)

| of which | 84.2 | $65.0 \%$ grant (see Appendix A: Table 38) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| and | 45.3 | $35.0 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 38) |
| of which | 24.6 | grant equivalent (54.4\%) |
| and | 20.7 | exchange equivalent |

The total grant ratio is: \$275.0 million 84.2
24.6
$\$ 383.8$ divided by $\$ 505.6=.7559$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $.00545(\$ 20.7 / \$ 3,791.7)=$
.00202
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by
.00031
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of $(a)=$ .00101

Total $\mathrm{g}_{2}$
.00334

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 37 and 38; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2.
Appendix A: Table 40. FISCAL YEAR 1958 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of dollars)

| Aid category | Total aid commitment | Grant portion | Loan portion | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Grant } \\ & \text { ratio } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local Currency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Loan | 102,093 |  | 102,093 3 | 76,743 | 76,743 | . 7517 |
| Defense Support | 777,668 | 679,668 | 98,000 | 71,887 | 751,555 | . 9664 |
| Local Currency |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Development Assistance | 52,000 | 0 | 52,000 | 39,088 | 39,088 | . 7517 |
| Technical Cooperation | 148,010 | 148,010 | 0 | -- | 148,010 | 1.0000 |
| Special Assistance | 147,352 | 147,352 | 0 | -- | 147,352 | 1.0000 |
| Cther | 247,638 | 247,638 | 0 | -- | 247,638 | 1.0000 |
| Food For Peace $\quad 982,000{ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Local currency sales | 658,000 | 0 | 658,000 | 457,968 | 457,968 | . 6960 |
| 2. Emergency assistance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Donations | 173,000 | 173,000 | 0 | -- | 173,000 | 1.0000 |
| 4. Barter | 100,000 | 74,330 | 0 | --- | 74,330 | . 7433 |
| Export-Import Eank | 857,000 | 0 | 857,000 | 217,592 | 217,592 | . 2539 |
|  | 3,313,761 | 1,520,998 | 1,767,093 | 863,278 | 2,384,276 | $.7195^{\circ}$ |
| Sources: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1959, Part II, p. 128; |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Cooperation Ad P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, | nistration, eptember, 19 | erations R | June 30, | 59; U.S. De | tment of Agr | ture, |

$a_{\$ 90,437,000 \text { in local currency loans. }} b_{\text {Total of Food For Peace funds, items } 1,2,3, \text { and } 4 .}$
$c_{\text {Weighted }}$ average.

Appendix 4: Table 41. ETSCAL YEAR 1958 GRANT ELDEST AMD MRADYG factors data

Development Io ens (also
Defense Support and
Development Assistance Ions)

Other

Tied Aid $\left(X_{1}\right)$
Local Currency Loans ( $f_{2}$ )
]. Develonment
?. PT 480

Eximbent

PI 480 garter

Approximate average terms are 3 interest on both 5 years grace and 25 years maturi.ty.

A11 other I.C.A. funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
Bo procurement restrictions on I.C.A. funds. Eximbank loans are 8857.0 million.
97. of Develomront Loans ${ }^{2}=3244,532,210$ (assumed 20 retained for U.S. -use) at same terms as other Development Loans (51.6\% rant ratio).
\$658,000,000, of winch U. 3. -use funds are $\$ 168,448,000(25.6 \%)^{c}$ and recipient countryuse funds are $\$ 439,552,000$. Of country-use funds, assume $\$ 318,189,300(65 \%)^{c}$ are loans and $\operatorname{P171,362,700}$ are rants. Assumed average terms are 3 interest on both 5 years grace and 20 years maturity (48.0\% grant ratio).
Approximate average terms are $5 \%$ interest on 12.5 year maturities and $2 \frac{1}{N}$ years race.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collection earmarked for country-use.

