

Jamaica

TO: Joseph Stepanek, Director, LAC/DPP
FROM: Robert Queener, Director
SUBJECT: FY 1994/95 Annual Budget Submission
DATE: August 31, 1993

Attached you will find USAID/Jamaica's Annual Budget Submission for FY 1994/95 as requested in the Administrator's faxed guidance of August 18 and the LAC Bureau's guidance of August 19. Meeting the lowest program and OE resource targets within the specified time period would be at considerable cost to our development impact and USAID's political profile.

Considering that USAID/Jamaica's combined DA/ESF program levels have fallen from \$30.7 million in FY 92, to an estimated \$19.1 million in FY 93, further cuts to \$10.6 million in FY 94 (at the 75% level) and \$7.1 million in FY 95 (at the 50% level) would be very disruptive to USAID's program objectives, our multi-donor efforts, and Jamaica's critical development needs.

The worst case scenario would entail drastic program restructuring and accelerated termination of projects. These actions alone would impose extraordinary demands on Mission staff in addition to normal implementation responsibilities. Stringent FY 93 OE levels have already constrained program management. Further cuts will not only preclude us from carrying out the program envisioned in the FY 94/95 Action Plan, but will also affect our ability to manage the program reduction process being called for. In this regard, it is important to note that the 25% OE reduction scenarios in this ABS, if implemented, would seriously limit our ability to adequately support our program, regardless of DA levels, because of the precipitous timing of the reductions.

In anticipation of the most extreme reductions, the Mission has identified \$18.6 million in potential program cuts (beyond the \$16 million in reductions in the FY 94/95 Action Plan). Assuming the most extreme resource cuts, the Mission would be forced to reduce its active projects to 9 at the end of FY 95 -- down from 30 at the end of FY 92 -- compared with the Action Plan figure of 12 at the end of FY 95. Consistent with Agency guidance, we have not extended any project PACDs in the planning scenarios. The Mission was guided by three key precepts to determine how to respond to the scenarios where OE and program resources were cut. These were:

- 1) current Agency priorities and our strategic objective framework;
- 2) staff and support cost implications of various projects;
and

3) institutional/developmental implications of potential cuts.

First and foremost, we strove to preserve those activities that we believe will have the most positive impacts on promoting equitable, sustainable development in Jamaica. We emphasized population and health, environment, democracy and economic growth as our touchstones in this regard. Our current strategic objective framework -- keyed to export growth/employment, environmental management, and smaller, healthier families -- is largely consistent with these priority areas, but we used the sense and spirit of the priority areas -- with equal emphasis on each area -- as a key basis for trimming and preserving activities within the strategic objective framework.

Second, we analyzed the relative staff intensity of our portfolio to determine which activities, if cut or reduced, might yield the greatest OE savings over the long run. This approach led us to consider cuts in the more complex activities that tend to have a multitude of subcomponents.

Finally, we considered the institutional and developmental implications of potential cuts. We concluded that the least cost approach was achieved by eliminating or reducing planned enhancements of projects, cutting back or closing early those activities where institutional development objectives would not be impaired, and where substantial elements of overall project objectives have been achieved.

By applying the above precepts, USAID/Jamaica has been able to meet each of the scenarios given us for DA/ESF program cuts. The implications were, of course, progressively more serious at each reduced resource level, and the negative consequences are summarized in Table IV and Reduced Budget narratives.

Scenario #1: Full Funding and Orderly Implementation: At full FY 1994 CP proposed levels for DA and with \$4.0 million in ESF in FY 94, and at 100% of FY 93 OE funding through FY 95, we would be able to implement the program detailed in the FY 94/95 Action Plan. Even at these relatively optimistic levels we would not include new project starts in FY 94 or 95, but would allow planned increases in the authorized levels of several projects (EDIP, CLASP, and UWI Management Education) which represent opportunities to expand on successful interventions. We would also be able to meet earmarks as tentatively assigned by the LAC Bureau. Although FY 93 OE levels have stretched Mission management capabilities, continued FY 93 OE levels through FY 95 (which would include some trust fund generation from FY 93 ESF) would allow us to effectively support the assistance program outlined above, though we would be constrained below ideal staffing and support levels.

