FY 2001 Results Review and Resource Request (R-4)
Submitted by the Secretariat for the U.S. - Asia Environmental Partnership

Asia in Transition: 2000 and Beyond

March 31, 1999

Please Note:

The attached FY 2001 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4") was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: http://www.dec.org

Released on or after Oct. 1, 2001

CONTENTS

PART I. OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

A. The US-AEP Program

The U.S. - Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP) was organized by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) in January, 1992. From that date, and with continuing support from the highest levels of USAID and the Executive Branch, US-AEP has launched a wide range of development and economic activity - in close collaboration with the ANE Bureau and its field missions, with the Global Bureau, with other agencies and departments of federal and state governments, and with an even wider range of private sector and non-governmental organizations throughout Asia and in the United States.

The development challenge in the Asia region is twofold: achieving large, sustained increases in economic activity and improving environmental quality. Call the challenge sustainability. Quite possibly, political leaders will face no greater challenge in the decades ahead. Seen this way, reconciling economic and environmental goals will be possible only through fundamental change - *structural transformation* - a shift, perhaps unprecedented in scope and pace, to new industrial and urban systems that dramatically reduce environmental impact and increase environmental well-being per unit of prosperity.

In response to this challenge, US-AEP. seeks to create an ever-enlarging web of professional and organizational linkages. Its activities connect actors from the United States with counterparts in Asia. Most call for cooperation among governmental, private sector and nongovernmental organizations. Many rely on cooperation inside of networks or associations. They do not require massive new transfers of aid or capital or large-scale institutions, relying heavily instead on new relationships within the private sector, supported and channeled by public activity. Beneath the surface, all rely on a common vision of economic progress and environmental quality as two sides of the same coin - a better quality of life.

B. Progress in 1998

In 1998, the economic crisis and environment met head-on. As in other countries responding to economic down-turn, environmental protection agencies lessened enforcement pressure, and firms took a step-back on both compliance and procurement of environmental technologies. Nevertheless, there were signs throughout the region that Asian leadership was prepared to consider an agenda for environmentally sustainable growth into the 21st century - reflected in the priority given to environmental topics at both ASEAN and APEC meetings, the efficiency response to the international concerns about climate change and greenhouse gasses, and the emphasis on *transforming approaches* to environmental, industrial and urban policies in most countries. Specifically, and attributable to the US-AEP. in 1998, each of the ten target countries in Asia are actively participating in the policy work surrounding the ISO 14000 initiative; clean production roundtables are active in most of the target countries; the Greening of Industry Network is launched in Asia with broad support from all target countries; and a score of multinational companies are championing environmental management, voluntary business standards and greening of the supply chain approaches throughout the region. In addition, US-AEP. efforts to promote technology transfer are evident in the establishment of new local and national partnerships, in the expansion of environmental and industrial extension between

America and Asia, and in the continuing flow of U.S. experience, practice and technologies to Asia even in the face of the economic down-turn there.

C. Mission Partnership

US-AEP works in five presence countries (Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Philippines, and Sri Lanka) and seven non-presence countries (Hong Kong, Malaysia, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, and Viet Nam). In 1998, in close collaboration with the ANE and Global bureaus, the US-AEP worked to improve its partnership with ANE field missions, developing an important energy initiative with the Bangladesh mission, strengthening its collaboration with the India mission's Clean Technologies and Clean Cities initiatives, launching an environmental, economic and recovery "safety-net" activity on behalf of the Indonesia mission, funding several state partnerships in support of the Philippine mission's environmental programs, and confirming its continuing support for the technology transfer work of the Sri Lanka mission.

D. Economic Crisis

The issues giving rise to the economic crisis of 1997 and 1998 are complex - including economics, politics, society, security and sustainability. The standard response to the crisis is that countries in the region must improve their approach to economic growth, adopting prudent macro policies, stronger and better supervision of financial institutions, broader ownership of financial institutions, greater transparency and incentives to attract more stable capital flows. Little is discussed or prescribed re sustainability - although it is obvious that the standard response contains little that is relevant to the growth-to-environmental degradation equation that has been addressed so cogently by USAID and US-AEP over the past half-decade.

While USAID must contribute to America's agenda for economic recovery in the region, so too must it remind itself, its sister agencies and departments, and its other partners in both America and Asia that economic growth and security are undergirded and integrally connected to stewardship of the planet. The growth of economies and the stability of societies are intertwined with the effects of environmental degradation, resource depletion, threats to human health and population shifts. USAID and US-AEP have championed the way societies ought to approach environmental concerns by highlighting the linkages between sustainable development, freedom and prosperity.

In 1998, the US-AEP took the initiative in Indonesia to underscore the connection among the environment, sustainability concerns and economic recovery. Working with Friends of the Environment in Indonesia, US-AEP helped to organize an "eco-efficiency engineering corps" to identify no- or low-cost production changes in small to medium scale industrial enterprises with a view to increasing efficiency, reducing production costs and re-employing workers while at the same time reducing the pollution intensity of industrial output. The *win-win* inherent to clean production was given an immediacy in the crisis context, while demonstrating again the ability of US-AEP to move quickly against needs, trends and important ideas. Similar initiatives, promoting the conversion of industrial waste to inputs for new manufactured products, and emergency assistance to small independent water supply operations, carry a similar level of immediacy and relevance to the economic crisis in Indonesia.

E. New Directions

The US-AEP Secretariat undertook to expand its reach in 1998 to embrace the environmental and sustain ability issues associated with energy and urban growth and with climate change working closely with the Global Bureau.. In a sense, US-AEP's decision to move in these directions raises and deepens the significance of its leadership on the environmental and sustain ability stage both here and in Asia. Industrial and urban transformation go hand-in-glove, and, as a result, the success of work in those areas will broaden-out from local and national impacts to regional and global effects. In planning, budget constraints have forced a very close integration of ideas, approaches, and activities between the older and newer areas of concern - demonstrating that there is a silver lining, even in the face of constrained budgets.

