PD-AAS-658

UNCLASSIFIED

AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT

ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

FY 83

THAILAND

BEST AVAILABLE

JUNE 1981

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20523

UNCLASSIFIED

FY 1983 Annual Budget Submission

Table of Contents

		Page
1.	Introduction - ABS Overview	1
	TABLE I - Long Range Plan and Narrative	12
2.	TABLE III - Project Obligations by Appropriation Account: FY 1981-1983	15
3.	TABLE IV - Project Budget Data	20
4.	New Project Narratives	25
5.	TABLE V - Proposed Program Ranking	33
6.	Proposed Program Ranking Narrative	36
7.	Workforce and Operating Expenses	
	A. TABLE VIII - Operating Expense Summary	43
	B. TABLE IX - Overseas Workforce Requirements Schedule	46
	C. ADP - Report	54

ABS OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The proposed budget for FY 1983 provides the resources for AID, through its bilateral program, to contribute an important qualitative dimension to the achievement of Thailand's development objectives. As articulated in the CDSS, the core of USAID's strategy, highly lauded and supported by AID/W, is to seek a fundamental improvement in the productivity and income of rural families engaged in rainfed agriculture - the principal development concern of the Thai Government.

Since the submission of the CDSS, two major new initiatives have begun to take shape. This ABS responds to Washington guidance to draw upon the relative efficiencies of the private sector in the development process (the policy environment in Thailand offers excellent opportunities) and to position ourselves to manage a multi-year Economic Support Fund benefitting the Thai and refugee populations already affected by political and security problems emanating from Kampuchea and Laos. While these initiatives are peripheral to the "core" of USAID"s development strategy, there are compelling U.S. policy reasons for incorporating them into our overall program in Thailand.

This ABS identifies two critical issues for resolution by Agency management, both resulting from the recent imposition of unexpectedly low FTE ceilings on USAID:

(1) The ceilings force USAID to shift existing USDH positions away from longer-range analytical functions towards project management and support. In this way, USAID will be able to effectively manage the core project portfolio represented by existing projects and proposed new starts related to the core strategy in FY 81-82-83. However, the reduction in analytical capability challenges the efficacy of the longer term CDSS strategy, i.e., our ability to organize the development program beyond FY 83.

(2) Since essentially the full capacity of Mission staff will be applied to planning and managing the core programs, we would not have the staff resources to undertake new initiatives in the private sector or in refugee-related programs.

A summary comparison of USAID's project portfolio and total staff in 1978 (the year when AID moved from a phase-out strategy) and FY 1982 provides vivid portrayal of the dilemma USAID faces:

Year	No. of Projects	USDH	FSN	Total
1978	12	18	69	87
1982	29	25	67	92

Compared with 1978, USAID is responsible for 17 additional units of management and planning for major program expansion in FY 82/FY 83, with a net increase of only five positions, USDH and FSN combined. On the basis of rough comparisons with other Asia mission situations, we believe that this ratio is the lowest in the Asia Bureau. It critically impairs Mission operations even after taking into account radical and painful restructuring of Mission staff and other efficiency measures planned or underway (as described below) designed to enhance USAID's project management capabilities.

The pressure of the expanded, diversified portfolio will ease somewhat in FY 83 as eight projects terminate and four new starts are funded (including one in the private sector). Thereafter, we expect to progressively reduce the number of projects in implementation by selecting fewer, larger projects, primarily by expanding on demonstration and capacity building efforts now underway. Nevertheless, USAID faces an awesome challenge over the next two years just to implement successfully the projects within our current portfolio, augmented by relatively few new starts in FY 81/82.

The bottom line is that there is a minimum of 25 US FTE required to plan and manage the core project program through FY 83. Three FTE's would need to be added to restore mission analytical capability and front-office efficiency in FY 82 or FY 83. Additionally, four FTE's will be needed (for a total of 32 in FY 83) if AID is to assume the responsibility for new private sector and ESF initiatives.

A comparative country analysis of staff resources related to project and program responsibilities within the region, and perhaps globally, should justify a reallocation of FTE resources to accommodate USAID/Thailand's minimum essential request.

The supporting narrative below provides a more detailed commentary on (1) USAID's strategy, (2) program levels, (3) project portfolio, (4) size and mix of USAID staff, (5) program options and their strategic impact, and (6) the operational expense budget.

I. AID Strategy - Evolution and Content

Beginning in FY 1978, AID shifted from a phase-out mode of operations to an intensive dedication of time, talent, and staff resources to the development of a long term strategy and related project portfolio. The FY 83 CDSS reflects an evolution of a constant but increasingly focussed strategy. During the FY 1978-81 planning period, USAID became engaged in a relatively broad array of program interventions of concern to Thailand and AID/W special interests, including irrigated agriculture, watershed (forestry) management, energy, and a major expansion in PVO activities. Many of these programs, while peripheral to the core strategy, will provide the programmatic structure and hands-on experience over the next 3-5 years to facilitate substantial expansion and investments by the RTG and major donors.

From this initial involvement in nine sub-sectors, the program focus has sharpened to deploy limited personnel and financial resources to four sub-sectors of greatest relevance to AID - population, rainfed agriculture, health and nutrition and decentralization. The program's operational mode draws upon AID's comparative institutional advantage in Thailand - the testing and application of new technologies and management approaches. Through this approach, we expect to generate enhanced efficiency, impact, and replicability of past and future development investments.

Viewed from a management perspective, USAID is at a crucial watershed. We have an on-going portfolio of high potential for contributing to Thai development. This portfolio includes projects which are the lead-in efforts to our core development strategy for the CDSS period and projects which perhaps represent USAID's last involvement in problem areas which lie outside the core strategy, like non-conventional energy development - which nevertheless are highly important to Thailand's overall development program. To be successful, these projects require more management attention by USAID than we have been able to give them, partly because of RTG management deficiencies, partly because of the difficulty of the problems addressed and the associated complexity of interventions to overcome the problems. Over FY 82/83, in order to make meaningful progress towards CDSS objectives, USAID and the RTG must organize additional development efforts in problems areas of the core strategy, while at the same time assuring sufficient management attention to our existing projects. Under current FTE constraints, the only way that we can do this job well is to direct more staff resources to project implementation at the expense of analytical functions.

II. Program Levels

Given this management problem, one option would be to reduce the level of future obligations to avoid compounding the problem. As we discuss below, however, this option is not desirable because it vitiates the CDSS strategy. Moreover it would not resolve the problem. The few proposed new starts related to the core strategy within our FY 83 budget request will not represent a net addition to our management workload; they can be accommodated because eight existing projects will terminate in FY 83.

By adhering to the ABS definition of minimum level, the DA program to Thailand would be sufficient at $18.5 million. The technical definition of "minimum", however, does not consider the paramount factor influencing the efficacy of AID's development assistance strategy - the constancy and credibility of the US-Thai development assistance relationship. A reduction in the DA program level from that planned for FY 1982 would signal that AID is not a serious or relevant partner in Thailand's development process. It would also signal to the international development community a slackening of U.S. interest in Thailand's economic concerns and objectives. At the minimum level, AID could no longer engage the time and attention of Thai development planners in the arduous collaborative process of project identification, design and implementation.

The AAPL level proposed is much more consistent with RTG desires/expectations of increasing U.S. support for its development program. It is also in proportion to the level of need within the problem areas to be addressed by our core strategy and our assessment of the real opportunity for AID project funding in these areas in FY 83.

III. Project Portfolio

USAID's problem in managing its on-going portfolio and need for immediate relief in the form of additional staff have been highlighted above. During the FY 82/83 period, we intend to manage our progam levels, sector concentration, and project selection so as not to add significantly to that problem.

The FY 1983 ABS reflects a continuum of AID's tactical approach to move to fewer projects within the context of the CDSS strategy and new policy directives. In FY 82 and FY 83, a total of seven proposed new project starts are related to the "core" strategy. This compares with a total of 15 new starts in FY 1979 and FY 1980. In FY 1982, all new projects are follow-ons or spin-offs from current activities - areas in which AID has developed in-depth understanding of the technical

and administrative constraints and has established effective working relationships with relevant RTG technical agencies.

In FY 1983, we are proposing three new projects which add an important qualitative dimension to the core strategy: (1) improving the institutional capacity of selected functional agencies to deliver relevant agricultural services and inputs to non-irrigated and largely subsistence farm enterprises in the Northeast, (2) enhancing the nutritional awareness and status of the same population group through nutrition education preventative health programs and (3) the improvement of domestic water and sanitation facilities.

While the private sector initiatives evolved outside the CDSS conceptual framework, the Thai policy environment has encouraged the growth of a dynamic and resilient private sector which, in turn, enhances U.S. trade and investment opportunities. If personnel resources permit, we propose to bring together under one field organization a combination of U.S. instrumentalities to tap the creative energy and talent of the local and U.S. private sector in furtherance of Thai development objectives.

IV. Personnel Levels

Since the initial CDSS submitted in January 1979, USAID has consistently projected a USDH staff requirement of 29-30 positions to carry out our program strategy and project portfolio. AID/W's consistent reaction has been to question the Mission's capability to plan and manage an expanded program with such a modest staff -- particularly since the Mission did not have any resident procurement, contracting or legal expertise.

In spite of severe Missionwide MODE pressures, the Ambassador recently supported a 27 FTE level to carry out USAID field responsibilities, with the further understanding that additional staff would be justified by the extent and nature of USAID involvement in new private sector and ESF initiatives.