Scenario #2: Early Termination of Selected Projects and Reduction of Planned Amendments: This scenario envisions 75% DA

levels in FY 94 and 95, no ESF in FY 94 or 95, and OE reduced to 75% in both FY 94 and 95. Such reductions would have considerable implications. Note that in our FY 94/95 Action Plan, the Mission planned to projectize ESF in FY 94 to finance part of the EDIP amendment and thereby reduce the DA mortgage. For that reason, USAID/Jamaica maintains that any reduction in ESF should be proportional to DA cutbacks, i.e. to ESF \$3 million at the 75% level or ESF \$2 million at the 50% level. We urge that the total elimination of ESF in FY 94 be reconsidered.

Assuming no ESF resources, the Mission would reduce the EDIP amendment by 25%, thereby diminishing the impacts of our flagship economic growth project. The combined effects of no ESF, cuts in DA, and reductions in OE will also force us to reduce overall portfolio size on an accelerated basis. Four relatively staff-intensive projects would have to be terminated early: Hillside Agriculture, an important set of agricultural development, rural employment and environmental activities; Ag Export Services, which supports exports of agricultural products; CLASP, our cross-cutting training program which buttresses our three strategic objectives; and Tech Support for Shelter and Services, which targets environmentally-sound shelter and site solutions. Although the amendment was not specified in the FY 94/95 Action Plan, we would also forego tentative plans to amend the Inner Kingston Development project which works to improve investment and employment in the blighted Inner Kingston area.

Scenario #3: Further Reductions in Scope and Impact of Selected Projects: This entails a further 25% cut in DA in FY 1995, to be maintained in the out years, and OE levels at 75% in FY 94 and 95. The cuts under scenario #2 already assume the OE cuts and elimination of ESF, but to meet this level, beside the cuts summarized above, two components would be closed early in Health Sector Initiatives project, and the Mission would reduce its planned activities in the PEAP and/or UWI Management Education project. These cuts, unless relatively small, would affect the long-term sustainability of each program. In addition, we would further scale back the EDIP amendment from the reductions in scenario #2.

It should be noted that even under the most stringent circumstance we are attempting to maintain full or almost full funding for our Microenterprise Development Project, Development of Environmental Organizations Project, Family Planning Project, AIDS/STD Prevention and Control Project, Sustainable Justice Project, Inner Kingston Development Project, Primary Education Assistance II Project, University of the West Indies Management Education Project and the North Coast Development Project (which is an important co-financed project with the Japanese). We have selected these projects for one or more of the precepts listed above.

Overall, program/OE cuts will have the following effect on Mission strategic objectives and Agency policy objectives:

Strategic Objective #1, "increased foreign exchange earnings and employment," corresponds with the A.I.D. policy objective of "economic growth." In the most stringent scenario, the amended EDIP project drops to \$6 million or less, compared with an FY 94/95 Action Plan indicative level of \$10 million. We would also terminate the Ag Export Services project saving \$5.1 million in mortgage. The Mission would also be forced to forego tentative plans for a \$1.5 million amendment to the Inner Kingston Development Project to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Kingston Restoration Company and enlarge its community development/poverty alleviation efforts. **Total savings: \$12.6 million. Potential impacts:** virtual withdrawal from the agricultural sector; diminished support for GOJ institutional capacity to implement policy reforms; reduced impact on export production and competitiveness.

Strategic objective #2, "improved environmental quality and natural resource protection," conforms to the "environment" policy objective. Assuming the most severe cuts, the Mission would terminate earlier than planned and at reduced LOP funding the Hillside Agriculture Project (a 100% environmental earmark project with anti-poverty impacts) and the Tech Support for Shelter and Services project. **Total savings: \$3.0 million. Potential impacts:** reduced watershed protection, increased urban and coastal area pollution.

Strategic objective #3, "healthy, smaller families," corresponds with the Agency's "population/health" policy objective. This objective would be largely preserved under each scenario. Under the most stringent program scenario, two components from the Health Sector Initiatives project would probably have to be terminated. **Total savings: \$0.7 million. Potential impacts:** delayed shift to private provision of health services.

Crosscutting projects: assuming reduced program/OE levels, the Mission would not amend CLASP, which funds participant training in support of all three strategic objectives and all four Agency policy objectives. **Total savings: \$2 million. Potential impacts:** reduced strategic impacts and fewer training opportunities for disadvantaged students.

Other projects: at the lowest DA budget levels, the Mission would terminate early one component under the Primary Education II project and/or activities under the UWI Management Education project. **Total savings: up to \$1 million.**

Potential impacts: impeded decentralization of school administration and curriculum development, disrupted multi-donor effort, delayed sustainability of graduate business programs.