Appendix A: Table 42. FISCAL YRAR 1958 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS

## $g_{1}-$ Tied Aid

Tied aid consists of $\$ 857.0 \mathrm{milli}$ on of Eximbank loans. This tied aid divided by $\$ 3,313.8$ million total aid equals 25.9 (percent of tied aid).
$25.9 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{\text {U.S. }}}{P_{\text {World }}}=.259 \times \frac{101.2-106}{101.2}=$ $.259 \times-.0474=-0.0123$
$\mathrm{g}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans
PhI. 480 Title I
$\$ 658.0$ million total aid
of which 315.8 grant equivalent (48.0\%)
and 342.2 exchange equivalent
minus 168.4 U.S. -use funds
equals 173.8 country-use funds
of which $113.065 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 4I)
and $\quad 60.8 \quad 35 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 4.1)
of which 29.2 grant equivalent ( $48.0 \%$ )
and 31.6 exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 315.8$ million

$$
113.0
$$

$\$ 458.0$ divided by $\$ 658.0=.6960$

## Appendix A: Table 42. (continued)

Development Loans
$\$ 244.5$ million total aid
of which 126.2 grant equivalent (51. $6 \%$ )
and
minus
equals 69.4 country-use funds
Of which $45.165 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 41)
and
$24.335 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: liable 4. )
of which 12.5 grant equivalent ( $51.6 \%$ )
and
11.8 exchange equivalent

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 126.2$
45.1
12.5
$\$ 183.8$ divided by $\$ 244.5=.7517$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent per$\begin{array}{ll}\text { centage of } .01309\left(\$ 43.4^{a} / \$ 3,313.8\right)= & .00485 \\ \text { Currency depreciation of } 15.14 \% \text {, raise (a) by } & .00074\end{array}$
(b) Currency dep
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, apo ry

$$
50 \% \text { of }(a)=
$$

Total $g_{2}$
Sources: Appendix $A$ : Tables 40 and 41; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. $a_{\$ 31.6 \text { million }}$ and $\$ 11.8$ million.
Appendix A: Table 43. FISCAL YEAR 1957 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of

| Aid category | Total aid commitment | Grant portion | $\begin{gathered} \text { Loan } \\ \text { portion } \end{gathered}$ | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Defense Support | 1,141,922 | 1,017,539 | 124,383 | 93,536 | 1,111,075 | . 9730 |
| Development Assistance | 208,317 | 0 | 208,317 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 156,654 | 156,654 | . 7520 |
| Technical Cooperation | 144,558 | 244,558 |  | -- | 144,558 | 1.0000 |
| Other | $168,893{ }_{6}$ | 168,893 | 0 | -- | 168,893 | 1.0000 |
| Food For Peace | 1,525,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Local currency sales | 908,000 | 0 | 908,000 | 631,968 | 631,968 | . 6960 |
| 2. Emergency assistance \& economic development | 51,000 | 51,000 | 0 | -- | 51,000 | 1.0000 |
| 3. Donations | 165,000 | 165,000 | 0 | -- | 165,000 | 1.0000 |
| 4. Barter | 401,000 | 298,063 | 0 | -- | 298,063 | . 7433 |
| Export-Import Bank | 1,067,400 | $\bigcirc$ | 1,067,400 | 318,405 | 318,405 | . 2983 |
|  | 4,256,090 | 1,845,053 | 2,308,100 | 1,200,563 | 3,045,616 | $.7156^{\circ}$ |

- 7
International Cooperation Administration, Operations Report, June 30,1957 ; U.S. Department of Agriculture, $a_{\text {Local currency. }}$
$b_{\text {Total of Food For Peace funds, items 1, }}$ 2, 3, and 4.
$c_{\text {Feighted average. }}$

Appendix A: Table 44. EISCAL YEAE 1957 GRANT ELEMENT ADD TRADTHG FACTORS DATA

Development Loans

## Other

Tied Rid ( $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ )
Local Currency Loans ( $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ )

1. Development
2. FT 480

Eximbank

PL 480 Earter

Development Assistance and part of Defense Support $=\$ 332.7 \mathrm{million}$. Averase approximate terms are 3 interest on both 5 years grace and 25 years maturity.

All other I.C.A. funds are valued as $100 \%$, rrants.
Io procurement restrictions on I.C.A. funds. Eximbank loans $=\$ 1,067.4$ million.