F. Global Climate Change

Beginning in FY 1999, US-AEP identified global climate change (GCC) as a new area of focus. US-AEP is well positioned to advance the Agency's Climate Change Initiative, given its extensive presence in Asia, its focus on the private sector, and the highly industrial and export-driven economies of Asia. Much of US-AEP's work towards sustainable industrialization and urbanization already promotes GCC mitigation by addressing energy and resource efficiencies. Just a few examples of such activities are: promotion of environmental management systems (which address energy efficiency), conversion of waste to energy, material recovery and re-use, and municipal solid waste management (with landfill methane gas recovery). US-AEP made significant progress in GCC in 1998 even though it was not yet an explicit objective: the National Association of State Development Agencies awarded ten grants to private sector groups promoting technology transfer relating to energy audits, waste recovery, recycling and reuse, waste to product technologies, medical waste incineration, and waste minimization; the Environmental Exchange Program sponsored ten programs with Asian businessmen and officials relating to topics such as recovery and recycling in the printed circuit board industry, recycling of oil and lubricants, waste-derived fuels, and livestock waste management; The Policy Group supported a meeting of Asian climate change specialists in conjunction with the launch of the Greening of Industry Network at Chulalongkorn University in Thailand; and the Clean Technology and Environmental Management team continued a broad range of activities to improve energy and resource efficiencies in industry. Beginning in FY 1999, US-AEP will also target the power sector directly, through power sector reforms that will enhance the efficiency of energy use and decrease the carbon intensity of energy sources; and through the promotion of energy efficient, renewable energy, and cleaner fossil fuel technologies.

G. Country Expansion

During the year, it was agreed to include Viet Nam within the US-AEP activity portfolio. The Secretariat believes the program is in position to influence a number of emerging environmental and economic policy questions (e.g., conformance to OECD environmental norms, integrating environmental considerations into infrastructure and industrial investment decisions, etc.). These are issues essential to sustain a market economy. They are also issues which indirectly but forcefully touch on questions of civil society and democratic governance. Start-up activities include creation of a technology representation office, promotion of environmental due diligence in the Vietnamese banking community, incorporation of Vietnamese counterparts into US-AEP's emerging Asian policy network, and partnership activity between the respective environmental protection agencies. Activities of this kind will allow us to integrate USAID into

the macroeconomic and environmental policy dialog and complement the programs of ExIm, OPIC and TDA.

PART II. RESULTS REVIEW BY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE

A. Summary Assessment

US-AEP continues to meet expectations - exceeding expectations in some instances. This statement is confirmed by most indicators, although it is clear that the economic crisis has affected technology transfer targets (discussed below). For purposes of this submission, US-AEP has selected three reporting areas: (I) *clean technology and environmental management* (CTEM) reflecting progress in building Asian demand for environmental quality and progress; (ii) *partnership* reflecting progress in building a web of professional and organizational linkages between Asia and the United States, within Asia, within the United States and between the US-AEP itself and a growing number of partner organizations; and (iii) *technology transfer* reflecting US-AEP's commitment to improving America's environmental competitiveness and expanding Asia's access to American experience, practice and technologies.

Performance Summary

	Target	Actual	
Private Pressures	40	55.5	exceed expectations
Partnership	40	60.0	exceed expectations
Technology Transfer	40	23	failed to meet expectations

B. Private Pressures

US-AEP has committed important resources to increasing private initiative and market pressure in support of industrial environmental performance. The strategy is to promote environmental management systems locally (and particularly ISO 14000), introduce voluntary environmental standards for industrial sectors, promote environmental expectations all along the industrial supply chain, introduce environmental due diligence to financial practice, and target industrial extension to the environment.

Environmental Management Systems: US-AEP contributed to the successful organization of accreditation organizations for ISO 14000 in nine of ten target countries in 1996-1997 and to the tenth in Sri Lanka in 1998. In 1998, it turned its attention to international recognition and reciprocity (or the quality side of ISO national management). Working with the two U.S. accreditation organizations (US-AEP partner organizations), nine of the ten national accreditation organizations established workplans for international recognition, and nine of the ten also joined the International Accreditation Forum with a view to finalizing mutual recognition agreements under which certifiers accredited by any one of the signatories will receive reciprocal recognition in all member countries. US-AEP supported training in the areas of “audit witnessing” and “pre-peer review” to catalyze the process. While no points can be awarded until the international process is complete, work is ahead of schedule.

Voluntary Environmental Standards: US-AEP continued to seek corporate commitment to establishing and implementing voluntary codes of conduct and environmental standards. In 1998, US-AEP continued to work with the chemical industry, to implement “responsible care,” while also working to establish a code of conduct with the mining industry in Philippines, the steel industry in India and Philippines, and the textile industry in Sri Lanka and Thailand. This

area of industrial 'self regulation" is important because while governments can pass environmental laws and regulations, it cannot be in all places at all times. Work is ahead of schedule.

Supply Chain Relationships: US-AEP encourages the use of "greening the supply chain" techniques because they promote consistent environmental performance for corporations operating in countries with varying levels of environmental regulations and enforcement. In October, 1998, in an industry "first," US-AEP and Business for Social Responsibility (an US-AEP partner organization) brought together the major competitors from the international sports footwear industry to improve the environmental performance of their supply chains. Partnership agreements were also signed with Ford Motors and United Technologies to promote greening activity along their supply chains as well. The idea here is to strengthen the capacity of Asian industrial outreach organizations to replicate the work of U.S. corporations for their members and other relevant groups.