AID/W responded by providing the 27 positions in late April 1981, only to subsequently reduce the positions a month later to 25 FTE for FY 82 and FY 83. USAID is convinced that the current level and composition of staff will not permit us to effectively implement the project portfolio currently underway and the few additional, critical projects being planned for FY 81/82. Furthermore, it is clear that our top priority must be to produce early results from these projects, both because of their high potential to contribute to Thai development and because many of them provide the basis for expanded activity

within our core strategy. Projects like NERAD and Decentralized Development are, in effect, our most important forward-planning activities. Accordingly, we will examine all current options to direct staff time to implementation as required. In planning our future program, we will consider workforce implications for the viability of our current portfolio.

In an attempt to adjust to a worst-case scenario if the recently imposed FTE limitations are held, and still maintain an irreducible minimum project planning and oversight capability, the Mission has taken and plans to take a number of actions, some of which are drastic and painful. Specifically, we have restructured the Mission staffing pattern to replace positions least relevant to project implementation. Temporarily, the most important cost is a dimunition of in-house analytical capabilities associated with not replacing our Program Economist. We believe we can tolerate this posture in the short term since any shifts in the macro-economic environment, as we now understand it, can be effectively analyzed by the World Bank staff with whom we have developed a close and mutually supporting working relationship. This action, however, severely diminishes our capability to perform requisite sector and sub-sector studies which will form the analytical underpinning for sector project preparation contemplated for the FY 84-85 period.

Similarly, we would not replace the Mission's Behavioral Scientist officer upon his departure in 1982; instead we would use the position to meet project needs, and again this would adversely affect our ability to conduct micro-level analyses which will help tailor program interventions to specific equity and beneficiary concerns.

We are also forced to reduce the efficiency of Mission management be replacing our Executive Assistant, fully experienced in AID procedures with a part time resident hire secretary. Like the Economist and the Behavioral Scientist, this self-imposed staff deficiency will obviously impair overall Mission operations <u>but will not detract from effective implementation</u>.

Other actions will include:

- To the maximum extent possible, we will increase and enhance our FSN technical expertise at the expense of those administrative support functions which can be contracted out. The extent and pace of this shift, however, will be influenced by voluntary attrition, to create vacancies within the FSN staff. Almost all of USAID's administrative staff are career

employees with tenure, and civil service retirement rules apply. Moreover, we will need OE funds normally not available under stringent budgets to train current FSN staff to assume more technical responsibilities and to finance institutional contracts. Within the guidelines of Federal regulations, we will intensify our efforts to exploit the full range of options available to supplement the direct USDH role in project monitoring and "shadow management" of AID projects. This includes the use of contract advisors in operations and management, particularly ex-Peace Corps Volunteers possessing the dedication, language capabilities and experience relevant to AID's rural development programs.

We will need an increasing level of TDY support from the regional legal officer, regional contract officer, and a regional housing officer for the Thai HIG (the latter support would be needed without charge to the FTE allocation for Thailand). Additionally, USAID needs TDY services from a regional procurement officer, and urges that such a placement be effected by the Asia Bureau. We will also need adequate OE funds to finance the increased level of specialized regional support. One specific aim of the above actions will be to build up our project support staff, thereby relieving the technical staff of repetitive and time-consuming specialized functions such as procurement, preparation of implementation documents and project paper preparation. This will allow the technical staff more time to spend on project implementation in the field and relate their subject matter expertise to the specific needs of Thailand.

Yet, all of the above actions will not free up sufficient staff resources to carry out the proposed FY 1983 program. At a minimum, USAID USFTE requirements are 27 in FY 82 and 32 in FY 83. If staff relief is not forthcoming, we can no longer improvise. We must examine the practicality and strategic impact of the program options outlined below:

Program Options

1. One DA project in FY 1983. If we limit new starts to the Rainfed Agriculture Intensification Project, the proposed DA funding level can be maintained as the RAI budget is projected at $40 million over the FY 83/84 period. Yet, this approach would have only a marginal impact on USAID staffing needs related to the core DA program; the "core" staff could be reduced by one position in the Office of Health, Population and Nutrition with the elimination of the Nutrition and Water/Sanitation projects. The costs in terms of program impact, however, would be considerable as the two projects are deliberately linked to our two most important strategic

objectives: reducing fertility rates and increasing agricultural income and productivity in the Northeast.

2. Move to Program Aid. Again, we could achieve the proposed funding levels. However, we would become redundant to other donors, particularly the World Bank which is proposing up to one billion dollars in "structural adjustment lending" (read budget support) over the next five years. AID would not be doing what it can do best and would not be responding to Thai perceptions of the comparative value of US assistance. AID would also have abandoned the essence of its long-term development assistance strategy. In sum, such an approach would neutralize the development impact of scarce AID resources.

3. Eliminate or limit private sector initiatives. Within present FTE staff limitations, we plan to exploit all practicable opportunities to add a private sector dimension to development projects within our core program, whenever appropriate. For example, the efficiencies of the private sector's marketing and distribution systems have potential application for the FY 83 Nutrition project. This approach would not require additional personnel, only creativity and well-selected consultants during the design process. Beyond that, however, we foresee need for two USDH persons to be fully engaged in promotion of private sector involvement, if we hope to draw upon a broad array of development instrumentalities particularly suited to the dynamic and resilient private sector in Thailand. Without additional staff beyond the number needed to plan and carry out our core program, we would have to abandon the more intensive approach to private sector opportunities.

4. Use of a budget support mechanism for ESF. This is an attractive option in any case, because it would require minimal staff time. It may not, however, be responsive to the problem being addressed. At this stage in the dialogue, it is important that we do not foreclose more personnel-intensive alternatives. For example, it may be that the program, if realized, would involve AID in the technically difficult task of assisting the RTG to improve the resource base of specific areas to sustain population groups dependent upon scarce and poor agricultural land for subsistence agriculture. Under such an option, we foresee the need for two FTE positions exclusively dedicated to the ESF program.

VI. Operational Expenses

The OE budget for FY 1982 was constructed on the assumption that USAID FTE ceiling is raised from 25 to 27, our judgement concerning the minimum USDH staff necessary to carry out our

core program and continue to advance our strategic objectives through FY 83 and beyond. The FY 82 OE budget represents a $775,000, or 24.0%, increase over FY 81, with the major increases due to the following budget items.

Expense Category	% of Net Increase over FY 81
Salary and support costs for additional USDH personnel	23%
Increase in salary/allowance for FSN's	14%
Benefits for FSN upon termination	6%
Cost of PSC's for economic analysis, etc.	11%
Increase in housing costs, including furnishings	22%
Increase in Non-PSC contracts	8%
Miscellaneous Smaller Items	16%

Of this increase, roughly $210,000 or 27% is associated with the assignment and support of two USDH above the current FTE ceiling. Another 25% is largely attributable to USAID management actions to buttress mission capacity to plan and manage its core program (termination benefits for FSN; cost of PSC's and non PSC contract). The total OE cost involved in enlarging USDH staff and related management actions is roughly $400,000. The residual increase is primarily due to an assumed 15% inflation rate which operates on many of the expense categories in the FY 81 OE Budget.

In FY 83, the OE budget for the current (and AAPL) packages, we assume an FTE ceiling of 32 USDH. This budget would require an additional $892,000, or a 22.2% increase over the FY 82 OE budget (at 27 FTE). The major cost factors contributing to this increase are shown below. (An assumed 20% inflation rate in many of these categories is responsible for much of the increase.

Expense category	% Of net increase over FY 82
Salary costs of five additional USDH	35%
Support costs for all USDH staff (transport, household effects, etc.)	28%

Increase in salary/allowances for FSN's	18%
Increase in housing costs	13%
Miscellaneous smaller items	6%

Of this increase, roughly $575,000, or 64%, is associated with the five additional to USDH personnel.

The point of this analysis is to emphasize that Mission OE needs must also be met over FY 82/83 in order to assure the high level of program performance that is the objective of this ABS. Across the two budget years, we will need nearly $1,000,000 additional in OE to effectively manage mission responsibilities related to the core program, ESF and the private sector - and necessary accompaniment to 7 additional USDH personnel.

VII. "RECAP"

Briefly, the points made above may be summarized as follows:

1. USAID has an immediate management "crunch." The current FTE ceiling of 25 USDH seriously impairs Mission capacity to effectively implement its portfolio of on-going projects and core projects scheduled for obligation in FY 81/82, plus carry out forward planning for FY 83 and beyond.

2. USAID will make adjustments to the composition of its USDH and FSN staff within currently imposed ceilings to assure the viability of the core strategy through FY 83. The shift will reduce our analytical capacity. Within the FSN staff, the shift will be from administrative to technical functions.

3. Internal USAID adjustments, and other Mission management actions, will enable USAID to carry out its total obligated program through FY 82 with an acceptable level of performance, as well as plan and carry out the three core projects proposed in this ABS., however, ESF could be accommodated only as a budget support program. No project initiative related to the private sector could be organized.

4. USAID urgently needs two additional FTE's in FY 82 to partially re-establish its analytic capability (Program Economist) and to undertake preliminary planning for ESF and private sector initiatives.

5. Additionally, USAID will need five more FTE's in FY 83 beyond the 27 in FY 82. Two of these FTE's will enable us to

replace the Behavioral Science Officer and restore the Executive Assistant position. Three FTE's will be needed to carry out an ESF program with project-like attributes and to organize any meaningful program to promote private sector involvement in development. Otherwise, ESF could be carried out only as a budget-support program and discrete project activity related to the private sector would not be possible.