Virtually $100 \%$ of loans $=\$ 332.7$ million (assume 20\% retained for U.S. -use). ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The terms equal a $51.6 \%$ yrant ratio.
\$908,000,000, of which U.S. -use funds are assumed to be $\$ 232,448,000(25.6 \%)$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 675,552,000$. Of country-use funds, \$439,108,800 are loans ( $65 \%$ ) and \$236,443,200 are grants. Assumed averare terms are 3 interest on both 5 years grace and 20 years maturity ( 48.06 grant ratio).
Aporoximate average terms are $5 \%$ interest on 17.5 year maturities and $2 \frac{1}{3}$ years grace.
74.3 is the averare percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreinn Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969 ; Export-Import Dank of Nashington, Report to the Concress, June 30, 1957, Part II, p. 128; U.S. Department of Apriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{2}$ See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 16.
${ }^{\text {Calculation based on data in U.S. Department of Agriculture, }}$ P.I. 480 Concessional Sales, Table 2, p. 32.

Appendix A: Table 45. FISCAL YEAR 1957 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$g_{1}-$-Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of $\$ 1,067.4$ million of Eximbank loans. This tied aid divided by $\$ 4,256.1$ million total aid equals 25.1 (percent of tied aid).
$25.1 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S .}}{P_{\text {For Id }}}=.251 \times \frac{103.0-107}{103.0}=$ $.251 \times-.0388=-0.0097$
$\mathrm{g}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans
PD. 480 Title 1
$\$ 908.0$ million total aid
of which 435.8 grant equivalent (48.0\%)
and 472.2 exchange equivalent
minus 232.4 U.S. -use funds
equals 239.8 country-use funds
of which $155.9 \quad 65 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 44) and $\quad 83.9 \quad 35 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 44)
of which 40.3 grant equivalent (48.0\%)
and 43.6 exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 435.8$
155.9
40.3
$\$ 632.0$ divided by $\$ 908.0=.6960$

Appendix A: Table 45. (continued)

| Development Loans |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$332.7 | million total aid |  |
| of which | 171.7 | grant equivalent (51.6\%) |  |
| and | 161.0 | exchange equivalent |  |
| minus | 66.5 | U.S.-use funds |  |
| equals | 94.5 | country-use funds |  |
| of which | 61.4 | 65\% grants (see Appendix A: |  |
| and | 33.1 | 35\% reloaned funds (see Append | le 44 ) |
| of which | 17.1 | grant equivalent (51.6\%) |  |
| and | 16.0 | exchange equivalent |  |
| $\text { The total grant ratio is: } \begin{array}{r} \$ 171.7 \\ 61.4 \\ \hline 17.1 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| \$250.2 divided by $\$ 332.7=.7520$ |  |  |  |
| Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation |  |  |  |
| (a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent per- |  |  |  |
| centage of $0.01400\left(\$ 59.6^{a} / \$ 4,256.1\right)=$ |  |  |  |
| (b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by . 00079 |  |  |  |
| (c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately |  |  |  |
|  | $f(a)=$ |  | . 00259 |
|  |  | Total $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ | . 00857 |

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 43 and 44; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. $a_{\$ 4} 43.6$ million plus $\$ 16.0$ million.
Appendix A: Table 46. FISCAL YEAR 1956 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of
Total aid Grant Loan Grant Total grant Grant
equivalent ratio
.9800
.7446
1.0000
1.0000
1.0000
1.0000
$\begin{array}{r}.6877 \\ 1.0000 \\ 1.0000 \\ .7433 \\ .2616 \\ \hline\end{array}$
$.8400^{\circ}$

Appendix A: Table 47. PISCAL YEAR 1956 GFANT ELGMEN AND TRADTMG ractors data

Development Loans

Other

Tied Aid ( $\mathrm{E}_{2}$ )

Local Currency Loans ( $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ )
I. Development
2. PL 480

Eximbank

PL 480 Earter

Development Assistance and part of Defense Support $=\$ 210.8$ million. Approximate average terms are 3 interest on both 3 years grace and 25 years maturity.

All other I.C.A. funds are valued as look grants.

No procurement restrictions on I.C.A. funds. Eximbenk loans are $\$ 234.6$ million.
$96 \%$ of Development Loans ${ }^{a}=\$ 202.37$ million (assume $20 \%$ retained for U.S.-use) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ at same terms as other Develoment Loans (49.0, grant ratio).
$\$ 439,000,000$, of which U.S. -use funds are assumed to be $\$ 112,384,000(25.6 \%)^{c}$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 326,616,000$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 212,300,400$ are loans (654) ${ }^{c}$ and \$114,315,600 are grants. Assumed average terms are $3 \%$ interest on both 3 years grace and 20 years maturity ( 45.1 ) grant ratio).