Environmental Due Diligence: Despite the drag that the Asian financial crisis has understandably put on the process, US-AEP had some notable successes in 1998. It completed a long term partnership arrangement with the Bank of America to introduce its due diligence systems as models for both public and private banking institutions in the five countries in the region. It added a number of champions including the Development Bank and Land Bank of the Philippines, the Industrial Finance Corporation of Thailand, and the National Development Bank of Sri Lanka. It helped to connect Land Bank, Philippines' most innovative environmental bank with USAID's bilateral industrial environment project. Based on the collaboration among Bank of America, champions in three Asian countries, and US-AEP, five private banks in the region have introduced environmental due diligence to their credit and investment practices - Bank of Indonesia and Panin Bank in Indonesia, the Far East Bank and Trust Company in the Philippines, and the Bank of Ceylon in Sri Lanka. US-AEP has also begun the process of working with a number of key regional associations which offer promise for the future.

Industrial Environmental Extension: US-AEP continues to work to strengthen extension systems linked to American information technical support organizations with a view to assuring an aggressive systematic approaches to the transfer, exchange and dissemination of U.S. environmental experience, practice and technologies. US-AEP focused on three countries in 1998: India, Indonesia and Philippines. In the Philippines, US-AEP collaborated with the Industrial Technology Development Institute and the Pollution Control Association to bring science and outreach together around an environmental performance model. In India, US-AEP worked with two competitive industrial associations to develop the platform for an aggressive industrial environmental extension program in Eastern and Western India. These national efforts will be supported by an American information and training source in 1999.

C. Partnerships

Program performance in 1998 exceeded expectations and put the program into an position where an ever-increasing number of partnerships can be legitimately anticipated. A few examples from 1998. Of the twenty grants made by the Council for State Governments between 1995 and 1997, as many of fifteen have been renewed without additional financial input from US-AEP. Seven new grants were made in 1998 - each linked directly to US-AEP objectives and targets, several in collaboration with other US-AEP partners. Perhaps even more impressively, The Asia

Foundation reported that more than half of their grants (twenty four out of an eligible thirty two) for local business/NGO partnership have been renewed without additional financial input from the US-AEP. Also in 1998, The Policy Group concluded an important agreement with the Greening of Industry Network (GIN) to establish that OECD-based organization in Asia (at Chulalongkorn University in Thailand) and to host GIN's international conference in Bangkok in the year 2000. CTEM concluded partnership agreements with eight Asian organizations and several important U.S. partners including Ford Motors and United Technologies. With partnership being a critical intermediate goal to the 'clean revolution," 1998 was a banner year.

D. Technology Transfer

The past year was challenging attributable to the economic crisis. Total U.S. exports to Asia fell $26.5 billion in 1998 from the previous year. The U.S. trade deficit in goods with Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea and Taiwan widened to $22.6 billion last year from $7.9 billion in 1997, mainly because of lower U.S. sales to those countries. What did this mean for environmental goods and services? While the import of environmental technologies by Asian countries fell almost 20 per cent between 1996 and 1997, the decline in those imports as a percentage of industrial GDP fell at half at the rate (i.e, ten percent), suggesting a surprising claim for the environment against increasingly scarce resources for import. Note: trade statistics for the environment lag more generalized statistics by one year, so the impact of the 1998 year will not be fully understood for another several months. US-AEP Technology Representative, nevertheless, maintain their export posture despite the current set-back (registering almost $10 million in sales for 1998 - compared with $64 million in 1997) and have expanded their work to include greater emphasis on the demand side, devoting an increasing percentage of their time to pollution prevention, clean production and policy, and reflecting a more focused commitment to continuing incremental improvement.

E. Expected Progress

Progress into the next several years depends on both external and internal factors. Externally, progress will be related to economic recovery, deepening of the pro-environmental pressures associated with globalization, integration and liberalization, and to the necessary shift in thinking about the environment and sustainability among policy makers in Asia. US-AEP believes there are promising signs within the region - many related to the development ideas and processes launched or supported by US-AEP. Internally, progress will be related to the reenforcement the program can derive from a broader engagement with energy, climate change and urban issues and to the hard-headed management initiatives introduced in 1998 and 1999. Smart, green, clean growth makes good business and development sense. As we know, Asia responds to the market. Our job is to link business, market and development forces. Based on experience, US-AEP believes the prospects are good.

F. Results Framework

US-AEP will work in 1999 to incorporate new and essential elements of the envisioned "clean revolution" (i.e., climate change, energy and urban) and to reflect a new results framework which is simpler and more amendable to the rebidding of the several contracts associated with management of the US-AEP up to this time. US-AEP will engage both ANE and the Global Bureau in this ongoing effort.

G. Environmental Impact

In March 1999, the ANE Bureau Environmental Officer (BEO) reviewed the US-AEP project and its constituent components for continued consistency with the provisions of 22 CFR 216. That review found that the two regulatory assessments of US-AEP prepared in 1992 and 1993 approved the expenditure of funds to conduct a broad range of US-AEP activities without further environmental review. The BEO concluded that: "So long as US-AEP does not provide direct financing for the transfer of those technologies, or for the construction of facilities, (these) kinds of project activities do not require additional Reg 216 review."

The BEO, nonetheless, recommended that US-AEP consult with the ANE BEO prior to financing any activities which fall outside of these broad areas, or which US-AEP believes may otherwise be subject to regulatory review. US-AEP concurs with this recommendation, and will consult on any such activities prior to approval of financing for them.