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
TABLE 1 - LONG RANGE PLAN BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT ($ Thousands)

Country/Office Thailand

Development Assistance	FY 1981 EST	FY 1982 EST	FY 1983 REQUEST MIN	CURR	AAPL	PLANNING PERIOD 1984	1985	1986	1987
ARDN									
Grants	5400	12400	9000	16000	16800	11500	20000	19000	12000
Loans	12200	17800	5000	9500	12000	25200	40000	30000	52000
Population									
Grants	1900	2000	2000	2000	2200	2800	-	-	3000
Loans	-	2000	2000	2500	2500	2800	-	-	3000
Grants		(3000)*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loan		-	(850)*	-	-	-	-	-	-
Health									
Grants	-	-	1500	1500	1500	1700	-	4000	-
Loans	-	-	-	5000	6000	2000	-	5000	
Education									
Grants	1500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sel Dev Act									
Grants	1500	1600	-	3000	4000	4000	-	2000	5000
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5000	-
Sub Tot Func Acct	22000	35800	19500	39500	45000	50000	60000	65000	75000
Grants	9800	16000	12500	22500	24500	20000	20000	25000	29000
Loans	12200	19800	17000	17000	20500	30000	40000	40000	65000
Econ Support Fund									
Grants	2000	10000	15000	15000	15000	----(not determined)----			
Loans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total DA/ESF	24000	45800	34500	54500	60000	50000	60000	65000	75000
HIG (Non-Add)	-	-	(20000)	(20000)	(20000)	-	(10000)	-	(15000)
Total Personnel 1/									
USDH (Work Years)	24	25 1/	25 2/	25 3/	25 3/	30	30	30	30

* AID/W procured contraceptives. Includes provision for AID/W financing of "core" Thai contraceptive requirements, assuming RTG funding of any balance required.

1/ Does not include part-time secretary.
2/ Actual Requirement = 27
3/ Actual Requirement = 32

Long Range Plan Narrative

Based upon an FY 82 DA program level of $35.8 million and a revised project mix for that year, we will have an approximate $14 million "mortgage" (loan and grant) generated by prior-approved ongoing projects to be accommodated in FY 83. We anticipate that the mortgage will be comprised of final funding for Village Aquaculture Development, Mae Chaem (Highland), and N.E. Rainfed Agriculture Development, and continued incremental funding of the Population Planning, Emerging Problems of Development, and PVO Co-Financing projects. The precise composition of mortgaged projects may vary depending upon OYB's. This mortgage under FY 83 "Minimum" levels would have to be reduced and balance spread out to following year funding creating a mortgage situation in FY 84. It is preferred not to pass this mortgage in to FY 84 in order that both project and management resources can be increasingly allocated in support of CDSS objectives.

An "unmortgaged" $35.5 million level in the Section 103 account for FY 84, combined with approx. $19 million from FY 83, would provide $54.5 million over 2 year obligation period for new starts.

Together with the nutrition and second decentralization project initiative, this amount will be used to finance a single subsectoral "umbrella" project in rainfed agriculture intensification.

The umbrella rainfed ag intensification project would be an important step towards institutional preparation an activity conceptualization of an FY 85-87 sector project in rainfed agriculture. On the basis of the NERAD project experience, and the institutional development/program development spurred by an FY 83-84 (obligation period) rainfed ag intensification project, we would hope to provide budget support to a rainfed ag development program of the RTG, featuring agreement on clear program objectives and release of tranches on the basis of achievement of predetermined program-success benchmarks.

It is proposed that the $14.3 million population program receive planned increments at all decision package levels as it is crucial to maintain the momentum of this program in Thailand to continue the downward trend of population growth and forestall development gains being washed out by population growth.

In the Health sector we have allocated $7.5 million to cover the costs of full funding for the water and sanitation project (WASH), for which we already have approved PIDs. We would anticipate a single health project in FY 86.

In FY 84 an additional funding impetus would be given to decentralized planning and implementation through a $10 million allocation to this sub-sector as a follow-on to the DDPM Project. Additional funding in FY 86-87 could be for a separate project or placed in the major sector project for rainfed agriculture.

We have tried to maintain a balanced split between loan and grant mix during FY 82 to 84 period. In FY 83 it is proposed that the grant/loan mix be a bit higher on the grant side. This requirement evolves from several factors; our commitment on contraceptives; our desire to meet Bureau guidance to adequately fund projects; reduction of "mortgage"; provide the necessary upfront technical grant assistance in place for project starts which support the CDSS strategy, e.g. Grassroots in Nutrition and Rainfed Intensification; and initiate a private sector program.

Starting in FY 84, we propose that the loan/grant balance begins to swing back towards favoring loans until finally in FY 87 the mix is two loan to one grant.

In terms of annual new project starts we envision the following:

FY	New Starts	Functional Accounts
1983	4	ARDN - 2; HE - 1; SDP -1
1984	2	ARDN - 1; SDP - 1
1985	1	ARDN - 1
1986	3	ARDN - 1; HE - 1; SDP - 1
1987	2	POP - 1; SDP - 1

TABLE III - PROJECT OBLIGATIONS BY APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT
FY 1981 TO FY 1983
($ thousands)

Country/Office --Thailand

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT		FY 81	FY 82	FISCAL YEAR 1983 MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition						
Seed Development	L 493-0270					
Sericulture/ Settlements	L 493-0271					
Lam Nam Oon On-Farm Development	G 493-0272					
Lam Nam Oon On-Farm Development	L 493-0272					
Program Development and Support	G 493-0275					
Agriculture Extension	L 493-0280					
Land Settlements	G 493-0289					
Land Settlements	L 493-0289					
Mae Cham Watershed Development	G 493-0294	-	2,900	-	2,700	2,700
PVO Co-Financing Project	G 493-0296	500	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Village Fish Pond Development	G 493-0303					
Renewable Non-Conventional Energy Dev.	G 493-0304					
Rural Off-Farm Employment	G 493-0306					
NE Rainfed Agri. Development	G 493-0308	1,200	1,200	.500	1,300	1,300

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT		FY 81	FY 82	FISCAL YEAR 1983 MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
NE Rainfed Agri. Development	L 493-0308	6,300				
Northeast Small Scale Irrigation	G 493-0312	1,800				
Northeast Small Scale Irrigation	L 493-0312					
Decentralized Management Development	G 493-0315	1,200	1,900			
Decentralized Management Development	L 493-0315	5,900	1,600			
Village Aquaculture Development	G 493-0316		1,000		1,000	1,800
Village Aquaculture Development	L 493-0316		4,200		3,000	3,000
Agriculture Planning	G 493-0317	700	2,500			
Grassroots Action in Nutrition	G 493-0321	-	-	2,500	5,000	5,000
Small Scale Hydro	G 493-0324		1,900			
Small Scale Hydro	L 493-0324		6,200			
Seed Development II	L 493-0326		5,800			
Rainfed Agriculture Intensification	G 493-0328			5,000	5,000	5,000
Rainfed Agriculture Intensification	L 493-0328			5,000	6,500	9,000
TOTAL FOR ACCOUNT		17,600	30,200	14,000	25,500	28,800
GRANTS		5,400	12,400	9,000	16,000	16,800
LOANS		12,200	17,800	5,000	9,500	12,000

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT		FY 81	FY 82	FISCAL YEAR 1983 MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
Population Planning						
Population Planning	G 493-0283	1,900				
Population Planning	G 493-0325		2,000	2,000	2,000	2,200
Population Planning	L 493-0325		2,000	2,000	2,500	2,500
TOTAL FOR ACCOUNT		1,900	4,000	4,000	4,500	4,700
GRANTS		1,700	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,200
LOANS		-	2,000	2,000	2,500	2,500
Health						
Rural Primary Health Care Expansion	L 493-0291	-	-	-	-	-
Malaria and Vector Control	G 493-0305					
Malaria and Vector Control	L 493-0305					
Rural Water and Sanitation	G 493-0322	-	-	1,500	1,500	1,500
Rural Water and Sanitation	L 493-0322	-	-	-	5,000	6,000
TOTAL FOR ACCOUNTS		-	-	1,500	6,500	7,500
GRANTS		-	-	1,500	1,500	1,500
LOANS		-	-	-	5,000	6,000
Education and Human Resources						
Non-Formal Vocational Education	G 493-0295					
PVO Co-Financing Project	G 493-0296	.500	-	-	-	-
Hill Area Education	G 493-0297	1,000	-	-	-	-
TOTAL FOR ACCOUNTS		1,500	-	-	-	-
GRANTS		1,500	-	-	-	-
LOANS		-	-	-	-	-

APPROPRIATION ACCOUNT		FY 81	FY 82	FISCAL YEAR 1983 MINIMUM	CURRENT	AAPL
Selected Development Activities						
Emerging Problems of Development	G 493-0309	1,000	1,600	-	-	-
Remote Sensing	G 493-0314	-	-	-	-	-
Private Sector Investment Feasibility	G	-	-		3,000	4,000
TOTAL FOR ACCOUNT		1,000	1,600	-	3,000	4,000
GRANT		1,000	1,600	-	3,000	4,000
LOANS		-	-	-	-	-
Economic Support Fund						
Economic Support Fund	G 493-0000	2,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
TOTAL FOR ACCOUNT		2,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
GRANTS		2,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
LOANS		-	-	-	-	-
GRAND TOTAL DA ACCOUNT		22,000	35,800	19,500	39,500	45,000
GRANTS		9,800	16,000	12,500	22,500	24,500
LOANS		12,200	19,800	7,000	17,000	20,500
GRAND TOTAL ALL ACCOUNTS		24,000	45,800	34,500	54,500	60,000
GRANTS		11,800	26,000	27,500	37,500	39,500
LOANS		12,200	19,800	7,000	17,000	20,500