It is important to point out that the OE/FTE reductions over

the projected time periods are extremely difficult to meet. Program cuts necessitated by reductions in DA resources will contribute to some OE savings in the long run, however, the immediate implications for OE are on balance minimal, even if we cut our program more extensively to attempt to meet OE constraints. This is because:

- reductions and closeouts in each project must be phased in a reasonable manner;
- the process requires careful analysis and negotiations with the GOJ, and redesign in some cases will be required;
- the financial reconciliation process after a PACD is often a drawn-out process with extensive staff implications; and
- staff cuts/transfers are themselves costly over the near term (e.g. severance pay and transfer costs to AID/W). Even reductions in housing costs will require expenses of moving if not done by attrition.

The Mission is already implementing a number of tough procedures to cut OE costs as explained in our FY 94/95 Action Plan (e.g. moving staff and other costs to program funds wherever possible, tightening Mission procurement and inventory controls, and reducing transportation/communication/housing costs wherever possible). However, increases in salaries for FSNs and in guard costs at this critical-threat post, along with office rental increases, are countervailing factors in budget rationalization.

To meet the requirement to reduce operating expenditures by 25% in FY 94 and FY 95, we will need to install an interim "bridging" mechanism to allow the effects of the planned and accelerated project closeouts to generate their delayed OE savings from reductions in staff. We have accordingly developed an approach that will allow us to fund project support personnel (such as project accountants, project procurement staff, administrative staff who backstop project functions) and their support costs with trust funds outside of the OE account.

This approach to funding project support staff will permit us to absorb 15% of the OE reduction through non-OE account trust funds during FY 94-95, and provide sufficient time to complete the necessary restructuring of our portfolio, staff and office support arrangements. However, in FY 96, we will have no residual trust funds. We accordingly must complete necessary downsizing, pay necessary severance pay and reduce our office rental and overhead costs by FY 96. Without the use of trust funds for the interim Project Support Unit approach, we could not absorb the full 25% OE cut, and could not sustain more than a 10% reduction in FY 94-95.

FTE Reductions: to meet the FY 95 FTE scenario of 11, we will have to take USDH staff cuts of three positions that will result in:

- loss of the Mission Economist. This will mean the loss of much of our economic analysis and policy dialogue capacity;
- loss of our RLA who has provided significant oversight and guidance during the difficult restructuring process we have gone through to date; and
- loss of one USDH in our Office of Private Enterprise.

These cuts would be additional to the elimination of three positions in FY 93 and one other staff reduction planned in FY 94, our Education and Human Resources Officer. The Mission has already reduced its USDH complement from 20 FTEs in FY 1990, to 15 by FY 94, and would further reduce its FTEs to 11 by FY 95. This is a precipitous reduction that is stretching the Mission's capacity to manage its program. If we wish to preserve good relationships with the GOJ, and maintain acceptable standards of accountability and management, the downsizing of staff and OE resources must be phased over a longer time period.

From FY 92 to FY 93, our combined DA/ESF level already declined by 34%. We urge that any further cuts to be imposed on Jamaica and other USAID Missions consider the broad-ranging political and developmental implications of precipitous resource reductions before they are imposed. Recent public and media reaction to lower USAID levels has reaffirmed the importance that Jamaicans place not only on our development assistance, but on the leadership role we retain in our bilateral development dialogue with Jamaica and among the donor community. We also propose that the Agency consider providing a one-time, special budget allocation for the additional costs of downsizing. This would help defray costs of severance pay, relocations, and other actions needed to achieve lower costs over the long run.

ATTACHMENT 1

FY 1994 PROGRAM BY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE (\$000)

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	POLICY AREA	FY 1994 CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION LEVEL	
		100%	75%
1. Increased foreign exchange earnings and employment			
	Economic growth	9,225	4,590
2. Improved environmental quality and natural resource protection			
	Environment	3,200	2,500
3. Healthy, smaller families			
	Population/health	3,100	1,767
4. OTHER PROJECTS			
	Democracy	1,000	900
	None	1,660	882
TOTAL:		18,185	10,639

U:\OPDPUB\DOCS\SOCTABLES

ATTACHMENT 2

FY 1995 PROGRAM BY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE (\$000)