H. Performance Indicators

Selected Data Tables

Intermediate Result: 1.2	increased corporate and private sector pressure in support of improved environmental performance and privatization of environmental infrastructure
Intermediate Result: 2.1	increased international institutional partnership in support of improved environmental performance and environmental infrastructure
Intermediate Result: 2.2	increased flow and adoption of environmental and cleaner industrial and infrastructure technologies, with emphasis on U.S. practice and technologies

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1998 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 1.2 increased corporate and private sector pressure
In support of improved environmental performance

indicator 1.2a: ISO 14000 certification established

i) national ISO 14000 accrediting agency and at least one national certifying agency established ***(one point/country; 10 points max)***.

ii) international reciprocity for local accredidation/certification ***(one point/country; 10 points max)***.

	1.2a(i) agencies ***(1 pt)***	1.2a(ii) reciprocity ***(1 pt)***	points
HongKong	yes		1
India	yes		1
Indonesia	yes		1
Korea	yes		1
Malaysia	yes		1
Philippines	yes		1
Singapore	yes		1
Sri Lanka	**yes**		**1**
Taiwan	yes		1
Thailand	yes		1

Total Points **10**

maximum 20
IR maximum 100

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1998 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 1.2 increased corporate and private sector pressure in support of improved environmental performance

indicator:
1.2b industry codes established

voluntary environmental business standards adopted by the appropriate industrial asociation in three important industries ***(one point/industry/country; 30 points max)***.

note: can include agro-industries and municipal operations (e.g. waste management, transport, etc.)

	1.2b industry A *(1 pt)*	1.2b industry B *(1 pt)*	1.2b industry C *(1 pt)*	points
HongKong	chemical			1
India	chemical	**steel**		**1.5**
Indonesia	chemical			1
Korea	petro-chem.			1
Malaysia	chemical			1
Philippines	chemical	**various**		**3.5**
Singapore	chemical	**SCI**		**2**
Sri Lanka	chemical	**various**		**2**
Taiwan	chemical			1
Thailand	chemical	**FTI**		**1.5**

Total Points **16.5**

Notes:
(1) voluntary waste water guidelines have been established for textile suppliers of GAP, Levi Strauss, Nike, Pategonia, LL Bean and Guess. These have not been included in score.

maximum 30
IR max 100

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1998 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 1.2 increased corporate and private sector pressure
In support of improved environmental performance

indicator 1.2c: "greening of the supply chain" promoted and practiced by the private sector

i) at least one local "champion" (e.g. industry association, NGO, leading corporation) actively promoting the "greening of supply chains"
(one point/country;10 points max).

ii) U.S. companies with suppliers in Asia and major Asian coorporations adopting programs to "green" their supply chain
(one point/company;10 points max).

	1.2c(i) champions *(1 pt)*	1.2c(ii) companies *(1 pt)*	points
HongKong			
India			
Indonesia	one	**one**	**2**
Korea		one	1
Malaysia			
Philippines		**one**	**1**
Singapore			
Sri Lanka			
Taiwan	**one**		**1**
Thailand	**one**	**one**	**2**
U.S.	yes	five	6

Total Points 13

maximum 20
IR maximum 100

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1998 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 1.2 increased corporate and private sector pressure
In support of improved environmental performance

indicator 1.2d: environmental "due diligence" Promoted and practiced by the financial sector

i) at least one "champion" (e.g. banking association, NGO, leading bank) in each country and in U.S. actively promoting environmental "due diligence" ***(one point/country; 10 points max)***.

ii) at least two major private sector banks incorporating environmental "due diligence" in their lending practices ***(one point/country; 10 points max)***.

	1.2d(i) champions ***(1 pt)***	1.2d(ii) banks ***(1 pt)***	points
HongKong			
India	yes	yes	2
Indonesia		yes	1
Korea			
Malaysia			
Philippines	yes	yes	2
Singapore			
Sri Lanka	yes	yes	2
Taiwan			
Thailand	yes		1
U.S.	yes		1

Total Points 9

maximum 20
IR max 100

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1998 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 1.2 increased corporate and private sector pressure
In support of improved environmental performance

indicator 1.2e: extension systems linked to U.S. technical support

i) at least one organization (government agency, business or industry association, utility, consulting industry, academic or technical institution or NGO) with proactive outreach (promotion, training, information services) for improved environmental performance
(one half point/country;10 points max).

ii) at least one organization with self-sustaining links to U.S. technical support
(one half point/country;10 points max).

	1.2e(i) outreach ***(1/2 pt)***	1.2e(ii) U.S. links ***(1/2 pt)***	points
HongKong	yes	yes	1
India	yes	**yes**	**1**
Indonesia	**yes**	yes	**1**
Korea			
Malaysia			
Philippines	**yes**	yes	**1**
Singapore	yes	yes	1
Sri Lanka			
Taiwan	yes	**yes**	**1**
Thailand	yes		½

Total Points 7.0

maximum 10
IR maximum 100

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1997 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 2.1 increased international institutional partnership in support of improved environmental performance

indicators:

2.1a partnership commitments: formalized commitments between U.S. and Asian institutions for the promotion of improved environmental performance
(one points/partnership to total 20 points max).

2.1b ongoing programs: partnerships with active ongoing programs to improve environmental performance
(one <u>additional</u> point/partnership to total 30 points max).

2.1c self-sustaining relationships: partnerships whose programs to improve environmental performance are completely funded by the partners without US-AEP assistance
(a <u>second additional</u> point to total 50 points max)

	2.1a	2.1b	2.1c	points
HongKong	1	1	1	3
India	1	1	**3**	**5**
Indonesia	3	1	**2**	**6**
Korea	3	2	**4**	**9**
Malaysia	1			1
Philippines	4	3	**6**	**13**
Singapore	1	1	1	3
Sri Lanka			**7**	**7**
Taiwan	2	2	**3**	**7**
Thailand	1	**2**	**3**	**6**

Total Points 60

maximum 100

UNITED STATES - ASIA ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP (USAEP)
Performance indicators: 1997 Scores by Country

Intermediate Result: 2.2 increased trade and transfer of cleaner technologies

indicators 2.2a-b:

2.2a increased regional import of cleaner environmental technologies relative to industrial GDP: greater than 10% increase over the preceding year in the ratio of total import of environmental equipment to total industrial GDP *(one point per country for every one percent increase over ten percent (e.g. a 12% increase in the ratio would score 2 pts) maximum 5 points)*.

source: United Nations International Trade Branch Commodity Trade Statistics (COMTRADE) based on 13 Dept. Of commerce commodity codes identified in the 1993 U.S. EPA study, "International Trade in Environmental Equipment."

