



# **FY 2003 Results Review and Resource Request (R4)**

**Submitted by the United States-  
Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)**

**March 30, 2001**

***Please Note:***

The attached FY 2002 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](mailto:docorder@dec.cdie.org)  
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

*Released on or after Oct. 1, 2003*



---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Part I. Overview .....	1
A. Progress in Implementing the Strategic Plan .....	1
B. Most Significant Program Achievements .....	1
C. Factors That Influenced Progress .....	2
D. Linkage to Agency and MMP Goals.....	2
E. Prospects for Progress in the Budget Year .....	2
Part II. Results Review .....	4
A. Header (for PPC/CDIE records) .....	4
B. Self-Assessment of Progress in FY 2000.....	4
C. Summary of Performance .....	4
D. Key Results .....	5
1. SO Level Indicators.....	5
2. IR Level Indicators.....	6
3. Attention to Gender Concerns.....	8
E. Performance and Prospects .....	8
F. Possible Adjustments to Plans .....	8
G. Other Donor Programs .....	10
H. Major Partners, Contractors and Grantees .....	10
I. Performance Data Tables .....	11
Part III. Resource Request.....	19
A. Operational Year Budget (OYB) .....	19
B. Global Bureau Collaboration .....	19
C. New Requests.....	19
D. Pipeline Status.....	19
E. Operating Expenses (OE).....	20
Part IV. Supplemental Information Annexes .....	21
A. Updated Results Framework.....	21
1. The Current Results Framework .....	21
2. New or Revised Indicators .....	21
B. Institutional and Organizational Development .....	30
C. Global Climate Change .....	32
D. Success Stories.....	44
1. The Unleaded Gasoline Campaign.....	44
2. The Involvement of U.S. States and Cities .....	46
3. Women in Development .....	48



---

## Part I. Overview

### A. Progress in Implementing the Strategic Plan

FY 2000 was arguably the US-AEP's best year since its inception in 1992. There was notable progress in implementing the Strategic Plan and achieving the US-AEP's one Strategic Objective: *sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia*. The progress was measured in substantial results at both the SO and Intermediate Result levels that met or greatly exceeded all of the US-AEP's performance targets for the year.

### B. Most Significant Program Achievements

The most significant program achievements in statistical terms were:

- A substantial increase in the number of partnerships between U.S. and Asian institutions engaged in US-AEP activities.
- An increase in the number of partnerships and institutions that were created with US-AEP support that are now operating on a self-sustaining basis.
- An increase in the number of Asian municipalities engaged in implementing environmental improvements and in the number of environmental laws and regulations strengthened through the US-AEP's regulatory dialogue throughout the region.
- A significant increase in the sale of U.S. environmental equipment and services in Asia, amounting to more than \$152 million (as compared to \$22 million in FY 1999); and an increase in the number of business transactions other than sales, which should be reflected in greater sales in future years.

The US-AEP's investments in India over the past several years produced particularly gratifying results in FY 2000 in terms of new partnerships created, municipalities engaged in environmental improvements, environmental laws and regulations passed or strengthened, and commercial success by American companies.

Many of the results achieved throughout the region—particularly in engaging key policy-makers in a dialogue on environmental and development issues—can be attributed to the US-AEP's close collaboration with two of its most important partners in Asia: the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in Manila, and the Greening of Industry Network (GIN)-Asia with its node in Bangkok.

Perhaps the most notable program achievement in terms of its direct impact on the people of Asia was the growing success of the US-AEP's regional initiative to improve air quality through the elimination of leaded gas. That success (written up as a Success Story in Part IV, Annex D.1) includes the total elimination of leaded gasoline in the Philippines at the end of last year. Furthermore, it describes how the US-AEP is helping the respective governments set targets for its elimination in all of Vietnam, as well as in the Indonesian capital of Jakarta by July 1 of this year.



Two other notable achievements have also been written up (in Part IV) as Success Stories: the US-AEP's success in involving U.S. states, counties, and cities in its programs in Asia; and its success in engaging Asian women in its activities.

### **C. Factors That Influenced Progress**

The increase in U.S. environmental sales and non-business transactions in Asia can be attributed to the general recovery of the region from the financial crisis of 1997-99, which has renewed Asians' interest and freed up more of their resources for environmental improvements. It can also be attributed to the good work of the US-AEP staff in the field, especially the Technology Representatives, who continued to maintain a dialogue during the crisis with key public and private officials responsible for the procurement of environmental equipment and services.

The success of the US-AEP's many non-commercial activities in FY 2000 can be traced in part to the many development activities that were started by various partners during the financial crisis years. The main factor, however, is the maturity of the US-AEP program after eight years of operation, and the multiplier effect of the many activities that were initiated over those years.

### **D. Linkage to Agency and MMP Goals**

As described further in Part II (Section C), the US-AEP contributes to the achievement of Agency Goal 5: *the world's environment protected for long-term sustainability*. It also contributes to the achievement of some of the goals of its major federal partners, the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Furthermore, the US-AEP's activities are linked to U.S. Embassy Mission Management Plans and closely integrated with those of the USAID Missions in Asia.

### **E. Prospects for Progress in the Budget Year**

Excluding China and Japan, the Asia region recorded real GDP growth of more than 7% in 2000. However, this average masks sharp differences between the industrialized economies in different regions of Asia. For example, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Korea grew at 9-10 %, while the economies of the Philippines, Thailand, and Indonesia recorded only 3-4% growth last year. The growth rates this year are expected to be somewhat lower across the entire region partly as a result of *the slowdown in the American economy*, which is hurting Asian exports to the U.S. Nevertheless, unless Japan's continuing recession begins to impact more heavily on other countries of the region, Asia's overall recovery from the financial crisis of 1997-98 is expected to continue, albeit on an uneven basis.