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: Thailand

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	O/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition																	
493-0270	Seed Development	L	75	76	3.7	3.7	1419	-	751	-	668	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0271	Sericulture Settlements	L	76	76.	2.6	2.6	1339	-	211	-	115	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0272	Lam Nam Oon On-Farm Development	G	77	77	.1	.1	92	-	30	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0272	Lam Nam Oon On-Farm Development	L	77	77	4.5	4.5	3900	-	596	-	1925	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0274	Transfer of Tech and Mangement Skills	G	75	79	1.2	1.2	969	-	969	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0275	Program Development and Support	G	75	75	.4	.4	133	-	73	-	60	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0280	Agriculture Extension Outreach	L	77	77	3.0	3.0	2033	-	1200	-	833	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0289	Land Settlements	G	79	80	.2	.2	193	-	37	-	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0289	Land Settlements	L	79	79	4.0	4.0	4000	-	35	-	509	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0294	Mae Chaem Watershed Development	G	80	83*	4.4	10.0	4400	-	-	2900	1760	2700	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0296	PVO Co-Financing Project	G	80	84*	2.3	4.0	195	500	189	1000	396	1000*	1200	-	-	-	-	
493-0303	Village Fish Pond Development	G	79	79	.4	.4	221	-	171	-	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0304	Renewable Non-Conventional Energy Development	G	79	80	5.0	5.0	4958	-	540	-	1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	

* FY 83 obligation in one account where core project is located, though minor projects will be in other accounts.

AID 1510-8 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: Thailand

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
493-0306	Rural Off-Farm Employment	G	79	79	.5	.5	310	-	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0308	NE Rainfed Agriculture Development	G	81	83 *	-	3.7	-	1200	185	1200	420	1300	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0308	NE Rainfed Agriculture Development	L	81	81	-	6.3	-	6300	-	-	425	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0312	Northeast Small Scale Irrigation	G	80	81	2.8	2.8	1000	1800	40	-	310	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0312	Northeast Small Scale Irrigation	L	80	80	5.8	5.8	5800	-	10	-	270	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0315	Decentralized Development Management	G	81	82	-	3.1	-	1200	200	1,900	750	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0315	Decentralized Development Management	L	81	82	-	7.5	-	5900	-	1600	1100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0316	Village Aquaculture Development	G	82	83*	-	2.8	-	-	-	1000	500	1800	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0316	Village Aquaculture Development	L	82	83*	-	7.2	-	-	-	4200	800	3000	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0317	Agriculture Planning	G	81	82	3.2	3.2	-	700	418	2500	944	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0324	Small Scale Hydro	G	82	82*	-	1.9	-	-	-	1900	700	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0324	Small Scale Hydro	L	82	82*	-	6.2	-	-	-	6200	2000	-	-	-	-	-	-	

AID 1310-8 (2-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: Thailand

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
493-0326	Seed Development II	L	82	82	-	5.8	-	-	-	5800	500	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0328	Rainfed Agriculture Intensification	G	83	83	-	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	5000	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0328	Rainfed Agriculture Intensification	L	83	83		9.0	-	-	-	-	-	9000	15200	-	-	-	-	
493-0321	Grassroots Action in Nutrition	G	83	83*		5.0	-	-	-	-	-	5000	10300	-	-	-	-	
	Total for Account						30962	17600	5965	30,200	16095	28800	26700	-	-	-	-	
	Grants						12471	5400	3162	12400	6950	16800	11500	-	-	-	-	
	Loans						18491	12200	2803	17800	9145	12000	15200	-	-	-	-	

AID 1330-8 (4-5)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: Thailand

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	Population Planning																	
493-0283	Population Planning	G	75	81	16.6	16.6	4388*	1900	1378	-	2400	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0325	Population Planning	G	82	84*	-	7.0	-	-	-	2000		2200	2800	-	-	-	-	
493-0325	Population Planning	L	82	84*	-	7.3	-	-	-	2000		2500	2800	-	-	-	-	
	Total for Account						4388	1900	1378	4000	2400	4700	5600	-	-	-	-	
	Grants						4388	1900	1378	2000	2400	2200	2800	-	-	-	-	
	Loans						-	-	-	2000	-	2500	2800	-	-	-	-	
	* Excludes AID/W funds																	
	Health																	
493-0274	Transfer of Tech and Management Skills	G	75	79	1.0	1.0	381	-	381	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0305	Anti-Malaria	G	79	79	.5	.5	423	-	176	-	150	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0305	Anti-Malaria	L	79	79	4.0	4.0	3874	-	2256	-	1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0322	Rural Water and Sanitation	G	83	83*		1.5	-	-	-	-	200	1500	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0322	Rural Water and Sanitation	L	83	83*		6.0	-	-	-	-	400	6000	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0291	Rural Primary Health Care Expansion	L	78	78	5.5	5.5	3881	-	1657	-	1000	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total for Accounts						8559	-	4470	-	2750	7500						
	Grants						804	-	557	-	350	1500						
	Loans						7755	-	3913	-	2400	6000						

AID 1330-8 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office
Thailand

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000) CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	1984	1985	1986	1987	FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
	Education and Human Resouces																	
493-0274	Transfer of Tech and Management Skills	G	75	79.	1.7	1.7	334	-	334	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0295	Non-Formal Vocational Education	G	80	80	.5	.5	500	-	255	-	152	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0296	PVO Co-Financing Project	G	80	84	1.0	1.0	264	500	250	-	430	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0297	Hill Area Education	G	80	81	1.6	1.6	563	1000	410	-	257	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total for Accounts						1661	1500	1249	-	839	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Grants						1661	1500	1249	-	839	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Loans						-	-	-	-	-							
	Selected Development Activities																	
493-0309	Emerging Problems of Development	G	81	84*	4.0	4.0	820	1000	300	1600	600	-	580	-	-	-	-	

AID 1330-8 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE IV PROJECT BUDGET DATA

Country/Office: Thailand

PROJECT NUMBER	PROJECT TITLE	G/L	OBLIGATION DATE INITIAL	OBLIGATION DATE FINAL	LIFE OF PROJECT COST AUTH	LIFE OF PROJECT COST PLAN	CUM PIPELINE AS OF 9/30/80	FY 1981 OBL	FY 1981 EXP	FY 1982 OBL	FY 1982 EXP	FY OBLIGATIONS 1983 AAPL	FY OBLIGATIONS 1984	FY OBLIGATIONS 1985	FY OBLIGATIONS 1986	FY OBLIGATIONS 1987	FY OBLIGATIONS FUTURE YEAR	ITEM #
							ESTIMATED U.S. DOLLAR COST ($000)											
493-0314	Remote Sensing for Development	G	79	79	.29	.29	290	-	70	-	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	
493-0329	Private Investment in Development Project	G	83	83		4.0	-	-	-	-	-	4000	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total for Account						1110	1000	370	1600	700	4000	580	-	-	-	-	
	Grants						1110	1000	370	1600	700	4000	580	-	-	-	-	
	Loans						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Economic Support Fund																	
493-0327	Economic Support Fund	G					1024	2000	2000	10000	2000	15000	-	-	-	-	-	
	Total for Account						1024	2000	2000	10000	2000	15000	-	-	-	-	-	
	Grants						1024	2000	2000	10000	2000	15000	-	-	-	-	-	
	Loans						-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
	Grand Total						47704	24000	15432	45800	24784	60000	32,880					
	Grant						21458	11800	8716	26000	13239	39500	14,880					
	Loan						26246	12200	6716	19800	11545	20500	18,000					

AID 1330 8 (4-81)

PROJECT NARRATIVE

Project Number and Title: 493-0328
Rainfed Agricultural Intensification

Proposed Funding:

	(In $000's) FY 83	LOP
LOAN	9.0	24.2
GRANT	5.0	15.3
TOTAL	14.0	39.5

Appropriation Account: Sec. 103 Food and Nutrition

Project Purpose: To strengthen Royal Thai Government (RTG) institutional capacity for the intensification of small farmer agricultural development.

Problems Addressed: As documented in the RTG's Fifth Plan Outline and recent RTG and World Bank studies, the status of Thailand's agricultural development is at an important developmental crossroad. Whereas past agriculural growth has been quite impressive, this was mainly possible through the steady expansion into new land areas. Two inter-related consequences from this well established tradition are observed. First, agricultural productivity per land unit has shown no substantial increases during the last ten year period and in certain areas, is actually declining. Secondly, because of the limited availability of additional arable land, the potential for significant agricultural growth is limited. Through this means, unless producer practices change from the extensive to intensive agriculture, the perpetuation of these trends will result in decreasing levels of rural and national well being.