2.2b increased export of U.S. environmental technology to Asia: increase over the preceding year in sales and investments in U.S. environmental goods and services including estimated value to the U.S. partner of all joint ventures and licensing agreements *(one point per country for each 5% in sales over the preceding year; maximum 5 points)*.

source: U.S. Bureau of the Census: 64 SIC codes for "dual use" environmental commodities

note: data, collected annually is only available in following year; scores based on preceding year's performance (e.g. 1997 score is based on increase in 1996.

	2.2a Increase in imports/GDP	2.2b Increase in U.S.exports	points
HongKong	20%	<1%	5
India	NA	33%	5
Indonesia	37%	7%	6
Korea	4%	19%	7
Malaysia	(8%)	57%	
Philippines	>100%	56%	
Singapore	NA	44%	5
Sri Lanka	>100%	(25%)	
Taiwan	NA	33%	5
Thailand	NA	5%	1
		Total Points	**34**

Ratio of Total Environmental Equipment Imports to Industrial GDP
1993 through 1996
(Environmental Equipment in thousand and GDP in millions of US dollars)

	1993			1994			1995			1996		
	Env. Equip Imports	Industrial GDP	Ratio	Env. Equip Imports	Industrial GDP	Ratio	Env. Equip Imports	Industrial GDP	Ratio	Env. Equip Imports	Industrial GDP	Ratio
Hong Kong	92,543	19,842	0.47%	108,076	20,807	0.52%	113,898	21,109	0.54%	139,993	21,583	0.65%
India	39,183	63,924	0.06%	40,300	76,054	0.05%		85,274			88,391	
Indonesia	118,974	62,699	0.19%	160,489	71,471	0.22%	152,592	82,247	0.19%	259,876	98,552	0.26%
S. Korea	276,545	144,841	0.19%	347,418	163,171	0.21%	477,952	198,530	0.24%	556,414	219,451	0.25%
Malaysia	146,197	26,667	0.55%	176,812	30,583	0.58%	223,213	36,877	0.61%	217,279	38,994	0.56%
Philippines		17,782		21,160	20,860	0.10%	25,708	23,833	0.11%	77,717	27,371	0.28%
Singapore	150,476	20,365	0.74%	163,979	24,525	0.67%	198,708	29,725	0.67%		33,451	
Sri Lanka	5,071	2,275	0.22%	6,570	2,616	0.25%	2,851	2,928	0.10%	260,813	33,451	0.78%
Taiwan	185,568	NA			NA			94,676		338,547	94,676	0.36%
Thailand	170,962	48,920	0.35%	170,962	56,203	0.30%	273,976	66,566	0.41%		74,222	
Average Ratio			**0.35%**			**0.32%**			**0.36%**			**0.45%**
% Increase			NA			-6.44%			10.30%			25.80%

U.S. Exports of Environmental Protection Equipment
Historical and Forecasted
1992-2000
(in thousands of U.S. Dollars)

	Historical					Forecasted			
	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Hong Kong	65,303	58,974	54,901	89,108	89,608	99,974	111,558	124,440	138,834
India	23,934	23,099	24,736	60,978	81,082	118,199	172,308	251,186	366,174
Indonesia	35,332	33,966	29,129	63,196	82,692	109,505	145,011	192,029	254,293
S. Korea	154,628	161,608	228,657	370,412	441,502	581,888	766,975	1,010,776	1,332,179
Malaysia	30,753	51,859	38,746	42,053	65,959	83,888	106,508	135,691	172,575
Philippines	19,488	24,153	29,010	39,111	60,865	81,351	108,731	145,326	194,238
Singapore	86,962	98,097	107,241	125,933	180,754	218,299	263,644	318,407	384,545
Sri Lanka	554	719	558	1,183	891	1,101	1,388	1,682	2,080
Taiwan	176,327	153,271	135,760	186,107	192,270	199,911	207,858	216,116	224,705
Thailand	43,183	57,866	60,387	100,097	105,044	133,684	170,132	216,518	275,550
TOTAL US-AEP	636,464	663,612	709,125	1,078,178	1,300,667	1,627,800	2,054,185	2,612,171	3,345,173
TOTAL WORLD	4,034,334	4,279,855	4,470,733	5,444,225	6,280,573	7,029,259	7,887,192	8,805,013	9,854,628
% US-AEP of WORLD TOTAL	15.8%	15.5%	15.9%	19.8%	20.7%	23.2%	26.0%	29.7%	**33.9%**

PART III. RESOURCE REQUEST

A. Overview

US-AEP's planned assistance levels are sufficient to meet its expanded development agenda for the next five years. US-AEP expects to receive a core operating year budget in FY 1999 of $14.6 million (versus its request for $18.0 million) and $19.3 million in FY 2000 and FY 2001. The proposed request is consistent with past and currently requested CP levels. It is important to note that US-AEP's OYB has endured significant reductions from actual request levels and from prior year actual levels beginning in FY 1997. The most evident result is that US-AEP's pipeline continues to decline and major contract and grant agreements began FY 1999 with as little as 90 to 120 days. This required US-AEP to submit two separate TNs to avoid termination or stop work orders from being issued. In part, this must be viewed as a systemic issue attributable to delays in the Congressional consultation process. However, US-AEP also believes that its core contracts/grants should begin a new fiscal year with nine to twelve months pipeline; which requires a higher funding level then recently provided.