Approximate average terms are 5 , interest on 14 year maturities and 2 years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis $E$. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; Export-Import Eank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1956, Part II, p. 128; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ See O.E.C.D., The Flow of Financial Resources to Developing Countries in 1961, Paris, 1963, p. 71.

See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. 16.
${ }^{c}$ Calculation based on data in U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.I. 480 Concessional Sales, Table 2, p. 32.

Appendix A: Table 48. FISCAL YEAR 1956 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCUIATIONS
$\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{I}}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of $\$ 234.6$ million of Eximbank loans. This
tied aid divided by $\$ 2,686.2$ million total aid equals 8.7 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 8.7 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.087 \times \frac{100.7-104}{100.7}= \\
& .087 \times-.0328=-0.0029
\end{aligned}
$$

$g_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

$$
\text { P.L. } 480 \text { Title I }
$$

$\$ 439.0$ million total aid
of which 198.0 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and 241.0 exchange equivalent
minus 112.4 U.S.-use funds
equals 128.6 country-use funds
of which 83.6 65\% grants (see Appendix A: Table 4'7)
and $\quad 45.035 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 47)
of which 20.3 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and $\quad 24.7$ exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 198.0$ million
$\$ 301.9$ divided by $\$ 439.0=.6877$

|  | Development Loans |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- |
|  | $\$ 202.4$ | million total aid |
| of which | 99.2 | grant equivalent (49.0\%) |
| and | 103.2 | exchange equivalent |
| minus | 40.5 | U.S.-use funds |
| equals | 62.7 | country-use funds |
| of which | 40.8 | $65 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 47) |
| and | 21.9 | $35 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 47) |
| of which | 10.7 | grant equivalent (49.0\%) |
| and | 11.2 | exchange equivalent |

The total grant ratio is: $\$ 99.2$ million
40.8
10.7
$\$ 150.7$ divided by $\$ 202.4=.7446$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of $0.371 x$ exchange equivalent percentage of $0.01336\left(\$ 35.9^{\text {a }} / \$ 2,686.2\right)=\quad .00495$
(b) Currency depreciation of 15.4\%, raise (a) by . 00076
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately

$$
50 \% \text { of }(a)=
$$

$$
.00248
$$

Total $\mathrm{g}_{2}$
.00829
Sources: Appendix A: Tables 46 and 47 ; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. $\mathrm{a}_{\$ 24.7}$ million plus $\$ 1.2$ million.
Appendix A: Table 49. FISCAL YEAR 1955 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED STATES ECONONIC AID COMMITNENTS (thousands of dollars)

| Aid category | Total aia commitment | Grant portion | Loan portion | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | Grant ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Defense Support | 807,146 | 807,146 | 0 | -- | 807,146 | 1.0000 |
| Development Assistance | 256,329 | 46,829 | 209,500 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 155,994 | 202,823 | .7913 |
| Technical Cooperation | 111,796 | 111,796 | 0 | -- | 111,796 | 1.0000 |
| Other | $32,568$ | 32,568 | 0 | -- | 32,568 | 1.0000 |
| Food For Peace | $385,000^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Local currency sales | 73,000 | 0 | 73,000 | 50,202 | 50,202 | .6877 |
| 2. Emergency assistance \& economic development | 52,000 | 52,000 | 0 | -- | 52,000 | 1.0000 |
| 3. Donations | 135,000 | 135,000 | 0 | -- | 135,000 | 1.0000 |
| 4. Barter | 125,000 | 92,913 | 0 | -- | 92,913 | . 7433 |
| Export-Import Bank | 631,500 | 0 | 631,500 | 176,315 | 176,315 | .2792 |
|  | 2,224,339 | 1,278,252 | 914,000 | 382,511 | 1,660,763 | $.7466^{\text {c }}$ | $1,60,163$