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE	POLICY AREA	BASE: 100% FY 1994 CP LEVEL					
		50% OF BASE		75% OF BASE		100% OF BASE	
		ONGOING	NEW	ONGOING	NEW	ONGOING	NEW
1. Increased foreign exchange earnings and employment							
Economic growth		2,640		3,734		5,888	
2. Improved environmental quality and natural resources							
Environment		1,800		2,300		3,541	
3. Healthy, Smaller families							
Population/health		1,352		2,670		3,500	
OTHER PROJECTS							
Democracy		500		960		1,000	
None		800		974		256	
TOTAL:		7,092		10,638		14,185	

U:\OPDPUB\DOCS\SOTABLES

ATTACHMENT 3

FY 1995 OPERATING EXPENSE

ASSUMES FY 1994 BASE FY 1995 TARGET LEVEL
 FY 1995 BASE (75%) FY 1995 TARGET (100%)

Expense Category	Function Code	Trust		Trust	
		Dollars	Funds	Dollars	Funds
(COUNTRY)					
U.S. Direct Hire	U100				
Other Salary	U105				
Educ. Allow's	U106	71.0		71.0	71.0
COLA	U108				
Other Benefits	U110	5.4		5.4	5.4
Post Assign Trv	U111	6.8		6.8	6.8
Post Assign Frt	U112	54.3		54.3	54.3
Home Lv Trv	U113	9.6		9.6	9.6
Home Lv Frt	U114	30.9		30.9	30.0
Educ Trv	U115	6.4		6.4	6.4
R & R Trv	U116	18.2		18.2	18.2
Other Trv	U117	18.3		18.3	18.3
Subtotal		220.9	0.0	220.9	220.9
F.N. Direct Hire					
F.N. Basic Pay	U200				
Overtime/Holiday Pay	U201	10.0	71.0	81.0	10.0
All Other Code 11-F.N.	U202		4.0	4.0	9.4
All Other Code 12-F.N.	U203		3.0	3.0	3.0
Benefits - Former F.N.	U204		10.7	10.7	10.7
Accrued Severance	U205				
U206					
Subtotal		10.0	88.7	98.7	10.0
Contract Personnel					
U.S. PSC Sal/Benefits	U300				
All Other US PSC Coats	U302	135.7		135.7	135.7
U303		8.0		8.0	8.0
FN PSC Sal/Benefits	U304		294.6	294.6	574.8
All Other FN PSC Coats	U305		0.0	0.0	0.0
Manpower Contracts	U306		196.5	196.5	196.5
U307					
Accrued Severance	U307				
Subtotal		143.7	491.1	634.8	143.7
Housing					
U4.00					
Res. Rent	U4.01	225.0		225.0	225.0
U4.02			62.8	62.8	62.8
M & R	U4.03	15.0	35.4	50.4	15.0
LQA	U4.04				
Security Guards	U4.07		165.0	165.0	165.0
ORE	U4.08				

5

REP	U409	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Subtotal	241.2	263.2	504.4	241.2	263.2	504.4	
Office Operations	390.6	390.6	390.6	390.6	390.6	390.6	
Office Rent	86.9	86.9	86.9	86.9	86.9	86.9	
Office Utilities	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	
Bldg. M & R	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
Equip. M & R	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	35.4	
Communications	90.2	90.2	90.2	90.2	90.2	90.2	
Security Guards	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	82.5	
Printing	21.6	21.6	21.6	21.6	21.6	21.6	
Site Visit-Mission	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6	8.6	
Site Visit-AID/M	15.1	15.1	15.1	15.1	15.1	15.1	
Info Meetings	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	
Training	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	13.9	
Conference Attendance	19.4	19.4	19.4	19.4	19.4	19.4	
Other Ops Travel	49.7	49.7	49.7	49.7	49.7	49.7	
Supplies	65.0	65.0	65.0	65.0	65.0	65.0	
FAAS	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Cont Consult Svcs.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Cont Mgt/Prof Svcs.	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Spec Studies/Analysis	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
ADP H/W Leases/Maint	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	
ADP S/W Leases/Maint	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
Trans/Freight US00	35.9	35.9	35.9	35.9	35.9	35.9	
All Other Cont. Svcs	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	9.1	
Subtotal	625.5	332.6	958.1	760.1	421.1	1181.2	

ATTACHMENT 3

FY 1995 OPERATING EXPENSE

ASSUMES FY 1994 BASE
 FY 1995 BASE (75%)
 TRUST

EXPENSE CATEGORY FUNCTION CODE DOLLARS FUNDS TOTAL DOLLARS FUNDS TOTAL

(COUNTRY)