The Thai farmer, particularly those under rainfed conditions (which includes about 90 per cent of the producers) continue to use low levels of technology and traditional cultural practices. For the small farmer to participate productively in the most intensive use of his available land, the risks of innovation or change in the interest of higher productivity must be reduced. This roadblock to small producer modernization usually only happens through the provision of a comprehensive agricultural support system capable of providing appropriate farm enterprise services. The recently completed NERAD background study, Survey Report on Rainfed Agricultural Project In Northeast Thailand documented a myriad of problems related to the limited availability and use of appropriate technical and management services and facilities of such RTG

agencies as: Departments of Land Development, Agriculture (crop research), Agricultural Extension, Livestock Development et al. Such problems impede their capacity to more effectively support the RTG pledge to improve the conditions in the poorer districts. Activities related to soil and water conservation, cropping systems and farming systems research, agricultural and livestock technology diffusion, strengthening the coordination of services from national to at regional to farm level, etc are among the many areas that have been identified as needing strengthening.

Project Interventions: Within the context of the RTG's Fifth Plan which concentrates on improving income in the poverty districts where rainfed agriculture usually predominates, activities directed to strengthening the service delivery capacity of the above mentioned departments and others which are deemed essential to bring about rainfed agricultural intensification will be supported. In most instances, project efforts would be supporting established RTG initiatives. This sub-sector project in rainfed agriculture intensification proposes to aggregate a series of basically single functional institutional support activities within one multi-year project document. The project will not require a complex integration or service structure, thus permitting each intervention to procede at its own pace. The MOAC departments listed above and possibly others plus appropriate universities as Khon Kaen would be the Project participants. The multi-institutional nature of the project combined with the vast number of problems associated with intensification requires a major financial intervention within a single "umbrella" project in rainfed agriculture intensification. AID's contribution would emphasize the provision of technical assistance/training to qualitatively improve the institutional service delivery capability of RTG departmental programs oriented toward subsistence rainfed farmers. Commodity/ equipment procurement and limited "test-case" physical infrastructure financing would also be accommodated in the AID contribution. Such support would be oriented but not necessarily uniquely to the problems of the Northeast farmer. Accordingly the project will require institutional improvement at various levels of the delivery system from the central to farm level.

This project would strengthen the MOAC's institutional capacity and prepare for the identification of activities to be undertaken in an expanded FY 85-87 sector project in rainfed agriculture. On the basis of the NERAD project experience, and the institutional development/program development spurred by this FY 83-84 (obligation period) rainfed ag intensification project, we would hope to provide budget support to a sector type rainfed ag development program of the RTG. The following

activities would be funded during the life of this three to four year project.

Consulting Services - The RTG recognizes that to implement to the Fifth Five Year Plan, there is an urgent need to develop and strengthen the capacities of various departments so as to better facilitate the rainfed agriculture intensification process. Though at this time other donors are providing large capital assistance to some of these departments, only limited attention is being given to the development and diffusion of improved technologies and operational manangement systems required to improve services performance.

Human Resource Development - The level of donor sponsored advanced degree agricultural development training (especially that provided by AID) has dropped considerably since the mid 1970's. Paradoxically, the priority of the RTG and donor assistance to improve the income of the poorer farmers has increased. To facilitate the intensification process special emphasis must be directed toward improving the skills of both their mid-management technical/manager cadre and the producer level skills. Training directed towards increasing the numbers of MS level professionals, strengthening the national professional agricultural development training institutions, in-country in-service skills development and management training, and farm level demonstrations and training programs need to be provided.

Local cost support for large-scale demonstration programs and expansion of operations, primarily in Northeast Thailand.

Equipment Commodity - The needs for complementary support, for such items as mobile units, earth moving equipment, testing equipment, audio visual/training aids culverts, farm inputs etc. at various operational levels will be studied.

Construction - Though not anticipated to be a large item, provision for necessary project support facilities and infrastructure is included.

Issues:

1. Possibly at issue is the Mission's ability to maintain its geographic concentration on Northeast Thailand, given the nation-wide application of departmental program that will be assisted under this Project.

2. At this stage of project design, project support to agricultural credit, input supply and output marketing is not contemplated. During design, further analysis is

required to determine whether such exclusion is valid.

3. The nature of this project will require considerable relaxation of Bureau positions on Bureau of grant funds allocation.

Target Group:

The broader objectives of this project are intended to benefit the poor producer population most of whom farm under rainfed conditions. To accomplish this objective requires the strengthening of the capacity of the various institutions charged with the intensification process.

Project Narrative

Project Number and Title: Private Investment in Development 491-0329

Proposed Funding: (In $000's)	FY 83	LOP
GRANT	4.0	4.0

Appropriation Account: Selected Development Problems

Project Purpose: This activity would seek to stimulate greater U.S. and Thai private participation in key Thai development areas, focusing especially on those opportunities which enhance employment impact, maximize Thailand's comparative advantage, promote the transfer of technology, and complement public sector development programs.

Problem Addressed: The remarkable growth of the Thai economy reflects the very favorable climate for private investment which has been fostered over the past quarter century by successive Thai governments. Thailand, therefore, presents an unusually-fruitful opportunity for real public and private partnership in development of many sectors of the economy. RTG policy makers are actively seeking further ways to involve the private sector in targetting key growth-with-equity objectives. A practical example of this government interest has been the recent decision to implement its rice price support program largely through the mechanisms of the private grain marketing system. Longer-range RTG plans anticipate vigorous private investment in energy and natural resource development, further modernization of agriculture, and creation of job-creating industries.

Thai and Thai-American business can and should be drawn more closely into investing in non-traditional areas of the Thai Economy. For reasons of ignorance of investment opportunities, risk aversion by inherently-cautious private investors, lack of feasible technological solutions and shortage of "up-front" venture capital, the dynamic business community in Thailand has tended to remain rooted in the familiar surroundings of Bangkok. The Thai Government has not always provided the best stimuli for more far-flung private investment in economic development, and has often sought to execute its development program principally through the mechanism of public agencies. For their part, the U.S.G. foreign affairs agencies in Thailand have focussed their attention on enhancing U.S. exports through

Thai-U.S. trade without emphasizing the developmental potential of this trade and investment. AID has generally used the public sector as the preferred medium for its development assistance.

This is not to say that the U.S. is without capability in sponsoring private investment in developmentally-desirable areas. TDP, OPIC, and even EX-IM have all been active in Thailand to some degree and pursued developmental objectives in the broad sense. It is to say that there has been no resident USG focal point in stimulating the U.S. (and Thai) private sector as an agent of development. Institutional capabilities on the Thai side do not seem to be directly focussed on this problem either.

Preliminary analysis indicates that there are some specific aspects of the overall problem which could be qualitatively addressed by the RTG and AID to enhance the role of private investment in reaching Thai development objectives. First, a "shelf" of projects feasible for significant Thai and U.S. private investment in key development sectors is lacking. Second, private investors lack an information clearing-house on opportunities in the non-traditional sector. Third, private investors arguably feel that they cannot always carry alone the full risk of initial sponsorship of "developmentally-attractive" projects. Fourth, private enterprise tie-ins to public (RTG) projects -- some of which AID now or plans to assist -- are haphazard and not systematically pursued. And fifth, the RTG and Thai industry associations has an inadequate institutional capacity to address the preceding four problems.

Proposed AID Response: AID can play a modest, catalytic role in alleviating these problems. USAID/T proposes the following elements of a new project:

(a) Creation of an enhanced USG capability to finance pre-feasibility/feasibility studies proposed by the RTG or sponsored by private enterprise. In the case of both public and private sponsored studies proposed for AID funding some credible evidence of the likelihood of substantial U.S. and/or Thai private sector investment (e.g. expressions of senior level corporate interest, commercial bank backing) would be sought. Reconnaissance, pre-feasibility, and feasibility level studies jointly financed from public and private funds would be preferentially considered.

(b) Through technical assistance and training, improvement of public and quasi-public mechanisms for private

investment promotion. These mechanisms would be tasked with fostering a continuous dialogue/linkage between RTG-development planners, on one hand, and the pool of private investors, on the other, in order to lessen actual or perceived obstacles to private investment. Under this element, AID and the RTG would devise means to improve the collection and dissemination of information on private investment opportunities. AID direct-hire staff would play a key, direct role in this process. Potential U.S.-based sources of technical assistance/training in this respect are the International Executive Service Corps (IESC), the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and U.S. trade associations. Potential cooperators on the Thai side are the Association of Thai Industries, the Thai Board of Trade, the Industrial Finance Corp. of Thailand (IFCT), and NESDB.

(c) As required, post-feasibility, detailed technical, equipment, or A & E design studies in those cases where a serious potential investor has been identified. Preferably, some sort of pay-back arrangement with the ultimate equity-investor would be arranged.

(d) In a limited number of instances, AID financing of small-scale demonstrations on a shared-cost basis with the private investor for pilot operations. This approval may be especially appropriate in potential agri-business projects where the scheme relies upon use of small growers in future, large-scale replication.

Host Country Agencies: Potentially, IFCT, the RTG Industry Ministry or NESDB. Also, various Thai and Thailand-based American private sector groups, association, or councils.

Issues:

(a) Does the proposed project deviate too sharply from AID's core development strategy as expressed in the CDSS?

(b) To what extent should/can USAID subsume or coordinate the already established roles of TDP, OPIC, and EX-IM Bank?

(c) Can AID finance, on a non-competitive basis, pre-feasbility/design studies performed by and on behalf of private firms which propose proprietary development/investment schemes?

(d) Should the project be grant or loan financed?

(e) Will AID staff be adequate to implement this project under AID/W imposed workforce ceilings?