Sources: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30,1959 , Part II, p. 128;
International Cooperation Administration, Operations Report, November 16, 1955; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& a_{\text {Local currency. }} \\
& b_{\text {Total of Food For Peace funds, items }} 1,2,3 \text {, and } 4 . \\
& c_{\text {Weighted average. }}
\end{aligned}
$$

Appendix A: Table 50. FISCAL YEAR 1955 GRANT ELEMENT AND TRADING FACTORS DATA

Development Loans

Other

Tied Aid $\left(g_{1}\right)$

Local Currency Loans ( $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ )

1. Development
2. PL 480

## Eximbank

PL 480 Barter
\$209.5 million of Development Assistance at approximate average terms of $3 \%$ interest on both 3 years grace and 25 years maturity.
All other I.C.A. funds are valued as $100 \%$ grants.
No procurement restrictions on I.C.A. funds. Eximbank loans are $\$ 631.5$ million.

Assume $100 \%$ of loans (assume $20 \%$ retained for U.S.-use). ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The terms equal a $49.0 \%$ grant ratio.
$\$ 73,000,000$, of which U.S.-use funds are assumed to be $\$ 18,688,000(25.6 \%)^{\mathrm{b}}$ and recipient country-use funds are $\$ 54,312,000$. Of country-use funds, $\$ 35,302,800$ are loans $(65 \%)^{\mathrm{b}}$ and $\$ 19,009,200$ are grants. Assumed average terms are 3 interest on both 3 years grace and 20 year maturities ( $45.1 \%$ grant ratio).
Approximate average terms are $4.75 \%$ interest on 13 year maturities and 3 years grace.
74.3 is the average percent of PL 480 collections earmarked for country-use.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, O.E.C.D., Faris, 1969; Export-Import Bank of Fashington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1955, Part II, p. 128; U.S. Department of Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970.
${ }^{\text {a See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Foreign Aid, p. } 16 . ~}$
$b_{\text {Calculation based on data in U.S. Department of Agriculture, }}$ P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, Table 2, p. 32.

## Appendix A: Table 51. FISCAL YEAR 1955 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCUIATIONS

E ${ }_{1}$-Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of $\$ 631.5$ million of Eximbank loans. This tied aid divided by $\$ 2,224.3$ million total aid equals 28.4 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 28.4 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {World }}}=.284 \times \frac{97.0-100}{97.0}= \\
& .284 \times-.0309=-0.0088
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mathrm{g}_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## P.L. 480 Title 1

\$73.0 million total aid
of which 32.9 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and 40.1 exchange equivalent
minus $\quad 18.7$ U.S.-use funds
equals 21.4 country-use funds
of which $13.965 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 50)
and $\quad 7.535 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Tlable 50)
of which 3.4 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and 4.1 exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 32.9$ million

## Development Loans

$\$ 209.5$ million total aid
of which 102.7 grant equivalent (49.0\%)
and 106.8 exchange equivalent
minus 4..9 U.S.-use funds
equals 64.9 country-use funds
of which $42.265 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 50)
and $22.735 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 50) of which 11.1 grant equivalent (49.0\%)
and 11.6 exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 102.7$ million

$$
42.2
$$

11.1
$\$ 156.0$ divided by $\$ 209.5=.7446$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $0.00705\left(\$ 15.7^{a} / \$ 2,224.3\right)=\quad .00261$
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately

$$
50 \% \text { of }(\mathrm{a})=
$$

$$
\operatorname{Total} E_{2}
$$

.00131
.00432

Sources: Appendix A: Tables 49 and 50; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2. a $\$ 4.1$ million plus $\$ 11.6$ million.
(thousands of

Appendix A: Table 53. FISCAL YEAR 1954 GRAMT ELEMENT AND TRADEGG FACTORS DATA

Development Loans

Other

Tied Aid $\left(g_{1}\right)$

Local Currency Loans ( $\mathrm{g}_{2}$ ) Development

Eximbank
$\$ 100.0$ million of Development Assistance at approximate average terms of 3 interest on both 3 years grace and 20 years maturity.

All other F.O.A. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ funds are valued as 100\% grants.

No procurement restrictions on F.O.A. funds. Eximbank loans are $\$ 250.4$ million.