US-AEP expects to fully obligate its FY 1999 OYB. Although US-AEP expects to reach its agreed target for Global Climate Change in FY 1999, it anticipates significant difficulties in meeting its target of 40 percent in FY 2000. The Global Bureau's Office of Energy and US-AEP are working closely to explore opportunities for managing US-AEP activities to support GCC. It should be noted that only accounting for US-AEP's own funds understates the financial resources actually contributing to GCC. As noted in the annex of GCC indicators, several of US-AEP's activities specifically require significant matching contributions. USAID may wish to consider whether such leveraging of foreign assistance funds should be taken into account in meeting Agency spending targets for GCC.

B. Financial Plan

US-AEP has a single strategic objective (SO). It's funding is entirely drawn from the DA account. As managed, US-AEP is primarily an environmental program, but it also contributes to USAID's economic growth and democracy efforts. In addition, work it has undertaken in the industrial and urban infrastructure area, and in addressing severe air and water pollution problems, will contribute to protecting the public health, especially of more vulnerable populations such as infants, children and the elderly.

It is highly unlikely that the US-AEP will incur a pipeline in excess of 24 months for any time over the next three to five years. US-AEP will strive to manage its program portfolio to achieve a 12 to 18 month pipeline for certain key contract/grant mechanisms.

C. Global Bureau Programs

Several Global Bureau activities remain critical to achieving US-AEP's strategic objective. In 1999, US-AEP and Global Bureau's Office of Energy entered into a cooperative agreement to jointly program approximately $1.2 million on a 50/50 cost share basis. In addition, US-AEP expects to buy-ins of approximately $1.0 million with the Global Bureau's Environment and Economic Centers. US-AEP will also exlpore possibilities for collaboration with the Democracy Center as the US-AEP places greater emphasize on promoting "civil society" as a "driver" or

force which promotes improvements in environmental performance.

D. Workforce and Operating Expenses.

As reported in last year's R4, US-AEP's current staff level of four USDHs and two full-time RSSAs are insufficient to operate the program with adequate controls and assurances that resources are optimally managed. Moreover, staff put in considerable uncompensated over time. Inadequate staff resources also result in the loss of opportunities to enhance US-AEP's effective or further expand its network of partnerships. Adequate travel funds is also increasingly important for purposes of program oversight that extends over 11 countries. US-AEP direct-hire travel is essential for representational purposes, negotiation or maintenance of Asian partnerships, including renewing established relations with multilaterals like the Asian Development Bank.

US-AEP repeats its request of last year that the services of a mid level program analyst to strengthen program management. To remain within current ceilings, US-AEP would request an upgrade of an exisiting position to meet this need. As noted this would enhance US-AEP's ability to strengthen and expand its network of United States and Asian partners as well as US-AEP's ability to leverage additional resources in support of USAID's goals.

FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

19-Apr-99
08:35 AM

Program/Country:

Approp Acct: (Enter either DA/CSD; ESF; NIS; or SEED)

Scenario

O. # , Title		FY 1999 Request													Est. S.O. Expendi-tures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 99
	Bilateral/ Field Spt	Total	Micro-Enterprise	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G		
SO 1:																
	Bilateral	13,200											13,200		8,000	6,000
	Field Spt	1,400											1,400		800	700
		14,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,600	0	8,800	6,700
SO 2:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:																
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		13,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,200	0	8,000	6,000
Total Field Support		1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	0	800	700
TOTAL PROGRAM		14,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,600	0	8,800	6,700

FY 99 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	14,600
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 99 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	14,600
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	14,600
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

FY 2000 Budget Request by Program/Country

19-Apr-99
08:35 AM

Program/Country:

Approp Acct: (Enter either DA/CSD; ESF; NIS; or SEED)

Scenario

O. # , Title

	Bilateral/ Field Spt	FY 2000 Request Total	Micro-Enterprise	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expendi-tures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 00
SO 1:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	17,900											17,900		17,900	4,400
	Field Spt	1,400											1,400		1,400	700
		19,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19,300	0	19,300	5,100
SO 2:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral	0														
	Field Spt	0														
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		17,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,500	4,400
Total Field Support		1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	0	700	700
TOTAL PROGRAM		**19,300**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**19,300**	0	**14,200**	**5,100**

FY 00 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	19,300
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 00 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	19,300
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	19,300
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

FY 2001 Budget Request by Program/Country

19-Apr-99
08:35 AM

Program/Country:

Approp Acct: (Enter either DA/CSD; ESF; NIS; or SEED)

Scenario

O. # , Title

	Bilateral/ Field Spt	FY 20001 Request Total	Micro-Enterprise	Agri-culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expendi-tures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 01	Future Cost (POST-2001)
SO 1:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	17,900											17,900		14,000	3,900	
	Field Spt	1,400											1,400		1,000	400	
		19,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**19,300**	0	**15,000**	**4,300**	0
SO 2:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:															Year of Final Oblig:		
	Bilateral	0															
	Field Spt	0															
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		17,900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17,900	0	14,000	3,900	0
Total Field Support		1,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,400	0	1,000	400	0
TOTAL PROGRAM		**19,300**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**19,300**	0	**15,000**	**4,300**	0

FY 01 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	19,300
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 01 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	19,300
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	19,300
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account
Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.
For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

Accessing Global Bureau Services Through Field Support and Buy-Ins

Objective Name	Field Support and Buy-Ins: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding ($000)			
				FY 2000 Obligated by:		FY 2001 Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau
GRAND TOTAL.....							