Thus, barring the unforeseen in the economic and political climate of the region, the next several years should be good ones for the US-AEP. There should be steady progress in the implementation of the US-AEP's many policy initiatives and development projects with significant results projected from the new Urban program put in place last year, the substantially redesigned Industry program being launched this year, as well as activities in energy efficiency, air quality improvements, and renewable energy, which contribute to the Agency's Climate Change Initiative. It is always difficult to project sales levels by U.S. companies in the Asian environmental market, but the targets for the next several years appear to be achievable.

It should also be noted that the US-AEP installed significant improvements in its internal programming and management systems in FY 2000. They should have a very positive affect on



---

the US-AEP's capacity to produce further results in the coming years. These improvements include: a refined Results Framework with more precise performance indicators (described in Part IV, Annex A), the development of country-level Strategic Plans and Work Plans, the establishment of Program Advisory Groups to help the Secretariat design and monitor programs at the Intermediate Results level, the development of a new Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), and the issuance of a Policy and Procedures Handbook to guide the partners.

There may, however, be some internal disruptions in the US-AEP's operations later this year. Two of the US-AEP's most important management contracts are currently in the final stages of being re-bid. One is to manage the Exchange Program for Sustainable Growth; the other is to provide Technical Support Services to the Secretariat. No matter who is awarded these contracts, the transition period could have a dampening affect on the US-AEP's performance.

The minimum level of resources that the US-AEP requires in order to continue to achieve significant results in FY 2002 and beyond are detailed in Part III. It is entirely possible that even more resources will be required as early as FY 2002 if one or both of two possible scenarios develop in the coming months. One scenario is an expansion of the US-AEP program into the People's Republic of China if the new Administration should join those in Congress who have been pushing for sometime to ease the restrictions on U.S. aid to the PRC. The other scenario involves the new Global Development Alliance (GDA), which the new Administration appears to regard with favor. The US-AEP is a paradigm of precisely the type of program envisioned by the GDA, whose principles include: responding to the U.S. national interest, engaging the public and private sectors in both the U.S. and the developing countries, leveraging resources from public and private sector partners, and catalyzing and coordinating partners' aid programs rather than delivering assistance directly. If the GDA is given additional resources by the new Administration, then the US-AEP will be seen as a model for others in USAID to follow and be itself an obvious candidate for initiating new GDA activities.

Thus, the US-AEP's prospects, particularly for FY 2002, include the possibility of an expansion into two new and challenging areas, both of which would require "supplemental" funding.



---

## Part II. Results Review

### A. Header (for PPC/CDIE records)

The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)

Strategic Objective 1: Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.

Agency SO Number: 498-009-01

### B. Self-Assessment of Progress in FY 2000

The US-AEP's performance in FY 2000 *exceeded expectations*. All seven performance targets were met or greatly exceeded. There were significant results at the Intermediate Result level, and notable progress in achieving the US-AEP's Strategic Objective.

### C. Summary of Performance

The US-AEP's Goal and Strategic Objective are directly linked to USAID Program Goal 5: *the world's environment protected for long-term sustainability*. In meeting or exceeding all of its performance targets, the US-AEP contributed substantially to three of the USAID Objectives under Goal 5:

USAID Objective 5.1: *threat of global climate change reduced.*

USAID Objective 5.3: *sustainable urbanization including pollution management promoted.*

USAID Objective 5.4: *use of environmentally sound energy services increased.*

At the country level, the programs in both the USAID and non-USAID presence countries in which the US-AEP has activities are reflected in the local U.S. Embassy Mission Management Plans and contribute directly to their achievement. The US-AEP programs in the six countries in which USAID is actively involved are closely integrated with those of the USAID Missions with joint funding and management of a number of projects and activities.

It is also worth noting that the US-AEP's two major federal agency partners—the U.S. Department of Commerce and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—have their own goals and objectives (per the Government Performance and Results Act). The US-AEP's activities contributed to the achievement of their goals and objectives as well. In the case of the EPA, the US-AEP contributed directly to the achievement of the goal entitled "Reduction of Global and Cross-Border Environmental Risks." The linkages between the US-AEP and the DOC are even more direct: four of the US-AEP's performance indicators correspond to the DOC's indicators for measuring what it terms an "export success".

The US-AEP's Strategic Objective is based on the realization that no country is without pollution, and nowhere are its effects more visible than in the developing countries of Asia. Economic and urban development is returning to the pace displayed before the 1997-99 Asian financial crisis. Rapid industrialization in the region has led to environmental deterioration, particularly in countries where the necessity for economic development is most pressing, threatening human health, entire eco-systems, and the long-term sustainability of Asian economic growth.



The Strategic Objective is intended to harness the broad-based desire in Asia for accelerated but cleaner economic growth, and to assist Asian economies in utilizing new policies, technologies, and ideas for environmental preservation.

#### **D. Key Results**

In FY 2000 the US-AEP measured its results on the basis of four performance indicators at the Strategic Objective level, and three at the Intermediate Results level. Detailed descriptions of the indicators and units of measure discussed below can be found in the performance data tables on pages 12 through 18.

##### **1. SO Level Indicators**

**Performance Indicator 1a-b-c:** *The number of partnerships between U.S. and Asian institutions.*

The cumulative score is based on one point each for a) new partnerships, b) continuing partnerships, and c) partnerships which became self-sustaining during the fiscal year.

The FY 1999 baseline was 105. The FY 2000 target was 110, a cumulative increase of five. The actual results in FY 2000 greatly exceeded the target. There was an increase of 101, for a new cumulative total of 206. It included 72 new partnerships or networks between U.S. and Asian institutions that agreed to work together to tackle specific environmental problems. The biggest increase in partnerships was in India (25).