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE V - FY 1983 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

Country/Office: Thailand

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION		ONGOING/NEW	LOAN/GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) INCR	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) CUM	WORKFORCE (Number of Workmonths) USDH INCR	USDH CUM	FNDH INCR	FNDH CUM
	DECISION PACKAGE MINIMUM										
	Pipeline Projects						(77,288)	240	240		
	New and Continuing Projects										
1.	Population Planning	493-0325	O	G	PN	2,000	2,000		240		
	Population Planning	493-0325	O	L	PN	2,000	4,000				
2.	N.E. Rainfed Ag Development	493-0308	O	G	FN	.500	4,500				
3.	Rainfed Ag Intensification	493-0328	N	G	FN	5,000	9,500				
	Rainfed Ag Intensification	493-0328	N	L	FN	5,000	14,500				
4.	Grassroots in Nutrition	493-0321				2,500	17,000				
5.	Rural Water and Sanitation	493-0322	N	G	HE	1,500	18,500				
6.	PVO-Co Financing	493-0296	O	G	FN	1,000	19,500				
7.	ESF		N	G	SA	(15,000)	(34,500)	(24)	(324) 1/		804
	Basic Workforce						19,500	60	300		
							(29,500)	(84)	(324)		
	Total Minimum Package and Related Workforce					19,500		300		804	
						(29,500)		(324)			

1/ Above the planned workforce level.

AID 1330-9 (4-81)

FY 1983 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION

TABLE V - FY 1983 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

Country/Office: Thailand

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION		ONGOING/NEW	LOAN/GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) INCR	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) CUM	WORKFORCE (Number of Workmonths) USDH INCR	USDH CUM	FNDH INCR	FNDH CUM
	DECISION PACKAGE CURRENT										
9.	Population Planning	493-0325	O	L	PN	.500	20,000		300		
10.	Mae Chaem Watershed Dev.	493-0294	O	G	FN	2,700	22,700		300		
11.	N.E. Rainfed Ag Development	493-0308	O	G	FN	.800	23,500		300		
12.	Grassroots in Nutrition	493-0321	N	G	FN	2,500	26,000		300		
13.	Rainfed Ag Intensification	493-0328	N	L	FN	1,500	27,500		300		
14.	Village Aquaculture	493-0316	O	G	FN	1,000	28,500		300		
	Village Aquaculture	493-0316	O	L	FN	3,000	31,500		300		
15.	Rural Water and Sanitation	493-0322	N	L	HE	5,000	36,500		300		
16.	Private Investment in Development	493-0329	N	G	SD	3,000	39,500	24 1/	324 1/		
17.	Program Workforce Increment						39,500	36 1/	360 1/		804
18.	Housing Investment Guarantee		O	G		(20,000)					
	Total Current Package and Related Workforce					20,000		60			
						(20,000)					

1/ Above the planned workforce level.

AID 1330-9 (4-81)

TABLE V - FY 1983 PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

Country/Office: Thailand

RANK	DECISION PACKAGES/PROGRAM ACTIVITY DESCRIPTION		ONGOING/ NEW	LOAN/ GRANT	APPROP. ACCT.	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) INCR	PROGRAM FUNDING ($000) CUM	WORKFORCE (Number of Workmonths) USDH INCR	USDH CUM	FNDH INCR	FNDH CUM
	DECISION PACKAGE AAPL										
17.	Population Planning	493-0325	O	G	PN	.200	39,700		360		
18.	Rainfed Ag Intensification	493-0328	N	L	FN	2,500	42,200		360		
19.	Village Aquaculture	493-0316	O	G	FN	.800	43,000		360		
20.	Rural Water and Sanitation	493-0322	N	L	HE	1,000	44,000		360		
21.	Private Investment in Development	493-0329	N	G	SD	1,000	45,000		360 1/		804
	Total AAPL Package and Related Workforce					5,500	-		-		-
	ESF					-	(55,000)		(384) 1/		

1/ Above the planned workforce level.

Table V - Supporting Narratives
Part I - Program Ranking

A. Introduction

We have assigned priorities for FY 1983 funding by rank ordering our selected program areas, primarily on the basis of their criticality in achieving the goals established in the CDSS. Other considerations were cost effectiveness, the comparative advantage of AID to make a significant contribution in the area, and the degree of complementarity with other high-ranking program areas.

Such a program ranking provides a rational basis for establishing a project ranking. Other considerations being equal, such as readiness on the part of the RTG to proceed with a given project and/or lack of responsiveness by another foreign donor, a project associated with a high-priority program area should take precedence over one placed lower in the hierachy.

The program ranking, and justification therefore, is essentially the same as presented in our FY 82 ABS. The main difference is that several program areas were jettisoned in accordance with our decision in the FY 83 CDSS to emphasis greater program focus and concentration of resources.

B. Sector Ranking

1. Population Planning

High level RTG commitment and support for population planning have been the major factors behind the recent decline in the population growth rate from 3.0 percent to 2.2 percent in 1980. Despite these impressive gains, if the current growth rate continues unabated, the population will double in less than 35 years. Recognizing this, the RTG decided to make every effort to further reduce the annual population growth rate to 1.5 percent by the end of the Fifth Plan period (1982-1986).

The RTG places a high value on USAID assistance, and there is a close and exceptionally effective working relationship between USAID and concerned MOPH officials. Our usefulness to the RTG has been in direct proportion to our flexibility and responsiveness to changing needs, and perceptions of

those needs. Through the decade-long AID assisted Population Planning Project, innovations such as the use of paramedical personnel to deliver oral contraceptives, training of nurses to insert IUD's, and the training of traditional healers to motivate and provide family planning services were introduced. More recently, AID has assisted the NFPP in its efforts to expand the availability of male and female sterilization services.

AID assistance to the population planning program in Thailand has and will continue to yield a high return for relatively modest investment, both in terms of USAID staff involvement and financial resources. In addition, AID is uniquely qualified, in terms of available technical resources and experience, to respond to Thailand's future needs in population planning. For these reasons, and because rapid population growth continues to be an inhibiting factor in virtually all other areas of USAID assistance, we have given highest priority to continued assistance in this sector.

2. Rainfed Agricultural Development

The Mission involvement in this subsector is at the core of USAID's strategy for alleviation of rural poverty, especially in the Northeast. Concentration of development assistance in rainfed areas is intended to provide the basis for short-term income gains and long-term, sustained patterns of increased productivity and overall welfare.

The significance of raising productivity/incomes in rainfed areas for a strategy of overall rural poverty alleviation of raising productivity/incomes in rainfed areas is well established; only 4% presently, and 20% ultimately, of Northeastern farm families can ever hope to be served by year-round irrigation. Even more persuasive is the high correlation between the incidence of absolute poverty and farmers practicing rainfed agriculture in Northeast Thailand (World Bank studies). About one-third of the country's total population and most of its poorest people live in the rainfed areas of Northeast Thailand. It is the main focus of RTG's rural development efforts and it is also the prime geographic area of program concentration for USAID.

USAID activities in the rainfed areas will therefore

continue to be larger than in any other single subsector. The population sector is ranked ahead of it only because of that sector's pervasive effect on all other aspects of development in Thailand, and because of the well-demonstrated cost-efficiency of financial support to family planning.

3. Health/Nutrition/Water/Sanitation

It is well established that reduced fertility and longer birth intervals increase the likelihood that both mother and child will survive, and that there will be decreased morbidity during the first year of life. There is also evidence that perceptions regarding the likelihood of child survival can affect the number of children a couple desires. Apart from their contribution to overall family welfare, real reductions in infant and child mortality can therefore contribute significantly to family planning decisions and, ultimately, achievement of national family planning targets. Child mortality and morbidity can be addressed through increased availability of clean water, sanitation faciltiies, improved nutrition, and efficient and well-utilized maternal/child health care system.

A special characteristic of activities in this subsector, which enhances its priority, is their synergistic relationship with both program areas described above: population planning and rainfed agricultural development. The existing primary health care delivery system integrates family planning with health services. Nutrition promotion activities will help to strengthen the linkage between increased agricultural production and improved local diets intended in rainfed agriculture initiatives, including Village Fish Pond Development. Finally, improved water and sanitation facilities will reduce the incidence of gastro-intestinal infection and the associated loss of nutrients.

USAID has a particularly unique advantage in assisting in the development of preventative health approaches due to extensive recent experience with primary health care activities and the ability to commit funds for innovative programs. The choice of these two subsectors is heavily influenced by the desire to work at underlying or chronic causes for morbidity and mortality, i.e. our program will have a strong preventative bias.

4. Enhancement of Local Administrative Role and Capabilities in Rural Development.

In the last few years, the Thai Government has channeled a significant level of funding to rural areas through various programs to stimulate tambol/village development. In the Fifth Plan, the Government re-emphasized its intention "to decentralize development responsibilities to local authorities as well as to strengthen the capability of rural organizations (i.e., Tambon Councils) to undertake local development".

The basic justification for decentralization lies in administrative efficiency and effectiveness. Development initiatives need to take into consideration a wide variation in local conditions and constraints. It is more practical to devise area-specific action programs at lower levels of government where there is better understanding of local circumstance. Coordination of actions by several different agencies is also more practical in a decentralized mode if officials at lower administrative levels have sufficient authority. Finally, utilizing the beneficiaries and their organizations as development agents to some extent substitutes for ever-expanding networks of government field agents, which otherwise would result in an enormous drain on the government budget -- without reference to the difficulty of staffing these services with qualified, dedicated people.