* For Priorities use high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, low

Workforce Tables

Org: USAEP End of year On-Board **FY 1999 Estimate**	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con-tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4							4							0	4
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	3							3							0	3
FSNs/TCNs	1							1							0	1
Subtotal	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Total Direct Workforce	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and IDIs

Org: USAEP End of year On-Board	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
FY 2000 Target																
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4							4							0	4
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	4							4							0	4
FSNs/TCNs	1							1							0	1
Subtotal	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

FY 2000 Request																
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4							4							0	4
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	4							4							0	4
FSNs/TCNs	1							1							0	1
Subtotal	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and IDIs

Org: USAEP End of year On-Board **FY 2001 Target**	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO Staff	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con-tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4							4							0	4
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	4							4							0	4
FSNs/TCNs	1							1							0	1
Subtotal	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

FY 2001 Request																
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	4							4							0	4
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens	4							4							0	4
FSNs/TCNs	1							1							0	1
Subtotal	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Total Direct Workforce	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

1/ Excludes TAACS, Fellows, and IDIs

Workforce

MISSION : **US - AEP SECRETARIAT**

USDH STAFFING REQUIREMENTS BY SKILL CODE

BACKSTOP (BS)	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 1999	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2000	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2001	NO. OF USDH EMPLOYEES IN BACKSTOP FY 2002
01 SMG	1	1	1	1
02 Program Officer	1	2	2	2
03 EXO				
04 Controller				
05/06/07 Secretary	1			
10 Agriculture				
11 Economics				
12 GDO				
12 Democracy				
14 Rural Development				
15 Food for Peace				
21 Private Enterprise				
25 Engineering				
40 Environment	1	1	1	1
50 Health/Pop.				
60 Education				
75 Physical Sciences				
85 Legal				
92 Commodity Mgt				
93 Contract Mgt				
94 PDO				
95 IDI				
Other*		1	1	1
TOTAL	4	5	5	5

*please list occupations covered by other if there are any

Please e-mail this worksheet in either Lotus or Excel to:
Maribeth Zankowski
@hr.ppim@aidw
as well as include it with your R4 submission.

ANNEX

1998 Reporting on the USAID Climate Change Initiative

USAEP's 1998 re-engagement in the energy sector and launch of support for the Agency's Climate Change Initiative made substantial progress in FY 1998. Accomplishments include:

- Expansion of the Environment Technology Network for Asia to include the energy sector.
- Orientation and initial training of Partners and field staff.
- Establishment of collaboration with the USAID Global Bureau Energy Office.
- Adoption by field staff and key Partners of energy agenda in their workplans.
- Solicitation of proposals for energy and global climate change by the National Association of State Development Agencies (NASDA) and the Council of State Governments (CSG).
- Recruitment of an energy/climate change advisor.

Some specific, illustrative FY98 results relating to energy and global climate change are briefly described below.

The USAEP-CSG State Environmental Initiative (SEI) awarded a grant to the Pacific Northwest Economic Region to establish a waste utilization and resource recovery center in the Philippines to assist local businesses. The center will perform waste audits, develop technology needs profiles and make recommendations for waste utilization. USAEP support of this project leveraged an additional $288,474 from the participating partners. The SEI also awarded a grant to the State of Hawaii to transfer Hawaii's experience and expertise in energy efficiency to the Philippines. The project is working to improve energy efficiency through demand side management, codes and standards, and performance contracting, and is facilitating the expansion of a viable Energy Service Company (ESCO) industry in the Philippines.

The Asia Foundation (TAF) supported 11 Asian environmental NGOs to help Asian industries become more resource and energy efficient. For example, the NGO Pelangi Indonesia developed an environmental management system for hospitals and clinics in Jakarta. Among the issues being addressed are a reduction in waste per patient (reducing methane emissions from carbon-rich medical waste that has been landfilled) and reducing water and energy use per unit. Another Indonesian NGO, the Wisnu Foundation, helped the hotel/resort industry in Bali to recycle and reduce waste. In Nepal, TAF provided support to the Environment and Public Health Organization to help the Himal Cement Co. identify energy losses and minimize them. Clean Wheels Nepal assisted seven large auto shops in Kathmandu in the use of total environmental management techniques to reduce and recycle wastes generated from the shops. Another NGO in Nepal, the Save the Environment Foundation, assisted General Paper Industries Ltd. in reducing and recycling wastes. In Thailand, the Association for Development of Environmental Quality is helping the Plan Group, a Thai leader in construction, to design guidelines for efficiency in the architecture and construction industries. The project addresses the use of sustainable construction

materials, reducing waste from construction practices, and energy-efficient building designs.

The Environmental Exchange Program sponsored seven programs in FY 98 with Asian businessmen and officials relating to material recovery and recycling in the printed circuit board industry, recycling of oil and lubricants, waste-derived fuels, and livestock waste management. For example, a fuel specialist from California EPA helped develop components of the Metro Manila Air Quality Improvement Program, recommending a strategy and time table to market less-carbon intensive motor vehicle fuels. USAEP and the Korean Furnace Association co-sponsored a seminar on the conversion of waste to fuel using waste liquid chemicals.

The Policy Group supported a meeting of climate change specialists in conjunction with Southeast Asia START and the launch of the Greening of Industry Network at Chulalongkorn University in Thailand. START is the Global Climate Change Systems for Analysis, Research and Training, an NGO that takes a regional approach to global climate change, developing regional centers and networks of expertise, and scientific capabilities and infrastructure in developing Asia..

The Clean Technology and Environmental management (CTEM) team promoted and helped to implement Responsible Care, a well known, worldwide set of high environment and safety standards for the energy-intensive chemical industry to become more efficient and less polluting. Chemical industries were targeted in ten USAEP countries, and as a result each of these countries have adopted and are implementing the Responsible Care standards. CTEM also worked with the Steel Authority of India and the Philippine Iron and Steel Institute on improved environmental management with an emphasis on energy efficiency, including environmental management/energy efficiency audits.