One of the most productive continuing partnerships is the Greening of Industry Network (GIN) in Asia, which the US-AEP helped establish in 1998. GIN-Asia is a network of international policy professionals, researchers, and environmental practitioners focusing on the drivers of change for industrial development in Asia. With continuing support from the US-AEP's Policy Group, the GIN-Asia has published a series of books on environmental policy issues and organized a number of conferences for key environmental policy-makers, including the first-ever GIN conference in Asia (January 2001 in Bangkok), which the US-AEP co-sponsored.

A total of 16 partnerships are continuing without further US-AEP support, or led to the establishment of institutions that became self-sustaining. This was a substantial increase over last year's total of only three. A list of the institutions that are now self-sustaining includes: Environmental Engineering Association of Singapore (based on a partnership with the Water Environmental Federation); Environmental Pollution Prevention Roundtable in Indonesia (based on a partnership with its U.S. counterpart); Malaysia Clean Production Network; Hong Kong Business Council on the Environment; and Center for Resource Education in Hyderabad, India.

In FY 2000 the NGO-Business Environmental Partnership (BEP), one of the US-AEP's core programs since 1995, became self-sustaining. The Asia Foundation, which had been administering the BEP, obtained a grant from a private foundation to continue the partnership without further US-AEP funding.

**Performance Indicator 1d:** *The number of institutions impacted by US-AEP activities.*



---

The FY 1999 baseline was 3711. The FY 2000 target was a cumulative score of 4083, based on a planned increase of 372. The actual results in FY 2000 were much higher. There was an increase of 616 institutions, raising the cumulative total to 4327.

The 616 institutions that were engaged with the US-AEP in some way in FY 2000—through workshops, training, seminars, trade shows, trade missions, pilot demonstrations, and the like— included 197 American public and private sector institutions that *hosted* an engagement with groups from Asia, and another 75 American entities that *participated* in a US-AEP-supported event in Asia. A total of 59 Asian institutions hosted events, while another 285 Asian institutions sent representatives to participate in an event in the U.S.

The substantial involvement of American institutions at the state, county, and city level programs is one of the US-AEP's most important achievements. The extent of that involvement is amplified in a Success Story (Part IV, Annex D.2).

Institutional development and capacity building are important components of many US-AEP activities. The prescribed Agency table to show the relationship between the US-AEP's Intermediate Results, performance indicators and its institutional development activities is provided in Section IV (Annex B).

An increasing number of those activities involve strengthening the capacity of Asian institutions to employ the new Information Technology (IT), including instructions on how to access environmental data on the Internet and design their own web sites. Hong Kong and Mumbai serve as examples where such capacity building is occurring.

**Performance Indicator 1e:** *The dollar value of the resources leveraged by the US-AEP from non-USAID sources.*

The FY 1999 baseline was \$153,934,468. The FY 2000 target was an increase of \$9,065,532, for a new cumulative total of \$163,000,000. This target was met, with a total of \$9,077,829 in newly leveraged funds, bringing the cumulative total to \$163,012,970.

Most of the more than \$9 million that the US-AEP leveraged in funds and in-kind support came from its major public and private sector partners. For example, the U.S. Department of Commerce paid the full administrative costs of the US-AEP presence in the Advanced Developing Countries (ADCs), allowing the US-AEP to devote more of its limited resources to the Less Developed Countries (LDCs) of the region. An increasing number of Asians, particularly from the ADCs, are funding all or parts of the cost of the US-AEP-supported activities in which they participate. For example, in Taiwan last year 18 key decision-makers from the Environmental Bureaus of local cities and counties *paid their own way* for a study tour of superfund and waste management sites in the U.S. Furthermore, three local institutions (Business Council for Sustainable Development, Bank Association of China, and Taiwan Environmental Administration) paid two-thirds of the cost of a seminar on environmental management.

## **2. IR Level Indicators**

**Indicator 1.1a:** *The number of laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities.*



---

The FY 1999 baseline was a cumulative total of 16. The FY 2000 target was a new cumulative total of 18 (an increase of two). The actual result was far greater: an increase of 25, for a new cumulative total of 41. The US-AEP's success in this area included:

Assisting India's Supreme Court in incorporating best practices in national solid waste rules;  
Assisting in Vietnam's air quality monitoring and data collection;  
Helping Hong Kong draft new guidelines for medical waste disposal;  
Helping the Philippines draft an Omnibus energy bill;  
Helping Thailand draft wastewater operator certification regulations;  
Assisting Malaysia in developing an audit certification program under its Environmental Quality Act; and  
Assistance to the Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia in promoting and helping to draft and implement laws and regulations to eliminate the use of leaded gasoline (see Part IV, D.1).

**Indicator 1.2a:** *The number of municipalities engaged in US-AEP-supported improvements in environmental management.*

The FY 1999 baseline was a cumulative total of 125. The FY 2000 target was a new cumulative target of 130 (an increase of five). The actual result was far greater: an increase of 89, for a new cumulative total of 214.

The many new Asian municipalities supported by the US-AEP included: 10 in India, addressing medical waste and adopting best practices in solid waste disposal; two in Malaysia, involving improvements in solid and hazardous waste disposal; 43 in rural Thailand, engaged in the decentralization of environmental services and related financing to the local level; and activities involving two separate jurisdictions in Hong Kong, focusing on solid waste management and mass transport planning.

**Indicator 1.4a:** *The dollar value of US-AEP-assisted sales of U.S. environmental equipment and services.*

The FY 1999 baseline was a cumulative total of \$1,115,715,112. The FY 2000 target was about \$70 million in sales (\$69,284,888), for a new cumulative total of \$1,185,000,000. The actual results in FY 2000 far exceeded the target. There were \$128,288,475 in confirmed sales in the fiscal year and another \$23,838,830 in newly reported sales from prior years. Thus the new cumulative total is \$1,267,842,417, or an overall increase in FY 2000 of \$152,127,050 (more than twice the target figure).