Assume $100 \%$ of loans (assume $20 \%$ retained for U.S.-use) ${ }^{b}$ are local currency. The terms equal a 45.1 grant ratio.

Approximate average terms are 4 interest on 18.5 year maturities and $3^{\frac{1}{1}}$ years rrace.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Froceeds of Foroign Aid, O.E.C.D., Paris, 1969; Export-Import Eank of Washington. Report to the Concress, June 30, 1954 , Part II, p. 128
$a_{\text {Foreien }}$ Operations Administration.
$\mathrm{b}_{\text {See Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Forejgn Aid, p. } 16 .}$

Appendix A: Table 54. FISCAL YEAR 1954 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RATIO CALCULATIONS
$g_{1}-$ Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of $\$ 250.4$ million of Eximbank loans. This tied aid divided by $\$ 1,466.0 \mathrm{million}$ total aid equals 17.1 (percent of tied aid).
$17.1 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{\mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.171 \times \frac{97.3-99}{97.3}=$

$$
.171 \times-.0175=-0.0030
$$

$g_{2}$--Local Currency Loans

## Develorment Loans

$\$ 100.0$ million total aid
of which 45.1 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and 54.9 exchange equivalent
minus 20.0 U.S.-use funds
equals 34.9 country-use funds
of which $22.765 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 53)
and $12.235 \%$ reloaned funds (see Appendix A: Table 53)
of which 5.5 grant equivalent ( $45.1 \%$ )
and $\quad 6.7$ exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\$ 4.1$ million
22.7
$-5.5$
$\$ 73.3$ divided by $\$ 100.0=.7330$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:

Appendix A: Table 54. (continued)
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $0.00457(\$ 6.7 / \$ 1,466.0)=.00169$
(b) Currency depreciation of $15.4 \%$, raise (a) by . 00026
(c) Waiver on installments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of (a) =
Appenđix A: Table 55. FISCAL YEAR 1953 GRANT RATIO OF UNITED SIATES ECONOMIC AID COMMITMENTS (thousands of dollars)

| Aid category | Total aid commitment | Grant portion | Loan portion | Grant equivalent of loans | Total grant equivalent | Grant <br> ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Defense Support | 1,549,100 | 1,549,100 | 0 | -- | 1,549,100 | 1.0000 |
| Development Assistance | 71,700 | 55,300 | $16,400{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 12,000 | 67,300 | . 9386 |
| Technical Cooperation | 128,000 | 128,000 | 0 | -- | 128,000 | 1.0000 |
| Relief | 36,000 | 36,000 | 0 | - | 36,000 | 1.0000 |
| Other | 19,000 | 19,000 | 0 | -- | 19,000 | 1.0000 |
| Export-Import Bank | 571,100 | C | 571,100 | 227,298 | 227,298 | . 3980 |
|  | 2,374,900 | 1,787,400 | 587,500 | 239,298 | 2,026,698 | . $8534^{\circ}$ |

Sources: Export-Import Bank of Washington, Report to the Congress, June 30, 1959, Part II, p. 128; Foreign Operations Administration, Monthly Operations Report, July 31, 1954.
$a_{\text {Local currency. }}$
b Weighted average. $^{\text {. }}$

```
Appendix A: Table 56. FISCAL YEAR 1953 GRANT ELENENT AND TRADTUG
    FACRORS DATA
```

Development Ionns

Other

Tied Aid (s)

Local Curroncy Loans ( $f_{?}$ ) Develoment

Eximbank
\$16. 4 million of Development Assistance at approximate averarge terms of 3 interest on both 3 years crace and 20 year maturities.

All other T.0.A. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ funds are valued as 100\% grants.

No procurement restrictions on 7.0.A. funds. Eximbent loans are $\$ 571.1$ million.

Ascume 100 of loans (assume $20 \%$ retained for U.S.-use)b are local currency. The terms egual a 45.1 orant ratio.

Approximate averare terms are 4 interest, on 22.5 yenr maturities and 21 years mrace.

Sources: Alexis E. Lachman, The Local Currency Proceeds of Porejon Aid,
 Corrress, June 30, 1953, Part, 11, p. 129.

Foreion operations Administration.
Soe Lachman, The Loes Currenoy Froceeds of Poreion Aid, w. Io.