USAEP FY 1998 CCI Results

Indicator 4: Strategies/audits that contribute to the avoidance of greenhouse gas emissions

Instructions: In the first column describe the activity (e.g. "industrial pollution prevention and energy efficiency auditing in metal finishing"). In the second column, give the number of industrial firms/municipalities that have undertaken audits or developed greenhouse gas reduction strategies. In the third column provide the number of industrial firms or municipalities that have implemented the strategies or audit results.

Units: Number of strategies/audits

Country: USAEP **Activity: (please list)**	**Number of strategies completed**	**Number implemented**
Voluntary Business Standards in the Chemical Industry		10
Voluntary Business Standards in the Iron and Steel Industry	2	
Business for Social Responsibility Grant for Industrial Efficiency		6
United Technologies Corporation Supplier Outreach Program		1
Industrial Extension Activities for Industrial Efficiency		1
Total	2	18

Indicator 5: Dollars leveraged through agreements with USAID donor partners (energy, industry and urban sectors)

Instructions: In the first column, list the activities or projects taking place. In the right-hand columns, note the amount of 1997 dollars that are directly and indirectly leveraged by USAID. (See Indicator 6 on page 15 for definitions).

Units: 1997 dollars

Country: USAEP **Activity Description**	**Source of Leveraged Funds**	**Direct Leverage (5a)**	**Indirect Leverage (5b)**
Pacific NW Economic Region (PNWER) establishing a Philippine waste utilization and resource recovery center to help local businesses with materials recovery	PNWER; Washington Dept of Community, Trade and Economic Development; Philippine Industrial Technology Development Institute; Philippine Dept. of Trade & Industry.	$288,474	
Hawaii Dept. of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) adapted their model energy code to the Philippines for use in designing energy efficient buildings.	DBEDT; Philippines DOE; Hawaii Dept. of Health; National Association of Energy Officials; National Association of Energy Service Co's; & Energy Performance Services, Inc.	$141,304	
USAEP-assisted sale of incineration technology for municipal waste in Korea	AMKO New York (a private firm)	$975,000	
USAEP-assisted sale of incineration technology for municipal waste in Korea	North American Manufacturing (a private firm)	$47,500	
USAEP-assisted sale of Energy Efficient Technology in Sri Lanka	Wonder Wash Corporation (a private firm)	$22,065	
Total		$1,474,343	

Indicator 6: Institutional Capacity Strengthened
6a: Increased capacity to address global climate change issues
Unit: Number of institutions

Country: **USAEP** **Number of USAID-assisted associations, NGOs or other public and private institutions strengthened to address GCC issues**		**Name of Associations, NGOs, or other Institutions Strengthened**
Number of NGOs	21	BANGLADESH: Environmental Lawyers Association. HONG KONG: Association of International Chemical Manufacturers – Hong Kong. INDIA: Peddireddy Thimma Reddy Farm Fndn, Centre for Resource Education, Exnora Int'l, Indian Chemical Manufacturers Association. INDONESIA: Pelangi Indonesia, Wisnu Fndn, Indonesian Chemical Industry Club. KOREA: Korean Petrochemical Industries Association. MALAYSIA: Chemical Industries Council of Malaysia. NEPAL: Save the Environment Fndn, Environment and Public Health Organization, Clean Wheels Nepal. PHILIPPINES: Chemical Industries Club Association—Philippines. SINGAPORE: Singapore Chemical Industries Association. SRI LANKA: Ceylong Chamber of Commerce. TAIWAN: Taiwan Chemical Industry. THAILAND: Chemical Industry Club of Thailand, Association for the Development of Environmental Quality (twice).
Number of Private Institutions		
Number of Research/Educ'l Inst.		
Number of Public Institutions	6	1. Steel Authority of India 2. Philippine Iron and Steel Institute 3. Industrial Technology Development Institute (ITDI) 4. Philippine Industrial Technology Development Institute 5. Philippines Dept. of Trade and Industry 6. Philippine Dept. of Energy
Total Number of Institutions Strengthened:	27	

6b. Strengthening technical capacity through workshops, research, and/or training activities

Country: USAEP **Category**	**Types of Support Provided**		**List the Activity(ies) that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category**
	Training	**Technical Assistance**	
Improved demand side management or integrated resource planning	**1**		1. Support to the Samahana sa Philipinas ng Industriyang Kimika (SPIK) chemical industry association of the Philippines in organizing a workshop on emergency planning and response
Installation of energy efficient or other greenhouse gas reducing technologies, including improved efficiencies in industrial processes	**5**	**1**	1. Workshop on EMS in petrochemical industry (an energy-intensive industry), Singapore. 2. Environmental Exchange from Hong Kong to NC on livestock waste management (reduced methane emissions). 3. Waste-derived fuels seminar, Korea. 4, 5, 6. **Three (3)** Regional Technical Courses on Environmental Management and Cleaner Production Processes for Target Industries
Use of cleaner fossil fuels (such as cleaner coal or natural gas)		**1**	1. Environmental Exchange from California EPA to the Philippines Dept. of Environment and Natural Resources
Other: 1. Recycling, Recovery, Re-Use; Waste Minimization 2. Promote coordination and networking among SE Asian researchers on the environmental sustainability of industrial systems, including GCC	**2**	**2**	1a. Environmental Exchange between a U.S. and Thai firm on a refinery to recycle oil. 1b. Environmental Exchange from Thailand to U.S. on lubricant recycling. 1c. Regional workshop on pollution prevention in printed circuit board industry (addressing recovery & recycling of waste streams, and waste minimization). 2. SE Asian Industrial Transformation research workshop, co-sponsored by the GCC Systems for Analysis, Research and Training (START)
Total number of points for Training/technical assistance	**8**	**4**	