The figures included sales of \$73.2 million in Singapore, \$17.6 million in Indonesia, \$15.1 million in Malaysia, \$8.6 million in Thailand, and lesser amounts in Hong Kong, India, Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines and Vietnam. The large total in Singapore includes one big contract (\$73 million) for the design of a wastewater treatment facility. The FY 2000 sales target would have been met even had this large infrastructure project not resulted in business for an American firm. American companies also earned \$2.7 million in sales through various projects funded by the Asian Development Bank.

In terms of environmental categories, the total sales broke down as follows: wastewater (\$96.7 million), solid waste (\$21.3 million), water (\$3.5 million), air pollution (\$2.7 million), environmental management (\$2.3 million), hazardous waste (\$900,000), and energy (\$162,000).



The sales figures for FY 2000 were actually higher than the totals above indicate. As happens routinely, many U.S. companies are unwilling to provide information to the US-AEP on the dollar amount of their sales, even if those sales were generated with US-AEP support. Thus, in FY 2000 U.S. companies reported 12 sales in India, but only three of their reports included sales figures. There were also six sales reported by U.S. companies in the Philippines and one in Singapore for which no dollar figures are available.

Various studies and evaluations have estimated that hundreds of millions of dollars in US-AEP-assisted sales by U.S. companies have gone unreported over the years.

**Indicator 1.4b:** *The number of US-AEP-assisted business transactions, other than sales, between U.S. and Asian companies.*

The FY 1999 baseline was 27. The target for FY 2000 was an increase of five, for a new cumulative total of 32. The actual result was an increase of 21, for a new cumulative total of 48. The figures included: 12 in India (5 joint ventures, 5 agent-distributorships, 1 subsidiary relationship, and 1 Memorandum of Understanding), 1 joint venture in Indonesia, 1 joint venture and 1 agent distributorship in Malaysia, 1 joint venture and 3 agent-distributorship in the Philippines, and 2 agent distributorships in Singapore.

The number of business transactions other than sales is an important indicator of potential sales in the future. The large number in India (there were none last year) is particularly gratifying, because it appears to reflect a long-awaited breakthrough of American firms into the Indian market for environmental equipment and services.

### **3. Attention to Gender Concerns**

The US-AEP's regional and country programs in FY 2000 included a considerable attention to gender concerns. There was an increase in the number of Asian women impacted by one or more US-AEP activities. A growing number of US-AEP projects were targeting or being designed to target women. And an increasing number of Asian institutions with which the US-AEP has established a supportive partnership relationship are now headed by women. The US-AEP's overall engagement of Women in Development has been written up as a Success Story (Part IV, Annex D.3).

### **E. Performance and Prospects**

As described earlier in Part I, the economic and political climate of the region is generally good and, barring the unforeseen, is expected to remain favorable in terms of the prospects for further achievements by the US-AEP. However, in order to maintain the momentum of its current programs and build on its success in FY2000, the US-AEP must be allocated the resources it requests in Part III below.

### **F. Possible Adjustments to Plans**

No major adjustments are anticipated in the US-AEP's plans for the current budget year in the 11 Asian countries in which US-AEP staff are based. The US-AEP's five "focus" countries – India, Thailand, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam – will continue to receive the largest allocations of the available resources, followed by Malaysia, Hong Kong, Korea, Sri Lanka, Singapore and Taiwan. Modest energy activities will continue to be supported in Bangladesh,



where the US-AEP does not maintain a staff. The US-AEP's plans to start a new program in Egypt over the past year were thwarted by personnel changes and vacancies in the local USAID Mission.

The US-AEP's goal of *promoting a clean revolution in Asia* will be pursued by continuing to influence the key people, institutions and drivers who will actually determine the future of Asia. The US-AEP will continue to act primarily as a catalyst. Its resources are not plentiful enough to solve the region's daunting environmental problems directly. But, working with other donors and its many partners, the US-AEP can help key decision-makers in Asia come up with solutions to those problems.

All of the US-AEP's FY 2001 country and regional work plans include policy activities (i.e., developing plans or initiating actions by governmental bodies and officials to address a particular policy issue). Each work plan has identified an average of five such activities to pursue over the next year in one of three categories: basic health and environmental protection, pollution prevention and clean production, and sustainable practices.

The new Urban Strategy that was developed in FY 2000 is being aggressively implemented in FY 2001. It is comprised of three components: policy dialogue and networking/outreach, urban management and finance, and urban services and environmental quality.

A new framework for the US-AEP's efforts to improve industrial performance is also being implemented this year. It builds on the success of the Clean Technology and Environmental Technology (CTEM) program that was the centerpiece of the US-AEP's industry program for the past five years. The framework provides a continuum for the establishment of a strong regulatory/command and control foundation, upon which cleaner and more sustainable production can be built. New activities to improve industrial environmental performance are being designed along the continuum in accordance with the situation in each Asian country.

The US-AEP and the DOC recognize that identifying and building markets for the longer term is even more important than increasing sales in a given year. Thus, in their joint planning for FY 2001 the two agencies have agreed to:

- Align their trade and investment efforts more closely with the sector market development priorities established by DOC Senior Commercial Officers in Asia, and to measure results
- Focus on promising, longer-term market development opportunities, in accordance with DOC's own strategic plans, balanced with the opportunistic pursuit of trade leads generated by the US-AEP's trade leads program
- Do a better job of educating American firms on how to take advantage of the commercial opportunities in the US-AEP countries, how to make use of the available resources and support services to market their goods and services in Asia, and how to alleviate some of the risks associated with the volatile Asian markets.