EXPENSE CATEGORY	FUNCTION CODE	DOLLARS	FUNDS	TOTAL	DOLLARS	FUNDS	TOTAL
NXP Procurement	U600						
Vehicles	U601	12.0		12.0	12.0		12.0
Res. Furniture	U602	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
Res. Equipment	U603	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0
Office Furniture	U604	1.0		1.0	1.0		1.0
Other Equipment	U605	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0
ADP H/W Purchases	U606	0.0		0.0	0.0		0.0
ADP S/W Purchases	U607	10.0		10.0	10.0		10.0
Trans/Freight U600	U608	5.0		5.0	5.0		5.0
	U698	10.1		10.1	10.1		10.1

Subtotal 58.1 0.0 58.1 58.1 58.1

Total OE Expense Budget 1299.4 1175.6 2475.0 1434.1 1650.2 3090.3

Less FAAS US20

Total OE Expense Budget 1299.4 1175.6 2475.0 1434.1 1650.2 3090.3

636(c) U999

Grand Total OE Expense Budget 1299.4 1175.6 2475.0 1434.1 1650.2 3090.3

USDH FTEs	FMDH FTEs (U200)	TCM PSC FTEs (U300)	FN PSC FTEs (U300)	OTHER CONTRACTS FTEs (U300)	US PSC FTEs (300)
	3.1				
		3.2			
			#		
			21.0		
			21.0		
			#		
			37.0		
			25.0		

ATTACHMENT 3

FY 1994 OPERATING EXPENSE

Expense Category	Function Code	Dollars	FY 1994 BASE (75%)		FY 1994 TARGET (100%)		Overtime/Holiday Pay	U202
			Trust	Total	Trust	Total		
(COUNTRY)								
U.S. Direct Hire	U100							
Other Salary	U105	42.7		42.7	136.1	136.1		
Educ. Allow's	U106							
COLA	U108							
Other Benefits	U110	21.6		21.6	23.3	23.3		
Post Assign Trv	U111	18.7		18.7	20.4	20.4		
Post Assign Frt	U112	161.5		161.5	162.9	162.9		Home Lv Trv U113
		40.1		40.1				
Home Lv Frt	U114	33.1	0.0	33.1	29.8	29.8		
Educ Trv	U115	11.2	0.0	11.2	8.0	8.0		
R & R Trv	U116	5.6	0.0	5.6	9.1	9.1		
Other Trv	U117	20.2	0.0	20.2	22.1	22.1		
Subtotal		358.1	0.0	358.1	451.8	0.0	451.8	
F.N. Direct Hire								
F.M. Basic Pay	U200	5.0	80.5	85.5	10.0	168.0	178.0	Overtime/Holiday Pay U202
	U201	8.9	8.9	1.0	3.0	10.4	3.0	
All Other Code 11-F.M.	U203		1.0	1.0				
All Other Code 12-F.M.	U204		4.7	4.7		10.4	10.4	
Benefits - Former F.M.	U205							
Accrued Severance	U206							
Subtotal		5.0	90.8	95.8	10.0	190.3	200.3	
Contract Personnel								
U.S. PSC Sal/Benefits	U300	126.3		126.3	144.3	144.3		
All Other US PSC Costs	U302	8.0	0.0	8.0	8.0	8.0		
FN PSC Sal/Benefits	U303		245.2	245.2		490.8	490.8	
All Other FN PSC Costs	U304		0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0	
Manpower Contracts	U305		196.5	196.5		201.0	201.0	
Accrued Severance	U306	0.0						
	U307							
Subtotal		134.3	441.7	576.0	152.3	691.8	844.1	
Housing								
Res. Rent	U400	245.6		245.6	298.2	298.2		
Res. Utilities	U401		59.4	59.4		79.6	79.6	
M & R	U402	15.0	28.5	43.5	15.0	29.5	44.5	
LGA	U403							
Security Guards	U404		178.3	178.3		247.0	247.0	
	U407							