USAID's support to the program area is intended to reinforce the RTG's policy to deconcentrate development authority, help establish local planning and administrative capabilities, and stimulate genuine local participation and leadership. Closely related is the objective of placing progressively increasing resources with local authorities for development, including the generation of local revenues.

5. Private Sector Role in Development

To the extent possible, USAID will attempt to creatively engage the private sector in supporting the objectives of the program areas discussed above. In such instances, private sector activities such as marketing, input supply, etc., would be subsumed under those programs and projects, whenever feasible. We

list the "private sector role" here as a separate program area in the expectation that there will be numerous opportunities for private sector involvement in Thailand's development efforts that lie outside USAID's core development strategy. Many of these opportunities will be relevant to rural development and poverty alleviation, such as off-farm employment and development of alternative energy sources. This program area receives a lower ranking because it extends beyond the core USAID strategy and will require additional time and resources to develop .

6. Special Development Activities

This program area encompasses such projects as Emerging Problems of Development which are directed towards improving the overall analytical planning and management capability of the RTG. They therefore contribute to the eventual success of interventions in other, higher-ranked program areas. Its lower place in the hierarchy is attributable to the indirectness of its benefits.

C. Project Ranking

The project ranking in the Minimum Decision Package is straight-forward and closely follows the program ranking, with Population Planning heading both lists. Funding for the Northeast Rainfed Agricultural Development Project (NERAD) and Rainfed Agricultural Intensification Project (RAI) also receive top priority because of the pivotal nature of rainfed agriculture interventions in USAID's development strategy. NERAD is ranked ahead of RAI merely in the interest of completing planned obligations for this key project which we hope will provide the basis for greatly expanded funding in the CDSS outyears. The Grassroots Action in Nutrition Project (GAIN) has high ranking in the minimum package because of its complementarity and intended value to two key rural development projects, NERAD initiated in FY 81, and Village Aquaculture II, initiated in FY 82. GAIN will operate in many of the target villages of NERAD and Village Aquaculture and will need to get underway in FY 83 to help realize the potential of those projects for improved nutrition. Grant funding for Rural Water and Sanitation is given priority because of its direct relationship to the core strategy and the need to initiate at least a small lead-in project in FY 83 to demonstrate the feasibility of piped water systems and sanitary disposal facilities for small rural communities. PVO Co-Financing is responsive to

U.S. policy objectives and frequently yields spin-off activities that can contribute to the objectives of higher-ranked program areas. Moreover, it represents an ongoing program that has already established considerable momentum, as well as expectations of continued funding by both private organizations and the RTG.

The Current Decision Package introduces three more projects into the FY 83 ranking: Mae Chaem, Village Aquaculture II, and Private Investment in Development. Furthermore, it shows the priority of providing funding for these projects vs. additional budget increments for projects already financed in part within the Minimum Package. This secondary set of priorities gives precedence to the final funding increment for the Mae Chaem Project. This increment is needed to finance Activities in the third (and last remaining) sub-watershed area, and should be available in FY 83, for the project to be completed within its authorized termination date. It was not included within the Minimum only because implementation experience to date suggests that the initial preparation for activities in the third sub-watershed area could be covered from funds obligated in FY 80 and FY 82. This decision was a close judgment call.

The GAIN project gets the edge over the RAI project at the current level principally because with a relatively-small increment we obtain full funding for this project.

Incremental funding for Village Aquaculture II ranks ahead of loan-financing for Rural Water and Sanitation for two reasons: the higher program ranking assigned to rainfed agricultural development and the desirability of completing (nearly) the financing for an FY 82 start in agriculture before addressing the expanded financial requirements of an FY 83 start in health.

The Private Investment in Development Project is ranked low in the Current hierarchy because of its less direct relationship to our core strategy and workforce implications (our judgment that this activity would require the dedication of two USDH personnel, as discussed below).

At the AAPL level, project and program rankings are compatible.

D. Workforce Implications

We foresee no serious workforce implications from our proposed FY 83 program, with two exceptions Private

Investment in Development Project and ESF, which were discussed in the introductory ABS Overview. USAID does have a personnel and program management crisis, but one which is immediate as of May 1981, and must be resolved - or the program and strategy altered - long before the advent of the FY 83 program. The personnel requirements for RAI, GAIN, and Rural Water and Sanitation can be met through the reassignment of staff time made available through the termination of five rural development and three health projects in FY 83.

The Private Investment in Development project and ESF present special workforce problems - problems which we submit lie outside our core strategy and which should be addressed after assuring sufficient attention to core strategy projects. A serious effort to initiate a private sector program embracing project funding for feasibility studies, oversight of the Trade and Development Program, effective professional contacts with private sector entities, etc. will require two USDH personnel in FY 83. An ESF program that does anything more than provide general budget support for Thai development, e.g., projectized assistance or program funding with readily identifiable end uses, will also require two USDH. If the U.S. policy concerns supporting these two activities are compelling, then the required personnel should come with the funding.

Country/Office Thailand

TABLE VIII

OPERATING EXPENSE SUMMARY

COST SUMMARIES	FY 1980 ($000's)	FY 1980 Related Workyear	FY 1980 Unit Cost	FY 1981 ($000's)	FY 1981 Related Workyear	FY 1981 Unit Cost	FY 1982 ($000's)	FY 1982 Related Workyear	FY 1982 Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	1,163.3	22.4	51.9	1,500.0	22.5	66.6	1,513.0	25.4 1/	59.5
FN Direct Hire	556.3	68.0	8.2	749.6	69.1	10.8	899.6	67.0	13.4
US Contract Pers.	3.8	0.4	9.5	64.6	1.2	53.8	148.1	2.8	52.9
FN Contract Pers.	18.3	3.5	5.2	28.0	4.0	7.0	29.0	1.5	19.3
Housing Expense	267.4	28.8	9.3	264.3	22.2	11.9	408.9	26.1	15.6
Office Operations	524.0	xx	xx	628.3	xx	xx	817.2	xx	xx
Total Budget	2,533.1	xxx	xxx	3,234.8	xx	xx	3,815.8 1/	xx	xx
Mission Allotment	1,598.7	xxx	xxx	2,056.6	xx	xx	2,609.3	xx	xx
FAAS	13.1	xxx	xxx	21.1	xx	xx	29.5	xx	xx
Trust Fund	-	xxx	xxx		xx	xx		xx	xx

1/ The FY 82 O.E. Budget is based on 25 full time (FTE) workforce. A control FTE workforce of 27 would increase the O.E. Budget to 4,025.2.

TABLE VIII

COST SUMMARIES	MINIMUM FY 1983 ($000's)	MINIMUM FY 1983 Related Workyear	MINIMUM FY 1983 Unit Cost	CURRENT a/ FY 1983 (000's)	CURRENT a/ FY 1983 Related Workyear	CURRENT a/ FY 1983 Unit Cost	AAPL FY 1983 ($000's)	AAPL FY 1983 Related Workyear	AAPL FY 1983 Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	1,686.9	25.8	65.4	2,230.7	32.8	68.0	2,230.7	32.8	68.0
FN Direct Hire	1,047.0	67.0	15.6	1,047.0	67.0	15.6	1,047.0	67.0	15.6
US Contract Pers.	97.8	1.8	54.3	97.8	1.8	54.3	97.8	1.8	54.3
FN Contract Pers.	34.8	1.5	23.2	34.8	1.5	23.2	34.8	1.5	23.2
Housing Expense	346.9	26.2	13.2	522.3	33.2	15.7	522.3	15.7	15.7
Office Operations	938.0	xx	xx	969.5	xx	xx	969.5	xx	xx
Total Budget	4,151.4	xx	xx	4,902.1	xx	xx	4,902.1	xx	xx
Mission Allotment	2,863.3	xx	xx	3,218.5	xx	xx	3,218.5	xx	xx
FAAS	35.4	xx	xx	35.4	xx	xx	35.4	xx	xx
Trust Fund		xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx

a/ See page 3 for costs at an FTE level of 28 USDH employees

NOTE: Minimum O.E. Budget reflects staffing requirement at minimum program level. It also is the O.E. Budget requirement for Current and AAPL levels based on the FTE Control Numbers of 25 U.S. full time direct hire employees.