As in past years, approximately 30% of US-AEP's total resources help mitigate emissions of greenhouse gases, and therefore contribute to the Agency's Climate Change Initiative. These



---

activities cut across all four Intermediate Results and focus mainly on increasing energy and resource efficiency in industrial and urban sectors.

### **G. Other Donor Programs**

The US-AEP's major partners among the international donor community include: the World Bank, with which it has joint activities in a number of Asian countries; the Asian Development Bank, with which it collaborates on a host of environmental policy initiatives and urban infrastructure projects throughout Asia; and the Greening of Industry Network (GIN)—Asia. Other international organizations with which the US-AEP remains engaged in a policy dialogue on environmental policy issues include: the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), the United Nation Environmental Program (UNEP), and the Government of Japan.

### **H. Major Partners, Contractors and Grantees**

In keeping with its charter, the US-AEP continues to maintain a small Secretariat in the ANE Bureau, and to rely heavily on public and private sector partners to design and implement its major programs.

The US-AEP's Inter-Agency Agreement with its key federal partner, the Department of Commerce, expires this year. The US-AEP fully expects the Agreement to be extended for at least another two or three years. The DOC shares in the funding of the 16 offices of the US-AEP Technology Representatives located in 11 Asian countries. The "Tech Reps" in the field are the US-AEP's primary contacts with host country officials. They serve as the de facto USAID representatives in the seven non-USAID presence countries in which the US-AEP operates.

The US-AEP's other major federal partner, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, continues to share in the support of its programs in Korea, the Philippines, Malaysia, Vietnam, Indonesia, Thailand, and India. Other federal agencies that partner with the US-AEP in one or more Asian countries include the U.S. Trade and Development Agency, the U.S. Department of Energy, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Information Service, and the Peace Corps.

In FY 2000 the US-AEP renewed its on-going partnerships with a number of domestic not-for-profit institutions including: the Council of State Governments (CSG), which manages the State Environmental Initiative; the National Association of State Development Agencies (NASDA), which manages the Environmental Technology Fund and the Overseas Program Fund; and three U.S. professional associations engaged in establishing and supporting counterpart institutions in Asia. These are the American Consulting Engineer Council (ACEC), the Water Environmental Federation (WEF), and the Air & Waste Management Association (A&WMA).

Two of the US-AEP's major contracts are currently in the final stages of being rebid: the Technical Support Services Contract (TSSC), for a wide range of support services to the Secretariat and US-AEP offices in the field, and the Exchange Program for Sustained Growth (EPSG), formerly called the Environmental Exchange Program (EEP). Regrettably, these important re-competitions are a year behind schedule through no fault of the US-AEP Secretariat.



---

## I. Performance Data Tables

Performance data tables for the indicators reported in this R4 follow on the next seven pages. Note that most of these indicators were refined in FY 2000, and new performance targets were established or will be established with the FY 2001 results as the baseline. The refined indicators, which the US-AEP will use to report its performance *in next year's R4*, are provided in Part IV (Annex A).



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1a:</b> The number of partnerships between U.S. and Asian institutions. .			
<b>Approved:</b> 1995		<b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)	
<b>Intermediate Result:</b> n/a			
<b>Performance Indicator:</b> n/a			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> 1a (new partnerships); 1b (continuing partnerships with US-AEP support); and 1c (partnerships which became self-sustaining during the fiscal year).			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of partnerships between U.S. and Asian public and/or private institutions, based on a written Memorandum of Understanding, or a relationship where both partners have committed significant financial resources to jointly focus on environmental issues in Asia. The table shows cumulative planned and actual.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> All US-AEP partners in the U.S. and Asia.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Formal relationships between private sector entities for the purpose of doing business together are not considered partnerships for this indicator.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comments:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001, with new targets based on FY 1999 as the baseline (see Annex A).</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1995 (Baseline)		5
	1996	10	10
	1997	25	41
	1998	40	60
	1999	60	105
	2000	110	206
	2001	110	
	2002	120	



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

**Strategic Objective 1:** Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.

**Performance Indicator 1d:** The number of institutions impacted by US-AEP activities.

**Approved:** February, 2000 **Organization:** The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)

**Intermediate Result:** n/a

**Performance Indicator:** n/a

**Disaggregated By:** U.S. and Asian institutions. Also by *primary environmental category* (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other; and by *female orientation*, i.e., institutions that are women-owned/operated/managed, or predominantly made up of female members.

	Year	Planned	Actual
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of institutions, defined as non-profit, public sector and private sector organizations, in the U.S. and Asia. Table shows cumulative planned and actual	1992-99 (Baseline)		3711
	2000	4083	4327
<b>Source:</b> The Environmental Institutions Network, maintained by the Institute of International Education (IIE).	2001	4083	
	2002	4491	
	2004	4940	
	2005	5434	
<b>Description:</b> Institutions participating in exchanges implemented through one of the US-AEP's programs, including educational exchanges, fellowships, training workshops, field trips, conferences, pilot demonstrations and the like. Each time an institution is engaged it is counted separately.			
<b>Comment:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001, but it is not one of the Indicators to be reported in next year's R4 (see Annex A). The originally planned targets for the out-years on this table are no longer operative.			