Appendix A: Table 57. FISCAL YEAR 1953 TRADING FACTOR AND LOCAL CURRENCY GRANT RAIIO CALCULAMIONS
$\mathrm{g}_{1}$--Tied Aid
Tied aid consists of $\$ 571.1$ million of Eximbank loans. This tied aid divided by $\$ 2,374.9$ million total aid equals 24.0 (percent of tied aid).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 24.0 \% \times \frac{P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S}}{P_{\text {world }}}=.240 \times \frac{100.0-100}{100}= \\
& .240 \times---
\end{aligned}
$$

## Development Loans

\$16.4 million total aid
of which 7.4 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and $\quad 9.0$ exchange equivalent
minus 3.3 U.S.-use funds
equals 5.7 country-use funds
of which $3.765 \%$ grants (see Appendix A: Table 56)
and $\quad 2.035 \%$ reloaned funds (sce Appendix $\Lambda$ : Table 56)
of which 0.9 grant equivalent (45.1\%)
and $\quad$.l exchange equivalent
The total grant ratio is: $\phi^{\$} 7.4$ million
$\$ 12.0$ divided by $\$ 16.4=.7317$
Application of the shadow exchange rate ratio plus depreciation and waiver of repayments:

Appendix A: Table 57. (continued)
(a) Shadow exchange rate of 0.371 x exchange equivalent percentage of $0.00046(\$ 1.1 / \$ 2,374.9)=\quad .00046$
(b) Currency depreciation of $1.5 .4 \%$, raise (a) by .00007
(c) Waiver on instalments and interest, approximately $50 \%$ of $(a)=$ .00023

Total $g_{2}$
.00076

Sources: Appendix 1 : Tables 55 and 56; Appendix B: Tables 1 and 2.

## Appendix B: INDEX COMPUTATIONS

Two indices are requirod in the trading factor analysis: one to measure the relationship of United States versus world market export prices and the other to reflect the difference between official versus market currency exchange rates. The former is used in the aid tying calculations to indicate the loss of exports had aid been offered on an untied basis, while the latter is utilized in shadow exchange rate calculations for local currency loans.

## U.S. Versus World Export Price Index-- I

The index figures in Appendix B: Table 1 , which represent the value of U.S. export prices, are assumed to reflect a "basket of gocds" commodity mix similar to actual aid-financed domestic commodity expenditures. The United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Canada, and Japan are assumed to represent the bulk of the countries which could effectively compete with the United States for these commodity expenditures. In Table 1 the U.S. export price index is compared with the average price inder of the competing countries and the percent difference show. This percentage reflects the loss of exports attributable to foreign aid due to the price differential had aid been offered untied. ${ }^{I}$

[^6]Due to limited availability of data, three countries, India, Pakistan, and Brazil, are used in the calculation of the shadow exchange rate index. These countries represent approximately $65 \%$ of the 1954 1969 P.L. 480 sales and approximately $47 \%$ of other local currency sales during this period. The weighting of these countries, which reflects the flow of financial resources in both categories, are: India 65\%, Pakistan 21\%, and Erazil 14\%. The index calculated in Table 2 is assumod to approximate the data for the remaining countries receiving local currency loans. The exchange rate for each year is the rate as of June 30.

To calculate the index, the average local currency units per U.S. doller from Table 2 are utilized in the following manner:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { India }=\frac{5.26}{7.56}=0.696 \text { at } 65 \% \text { weighting }=0.452 \\
\text { Palistan }=\frac{4.41}{8.44}=0.523 \text { at } 21 \% \text { weighting }=0.110 \\
\text { Brazil }=\frac{75.76}{158.73}=0.477 \text { at } \frac{141}{100} \text { weighting }=\frac{0.067}{0.629}
\end{gathered}
$$

0.629 reflects the market value of local currency repayments, while its complement ( $1-0.629$ ) , 0.371, indicates the grant proportion which is to be utilized in the shadow exchange rate calculations for trading factor $g_{2}$.
commodities with U.S. versus world market prices for each commodity was not used due to a lack of available data. However, the index figures in Table 7 do reflect the relative change in the competitiveness of U.S. versus torld export commodities.