TABLE VIII

CURRENT a/

COST SUMMARIES	FY 1983 ($000's)	FY 1983 Related Workyear	FY 1983 Unit Cost	FY 1983 (000's)	FY 1983 Related Workyear	FY 1983 Unit Cost	FY 1983 ($000's)	FY 1983 Related Workyear	FY 1983 Unit Cost
US Direct Hire	1,920.7	28.8	66.7						
FN Direct Hire	1,047.0	67.0	15.6						
US Contract Pers.	97.8	1.8	54.3						
FN Contract Pers.	34.8	1.5	23.2						
Housing Expense	440.2	29.2	15.1						
Office Operations	942.4	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
Total Budget	4,482.9	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
Mission Allotment	3,039.9	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
FAAS	35.4	xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx
Trust Fund		xx	xx		xx	xx		xx	xx

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OVERSEAS WORKFORCE REQUIREMENTS
IN WORKMONTHS

BUREAU: BUREAU FOR ASIA

DECISION UNIT: THAILAND

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
870	U	10	011	30128 DIRECTOR	S	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
869	U	10	013	30130 ASSISTANT DIRECTOR	S	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
871	U	10	073	31053 EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT	E	-	40	12	-	-	12	12	*	12	12
	U			30154 SECRETARY (PART-TIME)			32	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
995	U	20	021	30135 PROGRAM ECONOMIST	H	-	40	12	12	-	12	12	*	12	12
873	U	20	023	34012 ASSISTANT PROGRAM OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
874	U	20	804	34022 BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE ADVISOR	H	-	40	12	12	-	12	12	*	12	12
	U	40	103	- ASST AG DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	-	12	12	12	*	12	12
	U	40	103	- ASST AG DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
561	U	34	091	36012 ASST GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	101	- AGRICULTURAL ECONOMIST	E	I	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
689	U	34	092	36027 PROJECT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	-	-	-	-	-	-

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
627	U	34	103	36005 AG DVL OFFICER (SENIOR)	S	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	103	- AG DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
668	U	34	103	36018 ASST AG DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
876	U	34	103	36023 ASST AG DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
621	U	34	104	36025 AGRONOMY ADVISOR	H	P	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	25	- ENGINEERING OFFICER			40	-	-	12	12	12	-	12	12
684	U	34	251	39007 GENERAL ENGINEERING OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	40	251	- GENERAL ENGINEERING OFFICER	H	-	40	-	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
875	U	34	502	37027 PUBLIC HEALTH ADV	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
678	U	34	551	37012 POPULATION ADVISOR	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
655	U	34	804	38007 HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	34	202	- TRADE DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	-	-	12	12	*	12	12
	U	40	940	- CAPITAL PROJECTS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	-	12	12	12	*	12	12
	U	40	940	- CAPITAL PROJECTS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
30	U	34	940	34008 DEP CAP RSRS DVL OFF	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	U	34	940	- CAPITAL PROJECTS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	-	12	-	12	12	*	12	12
11	U	34	940	34005 CAPITAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
73	U	34	940	34032 CAPITAL PROJECTS DEVELOPMENT OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
736	U	60	031	32006 EXECUTIVE OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1172	U	60	034	32011 ASSISTANT GENERAL SERVICES OFFICER	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4134	F	60	034	30083 SUPPLY SUPERVISOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
695	F	20	021	30549 ECONOMIC SPECIALIST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
696	F	60	050	30548 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
102	F	60	050	30547 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1697	F	40	092	30550 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (GENERAL)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1699	F	40	092	30680 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (RURAL DVL)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4112	F	40	092	30682 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (RURAL DVL)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4113	F	40	092	30676 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (RURAL DVL)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4114	F	40	092	30679 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (RURAL DVL)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4115	F	40	092	30684 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (RURAL DVL)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4116	F	40	092	30782 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (HEALTH)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4117	F	40	092	30783 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (POPULATION)	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
1698	F	60	050	30001 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4103	F	60	050	30677 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4104	F	60	050	30683 PROGRAM CLERK	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4105	F	60	050	30678 PROGRAM CLERK	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4106	F	60	050	30681 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4107	F	60	050	30784 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4108	F	60	050	30785 PROGRAM CLERK	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1700	F	40	251	30900 ENGINEERING OFFICER	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4111	F	40	251	30902 ENGINEERING OFFICER	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
728	U	50	041	33068 ACCOUNTANT/FINANCIAL ANALYST	H	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
726	U	50	043	33061 CONTROLLER	S	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1702	F	50	041	30516 PROJECT/ACCOUNTANT/FINANCIAL ANALYST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1705	F	50	041	30498 ACCT/FINANCIAL ANALYST SUP	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1706	F	50	041	30506 FINANCIAL SPECIALIST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1707	F	50	041	30517 ACCOUNTING TECHNICIAN	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4120	F	50	041	30451 PROJECT ACCOUNTANT/FINANCIAL ANALYST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
4121	F	50	041	30495 FINANCIAL SPECIALIST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4122	F	50	041	30508 FINANCIAL & BUDGET SPECIALIST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4123	F	50	041	30471 SUPERVISORY VOUCHER EXAMINER	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1701	F	50	042	30499 SUPERVISORY BUDGET SPECIALIST	-	-	4	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1708	F	50	050	30460 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1703	F	50	07	30480 SENIOR VOUCHER EXAMINE	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1704	F	50	07	30492 CASHIER	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4124	F	50	070	30484 VOUCHER EXAMINER	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4125	F	50	070	30477 VOUCHER AUDITOR	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1711	F	60	033	30049 PERSONNEL SPECIALIST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4133	F	60	033	30061 PERSONNEL ASSISTANT	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1714	F	60	034	30155 MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1719	F	60	050	30010 OFFICE SERVICES COORDINATOR	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4126	F	60	072	30335 COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORDS SUPERVISOR	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4127	F	60	072	30339 COMMUNICATIONS & RECORDS ASST.	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
4128	F	60	072	30375 PRINTING AND COMMUNICATIONS CLERK	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4129	F	60	072	30383 MAIL CLERK	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4130	F	60	050	30385 TELEPHONE OPERATOR	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4131	F	30	024	30653 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (GENERAL)	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4132	F	30	910	30651 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (EDUCATION)	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4135	F	30	024	30652 PROGRAM SPECIALIST (GENERAL)	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4136	F	60	050	30654 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4137	F	60	050	30655 PROGRAM CLERK	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
4138	F	60	050	30901 SECRETARY	E	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1709	F	60	07	30012 TRANSLATOR/INTERPRETER	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1717	F	60	034	30122 SHIPMENT/TRAVEL ASST.	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1710	F	60	600	30011 REFERENCE/LIBRARIAN	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1712	F	60	931	30082 CONTRACT SPECIALIST	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1715	F	60	932	30090 SUPPLY SUPERVISOR	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1716	F	60	932	30107 PURCHASING & PROPERTY DISPOSAL ASST.	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
1718	F	60	99	30209 MOTOR POOL SUPERVISOR	-	-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

ITEM	US/ FN	FUNC TION	SKILL	POSITION NUMBER AND TITLE	LEVEL	PERS CAT	WORK SCH	FY 81	FY 82	FY 1983 AT MIN	FY 1983 AT CURR	FY 1983 AT AAPL	FY 1983 APL	FY 84	FY 85
	F	60		30233 DISPATCHER		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30252 VEHICLE OIPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30263 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30264 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30272 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30277 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30278 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30279 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30284 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30285 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12
	F	60		30286 VEHICLE OPERATOR		-	40	12	12	12	12	12	-	12	12

Narrative on ADP/WP Systems

USIAD/Thailand has a Wang 25 word processing unit with five terminals and two more terminals on order. All WP equipment has been purchased. The word processing equipment with five terminals was installed in May 1981; it is fully operational and is being used extensively. Our staff is undergoing intensive training. The resulting benefits in time saved and the reduction in supplies/material costs should prove substantial. Therefore, in FY 82 and FY 83, we have budgeted for the purchase of two additional WP terminals in each fiscal year. We anticipate the cost of the terminals to be $21,500 in FY 82 and $23,000 in FY 83.

For FY-82, we have also budgeted $30,000 for a direct cable hook up with the mini-computer(Wang) located at the American Embassy, Bangkok. With the purchse of two ADP terminals, which is included in the $30,000 cost estimate, this hook up will enable us to share with other U.S. Government agencies the use of the mini-computer and avoid the cost of buying a computer for USAID/Thailand.

Alternatively, USAID is considering the option of "trading up" to a complete in-house capability. This approach might permit some reduction in the number of terminals required since it would avoid redundancy in ADP and WP terminals. It would also obviate the need for the Embassy/USAID hook up.

With the installation of word processing terminals the ADP hook-up and the ADP terminals, we believe not only will cost savings ensue but managerial efficiency and report capability will be enhanced without additional staff.

We plan to automate our financial management and accounting reports, property inventory records, personnel records and to store and use baseline data for program/project planning and implementation.

For Controller and Executive Office functions, we intend to use computer programs that have been developed and presently in use at USAID/Manila. We also plan to take advantage of any operational programs, pre-packaged or otherwise that become available to us.

The total costs of the terminals and the computer hook-up is $74,500 which has a "minimum" fund priority.

TABLE VII(a)
ADP SYSTEMS INVENTORY
($000, Workyears)

		Fiscal Year 1981	1982	1983
A.	Capital Investments			
1.	Purchase of ADP Equipment		30.0	
	Purchase of Software			
	Sub-total		30.0	
B.	Personnel			
1.	Compensation, Benefits, Travel			
2.	Workyears			
	Sub-total			
C.	Equipment Rental and Other Operating Costs			
1.	ADP Equi]ment (ADPE) Rentals			
2.	Supplies and Leased Software			
	Sub-total			
D.	Commercial Services			
1.	ADP Service Bureau			
2.	Systems Analysis and Programming			
3.	ADPE Mainteance (If separate from Item C.1)			
	Sutb-total			
E.	Total Obligations (A-D)		30.0	
F.	Interagency Services			
1.	Payments	7.6	8.7	10.4
2.	Offsetting Collections			
	Sub-total	7.6	8.7	10.4
G.	Grand Total (E+F)	7.6	38.7	10.4

4. Report on Inventory of Word Processing Systems

This report will contain information on obligations ($000).

		Fiscal Year 1981	1982	1983
A.	Capital Investments in W/P Equipment	18.0	21.5	23.0
B.	W/P Equipment Rental and Supplies			
C.	Other W/P Costs			
D.	Total	18.0	21.5	23.0