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1e:</b> The dollar value of the resources leveraged by the US-AEP from non-USAID sources.			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result:</b> n/a			
<b>Performance Indicator:</b> n/a			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> Contributing partners in the U.S. and Asia.			
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> The U.S. dollar value of the funds, in-kind support, and/or pro bono services provided by other partners. The table shows the dollar value in cumulative terms.	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1992-99 (Baseline)		\$153,934,468
<b>Source:</b> Partners own financial records.	2000	\$163,000,000	\$163,012,970
	2001	\$172,000,000	
<b>Description:</b> The resources available to support US-AEP programs and activities that are contributed by U.S. Federal Agencies (other than USAID), U.S. state agencies, and other public and private partners in the U.S. and Asia.	2002	\$181,000,000	
	2003	\$190,000,000	
	2004	\$199,000,000	
	2005	\$208,000,000	
<b>Comment:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001 (see Annex A). The new targets are expressed as a percentage of the total resources available to the US-AEP through leveraging, not as the actual dollar amount, as in this table.			



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result 1.1:</b> Improved public policy and environmental regulations.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.1a:</b> The number of laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other); also: <i>by Asian country</i> .			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of new or revised environmental laws and regulations. Table shows cumulative planned and actual.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> US-EPA and all other public and private sector partners in the U.S. and Asia.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Any environmental laws and regulations newly drafted and/or revised by Asian governments at the national, provincial, or municipal level, as a result of advice and assistance through a US-AEP program or partner. "Strengthened" includes improved regulatory compliance/enforcement.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comments:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001 (see Annex A). A new baseline will be established on the basis of FY 2001 results, and the targets in this table are no longer operative.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1999 (Baseline)		16
	2000	18	41
	2001	18	
	2002	22	
	2003	26	
	2004	30	
	2005	34	



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result 1.2:</b> Improved urban environmental management.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.2a:</b> The number of municipalities engaged in US-AEP-supported improvements in environmental management.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other); also: <i>by Asian country</i> .			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of municipalities, including major cities and towns, as well as separate jurisdictions in large metropolitan areas, such as the 17 jurisdictions that make up Metro Manila. Table shows cumulative planned and actual.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> All major US-AEP partners in the U.S. and Asia.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Municipalities are considered to be engaged if they are actively involved in one or more US-AEP programs, such as the State Environmental Initiative or the Clean Air Initiative.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comments:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001 (see Annex A). A new baseline will be established on the basis of FY 2001 results, and the targets in this table are no longer operative.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1999 (Baseline)		125
	2000	130	214
	2001	140	
	2002	150	
	2003	160	
	2004	170	
	2005	180	



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result 1.4:</b> Increased transfer of U.S. environmental technology, expertise and practices to Asia through trade and investment.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.4a:</b> The dollar value of US-AEP-assisted sales of U.S. environmental equipment and services.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other). Also: <i>U.S. state and company size</i> (small < 500 employees; medium – 500 to 1000 employees; large > 1000 employees).			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The U.S. dollar.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> Primary data source is the Commercial Service Success Story Record, a report required of the U.S. Technology Representatives and Urban Infrastructure Representatives in Asia; secondary sources include GTN-ETNA (trade leads program), NASDA, CSG, WEF, A&amp;WMA, ACEC, IIE and the TSSC.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Any sales in Asia by U.S. companies that can be attributed to: a) the support/assistance that the companies received through one or more US-AEP programs, e.g., the trade leads, ETF, SEI, EEP, etc., and/or b) ad hoc advice and assistance that the companies received from the Tech Reps or Urban Infrastructure Reps.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comment:</b> The US-AEP recently reviewed its sales records back to 1993 and determined that hard copy confirmation was lacking to support \$8,417,280 in previously recorded sales. Thus the actual baseline figure for cumulative sales from 1992 through 1999 was reduced by that amount, and is reflected in this table. The planned cumulative targets for the out-years were also reduced by that amount.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1992-99 (Baseline)		\$1,107,297,832
	2000	\$1,176,000,000	\$1,259,424,882
	2001	\$1,246,000,000	
	2002	\$1,316,000,000	
	2003	\$1,386,000,000	
	2004	\$1,456,000,000	
	2005	\$1,526,000,000	



## FY 2000 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000		<b>Organization:</b> United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)	
<b>Intermediate Result 1.4:</b> Increased transfer of U.S. environmental technology, expertise and practices to Asia through trade and investment.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.4b:</b> The number of US-AEP-assisted business transactions, other than sales, between U.S. and Asian companies.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other. Also: <i>U.S state and company size</i> (small < 500 employees; medium – 500 to 1000 employees; large > 1000 employees).			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of individual transactions.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> Primary data source is the Commercial Service Success Story Record, a report required of the U.S. Technology Representatives and Urban Infrastructure Representatives in Asia; secondary sources include GTN-ETNA (trade leads program), NASDA, CSG, WEF, A&amp;WMA, ACEC, IIE, and the TSSC. The <i>original</i> data source is the U.S. or Asian firm involved in the transaction.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> The legally binding signing of an agreement (including agent/distributor, representation, joint venture, strategic alliance, licensing, and franchising agreements) or the signing of a contract by the client, with sales expected in the future. The business transaction must be one that can be attributed to the assistance that the U.S. and/or the Asian companies received through one of more US-AEP programs or partners, e.g., NASDA's ETF.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comment:</b> Because it often takes years for sales to result from US-AEP assistance, this measures business transactions that have the potential to produce sales in the future.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1999 (Baseline)		27
	2000	5	21
	2001	11	
	2002	11	
	2003	11	
	2004	11	
	2005	11	



---

### **Part III. Resource Request**

#### **A. Operational Year Budget (OYB)**

The US-AEP's FY 2001 OYB is \$16,100,000. With a carry-over from FY 2000 of \$4,586,724, the available funds total \$20,686,724. The carry-over level is high this year because the two major contracts through which the US-AEP is implemented are in the process of being re-bid, but much of the money for the new contracts was not obligated during FY 2000 as anticipated.