ORE REP	UK08 UK09	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2
Subtotal		261.8	266.2	528.0	314.4	356.1	670.5
Office Operations	US00						
Office Rent	US01	355.1	0.0	355.1	395.1	150.0	395.1
Office Utilities	US02	0.0	81.3	81.3	10.0	5.3	15.3
Bldg. M & R	US03	10.0	4.4	14.4	10.0	45.4	45.4
Equip. M & R	US08	0.0	35.4	35.4	107.6	82.5	107.6
Communications	US09	86.1	0.0	86.1			
Security Guards	US10		66.0	66.0			
Printing	US11						
Site Visit-Mission	US13	0.0	21.6	21.6	0.0	21.6	21.6
Site Visit-AID/M	US14	8.6	0.0	8.6	8.6		8.6
Info Meetings	US15	15.1	0.0	15.1	15.1		15.1
Training	US16	19.0	0.0	19.0	19.0		19.0
Conference Attendance	US17	13.9	0.0	13.9	13.9		13.9
Other Ops Travel	US18	19.4	0.0	19.4	19.4		19.4
Supplies	US19	49.7	65.0	114.7	66.5	65.0	131.5
PAAS	US20						
Cont Consult Svcs.	US21	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
Cont Mgt/Prof Svcs.	US22	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
Spec Studies/Analysis	US23	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0
ADP H/W Leases/Maint	US25						
ADP S/W Leases/Maint	US26	9.1	0.0	9.1	9.1		9.1
Trans/Freight US00	US98	0.0	35.9	35.9		35.9	35.9
All Other Cont. Svcs	US99						
Subtotal		586.0	309.6	895.6	664.3	405.7	1070.0

ATTACHMENT 3

FY 1994 OPERATING EXPENSE

Expense Category	Function Code	Dollars	FY 1994 BASE (75%)		FY 1994 TARGET (100%)	
			Trust Funds	Total	Trust Funds	Total
(COUNTRY)						
NXP Procurement	U600					
Vehicles	U601	0.0		0.0		0.0
Res. Furniture	U602	0.0		0.0		0.0
Res. Equipment	U603	3.0		3.0		3.0
Office Furniture	U604	0.0		0.0		0.0
Office Equipment	U605	1.0		1.0		1.0
Other Equipment	U606	0.0		0.0		0.0
ADP H/W Purchases	U607	5.0		5.0		5.0
ADP S/W Purchases	U608	10.0		10.0		10.0
Trans/freight US00	U698	2.5		2.5		2.5
Subtotal		21.5	0.0	21.5	0.0	21.5
Total OE Expense Budget		1366.7	1108.3	2475.0	1656.1	3300.0
Less FAAS	U520					
Total OE Expense Budget		1366.7	1108.3	2475.0	1656.1	3300.0
636(c)						
	U999					
Grand Total OE Expense Budget		1366.7	1108.3	2475.0	1656.1	3300.0
USDH FTEs				13.3		14.0
FNDH FTEs (U200)				6.0		11.0
US PSC FTEs (300)				3.2		3.9
US PSC FTEs (U300)			21.0			
OTHER CONTRACTS FTEs (U300)			38.0	26.0		30.0
						FM PSC FTEs (U300)

JAMAICA (532)
TABLE V: PROPOSED PROGRAM RANKING

Rank	Project	Title	APPRO	US\$000	RANK
1	532-0101	Hillside Agriculture	FN	200	5
2	532-0120	Inner Kingston	SD	950	
3	532-0129	UWI Management Education	EH	1000	
4	532-0135	Export Development & Investment Promotion	SD	614	1
5	532-0135	Export Development & Investment Promotion	ES		
6	532-0149	Technical Support for Shelter	SD	400	
7	532-0152	Health Sector Initiatives	HE	600	
8	532-0153	AIDS/STD Prevention & Support	DG	300	3
	532-0155	Primary Education Assistance II	EH	732	8
	532-0156	Microenterprise Development	SD	733	
	532-0163	Family Planning Initiatives	PN	867	6
	532-0165	Agricultural Export Services	FN	500	
	532-0168	North Coast Development Support	SD	300	
	532-0169	CLASP II	SD	593	4
	532-0173	DEMO	FN	1800	
	532-0173	DEMO	HE		2
	532-0175	Sustainable Justice Reform	SD	900	7
	532-9103	PDES	PN	20	
	532-9105	PDES	EH	30	
	532-9105	PDES	EH	30	
	532-9105	PDES	SD	100	
		TOTAL MCC REQUEST		10639	
		Increment Level			
1	532-0135	EDIP	ES	4000	
2	532-0173	DEMO	HE	700	
3	532-0153	AIDS/STD Prevention & Control	DG	900	
4	532-0169	CLASP II	SD	85	
5	532-0101	Hillside Agriculture	FN	550	
6	532-0163	Family Planning Initiatives	PN	433	
7	532-0175	Sustainable Justice Reform	SD	100	
8	532-0155	Primary Education Assistance II	EH	778	
		TOTAL INCREMENT REQUEST		7546	
		TOTAL REQUEST		18185	