Appendix B: Table 1. EXPORT Trade INDEX: $1953=100$

| Country | 1953 | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| United States | 100 | 99 | 100 | 104 | 107 | 106 |
| United Kingdom | 100 | 99 | 101 | 105 | 110 | 109 |
| France | 100 | 94 | 95 | 99 | 101 | 97 |
| Germany | 100 | 98 | 98 | 101 | 103 | 103 |
| Italy | 100 | 99 | 98 | 102 | 102 | 101 |
| Canada | 100 | 98 | 99 | 103 | 105 | 103 |
| Japan | 100 | 96 | 91 | 94 | 97 | 94 |
| Total Non-U.S. Index | 600 | 584 | 582 | 604 | 618 | 607 |
| Average Non-U.S. Index | 100 | 97.3 | 97.0 | 100.7 | 103.0 | 101.2 |

$$
\left(P_{\text {world }}-P_{U . S .}\right)+P_{\text {world }}--.0175-.0309-.0328-.0388-.0474
$$

Sources: United Nations Statistical Yearbook 1959, Eleventh Issue, New York, 1960 ; United Nations Statistical Yearbook 1965 , Seventeenth Issue, New York, 1966; United Nations Statistical Yearbook 1969, Twenty-first Issue, New York, 1970.

| 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 | 1965 | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 109 | 111 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 117 | 120 | 123 | 127 | 132 |
| 109 | 111 | 112 | 114 | 117 | 119 | 122 | 129 | 129 | 122 | 125 |
| 89 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 95 | 98 | 100 | 103 | 102 | 104 | 105 |
| 103 | 105 | 110 | 111 | 110 | 111 | 113 | 114 | 114 | 112 | 114 |
| 94 | 97 | 93 | 90 | 95 | 98 | 96 | 94 | 94 | 91 | N.A. |
| 105 | 105 | 100 | 97 | 97 | 98 | 100 | 103 | 106 | 111 | 115 |
| 94 | 96 | 92 | 89 | 88 | 87 | 86 | 84 | 87 | 88 | 92 |
| 594 | 608 | 601 | 595 | 602 | 611 | 617 | 627 | 632 | 628 | 551 |
| 99.0 | 101.3 | 100.2 | 99.2 | 100.3 | 101.8 | 102.8 | 104.5 | 105.3 | 104.7 | 110.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -1010 | -.0958 | -.1178 | -.1290 | -.1167 | -.1002 | .1381 | -.1483 | -.1681 | -.2130 | -.1978 |

Appendix E: Table 2. ORGICTAL VERSUS MARKET CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE INDEX (U.S. dollars per unit of foreign
 $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Average per } \\ \text { U.S. Dollar } & 5.26 \quad 7.56\end{array}$

Source: Wall Street Journal, Foreign Exchange Listings, 1953-1969. ${ }^{2}$ Selline prices for bank transfers in the U.S. for payments abroad.
barket prices for foreion banknotes.
${ }^{\text {Since July }} 6$, 1948, the official exchange rate whs 5.40541 cents per cruzeiro to 1000 old cruzeiros. at the ratio of $I$ to 1000 old cruzer

$$
d_{\text {flot }} \text { available. }
$$
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[^3]:    Sources: Export-Import Bank of the United States, Fiscal Year 1968 Report; U.S. President, The Foreign Operations Report, June 30, 1968 ; Peace Corps
     ulture, F.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970 .
    $a_{\text {Total }}$ of Food For Peace funds, items $1,2,3,4$, and 5 .
    $b_{\text {Weighted average. }}$
     Agriculture, P.L. 480 Concessional Sales, September, 1970 .
    a Total of Food For Peace funds, items 1, 2, 3, 4 , and 5.
    beighted average. )
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[^4]:    See notations at end of table.

[^5]:    
    
    
    
    
    

[^6]:    $I_{\text {thile }}$ this procedure measures the percent change in the export price index of the U.S. versus the "world market," the magnitude of this percent change does not indicate the true world market price of the exports (e.g., if Country $A$ and Country $B$ sell a commodity at $\$ 10$ and $\$ 20$ per unit, respectively, a $50 \%$ price increase by Country $A$ and a $10 \%$ price increase by Country $B$ will still leave Country $A$ with a price advantage). An index including the actual yearly mix of foreign aid