All of the OYB is from the Development Assistance (DA) account, and the entire amount is committed to the achievement of the US-AEP's single Strategic Objective. Although all the funds in the accompanying tables for FY 2001 are listed under the Agency's environment goal, the on-going programs also support the Agency's goals for economic growth (EG), democracy and governance (DG), and health. The cross-sectoral nature of the US-AEP program is reflected in the funding tables for FY 2002 and 2003, which show a portion of the budget allocated to EG and DG.

There will be no problem obligating the full OYB in FY 2001.

#### **B. Global Bureau Collaboration**

The US-AEP's collaboration with the Global Bureau in FY 2001 will total about \$1.8 million for nine activities (listed in the accompanying table) managed through the Centers for Environment, Economic Growth, and Human Capacity Development. The level of funding required for Global Bureau support in FY 2002 will be about \$1.6 million.

#### **C. New Requests**

The proposed FY 2002 level of \$18,100,000 (consistent with the Congressional Budget Justification) is a decrease from the FY 2001 availability (FY 2001 budget plus FY 2000 carry-over). Therefore it is critical that this level be provided for next year in order for US-AEP to maintain its programs once the major implementing contracts (for the TSSC and EPSG) are operating at full speed.

The proposed budget of \$19,300,000 for FY 2003 represents the minimum requirement anticipated by the US-AEP to manage its ongoing and expanding activities. In view of the US-AEP's substantial achievements, as reflected in this R4, the ANE Bureau should build on the US-AEP's record of success by supporting the FY 2002 request level.

It should also be understood that additional resources may be required if the US-AEP program is asked to expand in the coming year. The US-AEP has been cited as precisely the kind of program envisioned by the proposed Global Development Alliance (GDA), and additional resources may be warranted should this initiative move forward within USAID. Also, there has been a growing movement in Congress over the past several years to allow the US-AEP to work in the People's Republic of China. If this movement gains support in the new Administration, additional resources will be required by the US-AEP to expand its program into China. Each of these potential scenarios could require an additional \$2 million in funding in FY 2002.

#### **D. Pipeline Status**



---

Unlike many other operating units, the US-AEP does not have the common problem of a lengthy pipeline. The FY 2000 pipeline was much larger than usual for the US-AEP, due to the delays mentioned earlier in awarding the two major contracts through which many of USAEP's programs are implemented. In the past several years the US-AEP has not had enough of a pipeline to sustain the funding for its major contracts and grant agreements. Technical Notifications to Congress and other mechanisms had to be employed in order to avoid costly termination or stop orders from being issued. Core contracts and grants should begin the fiscal year with a nine to twelve month pipeline. Only with higher funding levels can such a pipeline status be achieved.

#### **E. Operating Expenses (OE)**

The accompanying workforce tables show a decrease from last year of one AAAS Fellow.

Given the US-AEP's wide-ranging activities and many partners throughout the U.S. and Asia, the members of the small Secretariat are required to engage in substantial domestic and international travel.

## FY 2001 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2001

Program/Country: USAEP Secretariat

Approp:

Scenario:

S.O. # , Title		FY 2001 Request												Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY2000
	Bilateral/Field Spt	Total	Agriculture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Health Promotion (**)	Environ	D/G		
SO 1: To Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia															
	Bilateral	14,310						0						14,310	2,700
	Field Spt	1,790												1,790	220
		16,100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13,180	2,920
SO 2:															
	Bilateral														
	Field Spt														
		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
SO 4:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	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
SO 6:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	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
SO 8:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	0													
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		14,310	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,310	0	11,610	2,700
Total Field Support		1,790	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,790	0	1,570	220
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM</b>		<b>16,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>13,180</b>	<b>2,920</b>

FY 2001 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	16,100
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	5,000

FY 2001 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	16,100
Dev. Assist ICASS	0
Dev. Assist Total:	16,100
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	0
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)

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. (\*\*) Health Promotion is normally funded from the CSD Account, although amounts for Victims of War/Victims of Torture are funded from the DA/DFA Account

## FY 2002 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2002      Program/Country: USAEP Secretariat  
 Approp:  
 Scenario:

S.O. # , Title		FY 2002 Request												Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY2001
	Bilateral/Field Spt	Total	Agriculture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Health Promotion (**)	Environ	D/G		
SO 1: To Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia															
	Bilateral	16,500		500								14,500	1,500	13,200	3,300
	Field Spt	1,600										1,600		1,400	200
		18,100	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,100	1,500	14,600	3,500
SO 2:															
	Bilateral														
	Field Spt														
		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
SO 4:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	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
SO 6:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	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
SO 8:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	0													
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		16,500	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14,500	1,500	13,200	3,300
Total Field Support		1,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,600	0	1,400	200
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM</b>		<b>18,100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16,100</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>14,600</b>	<b>3,500</b>

FY 2002 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	500
Democracy	1,500
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	16,100
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	5,000

FY 2002 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	18,100
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	18,100
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)

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. (\*\*) Health Promotion is normally funded from the CSD Account, although amounts for Victims of War/Victims of Torture are funded from the DA/DFA Account

## FY 2003 Budget Request by Program/Country

Fiscal Year: 2003

Program/Country: USAEP Secretariat

Approp:

Scenario:

S.O. # , Title		FY 2003 Request												Est. S.O. Expenditures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY2002
	Bilateral/Field Spt	Total	Agriculture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Health Promotion (**)	Environ	D/G		
SO 1: To Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia															
	Bilateral	18,100		2,000								15,000	1,000	14,100	3,900
	Field Spt	1,200										1,300		1,100	200
		19,300	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16,300	1,000	15,200	4,100
SO 2:															
	Bilateral														
	Field Spt														
		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
SO 4:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	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
SO 6:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	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
SO 8:															
	Bilateral	0													
	Field Spt	0													
		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		18,100	0	2,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15,000	1,000	14,100	3,900
Total Field Support		1,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,300	0	1,100	200
<b>TOTAL PROGRAM</b>		<b>19,300</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16,300</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>15,200</b>	<b>4,100</b>

FY 2003 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	2,000
Democracy	1,000
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	16,300
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	5,000

FY 2003 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 Fiscal Year (FY2001, FY2002, FY2003)

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. (\*\*) Health Promotion is normally funded from the CSD Account, although amounts for Victims of War/Victims of Torture are funded from the DA/DFA Account

Workforce Tables

Org: USAEP Secretariat End of year On-Board								Total	Org.	Fin.	Admin.	Con-	All	Total	Total		
<b>FY 2001 Estimate</b>	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	SO/SpO	Mgmt.	Mgmt	Mgmt	tract	Legal	Other	Mgmt.	Staff	
<b>OE Funded 1/</b>																	
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	
<b>Program Funded 1/</b>																	
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	1							1							0	1	
IDIs								0							0	0	
Subtotal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
<b>TOTAL WORKFORCE</b>	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	

Workforce Tables

Org: USAEP Secretariat End of year On-Board								Total	Org.	Fin.	Admin.	Con-	All	Total	Total		
<b>FY 2002 Target</b>	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	SO/SpO	Mgmt.	Mgmt	Mgmt	tract	Legal	Other	Mgmt.	Staff	
<b>OE Funded: 1/</b>																	
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	
<b>Program Funded 1/</b>																	
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	1							1							0	1	
IDIs								0							0	0	
Subtotal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
<b>TOTAL WORKFORCE</b>	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	

Workforce Tables

Org: USAEP Secretariat End of year On-Board								Total SO/SpO	All						Total	Total
<b>FY 2003 Target</b>	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Staff	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	Other	Mgmt.	Staff
<b>OE Funded: 1/</b>																
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
<b>Program Funded 1/</b>																
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	1							1							0	1
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>TOTAL WORKFORCE</b>	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

USDH Staffing Requirements by Backstop, FY 2001 - FY 2004

Mission: USAEP Secretariat

Functional Backstop (BS)	Number of USDH Employees in Backstop in:			
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003
<b>Senior Management</b>				
<b>SMG - 01</b>	1	1	1	1
<b>Program Management</b>				
<b>Program Mgt - 02</b>	2	2	2	2
<b>Project Dvpm Officer - 94</b>	1	1	1	1
<b>Support Management</b>				
<b>EXO - 03</b>				
<b>Controller - 04</b>				
<b>Legal - 85</b>				
<b>Commodity Mgt. - 92</b>				
<b>Contract Mgt. - 93</b>				
<b>Secretary - 05 &amp; 07</b>				
<b>Sector Management</b>				
<b>Agriculture - 10 &amp; 14</b>				
<b>Economics - 11</b>				
<b>Democracy - 12</b>				
<b>Food for Peace - 15</b>				
<b>Private Enterprise - 21</b>				
<b>Engineering - 25</b>				
<b>Environment - 40 &amp; 75</b>				
<b>Health/Pop. - 50</b>				
<b>Education - 60</b>				
<b>General Dvpm. - 12*</b>				
<b>RUDO, UE-funded - 40</b>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

\*GDO - 12: for the rare case where an officer manages activities in several technical areas, none of which predominate, e.g., the officer manages Democracy, Health, and Environment activities that are about equal. An officer who manages primarily Health activities with some Democracy and Environment activities would be a Health Officer, BS 50.

remaining **IDIs**: list under the Functional Backstop for the work they do.

Please e-mail this worksheet in Excel to: Maribeth.Zankowski@HR.PPIM@aidw as well as include it with your R4 submission.

## 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 2001		FY 2002	
				Obligated by:		Obligated by:	
Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau				
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/ENV contract with IRG/EPIQ: PCE-I-00-96-0002-00	High	Sep 1996 - Mar 2002	0		50	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/ENV Energy IQC with PA Consulting: LAG-I-00-98-00005-00	High	Dec 1997 - Dec 2002	250		70	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/ENV Cooperative Agreement with Alliance to Save Energy: LAG-A-00-97-00006-00	High	Mar 1997 - Feb 2002	250		350	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/EGAD/BD Contract for Environmental Technology Network for Asia (ETNA): PEC-C-00-97-00002-00	High	Dec 1996 - Feb 2001	165		360	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/ENV Sustainable Urban Management (SUM) IQC: LAG-I-00-00-000 [+ 08-00 ICMA; 35-00 PADCO]	High	Feb 1999 - Feb 2002	732		350	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/ENV RSSAs: PCE-R-AG-93-00025-00	High	Sep 2001 - Sep 2003	200		350	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/HCD AAAS Fellow: Project #936-5861	High	Sep 2000 - Aug 2002	93		96	
SO 1: Promote a Clean Revolution in Asia	G/ENV SEGIR IQC: PCE-I-00-98-00013-00	High	Dec 1998 - Aug 2003	100		0	
<b>GRAND TOTAL.....</b>				<b>1,790</b>		<b>1,626</b>	

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

rsw/r401/fldsups00.xls - 11/30/99



---

## Part IV. Supplemental Information Annexes

### A. Updated Results Framework

#### 1. The Current Results Framework

In FY 2000 the US-AEP developed a new Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) that took effect on October 1, 2001, i.e., at the beginning of FY 2001. The development of the PMP included some refinements to the US-AEP's Results Framework and the introduction in FY 2001 of a number of new and/or revised performance indicators. The current and approved Strategic Objective and related Intermediate Results (and sub-Intermediate Results) are as follows:

Strategic Objective 1: Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.

Intermediate Result 1.1: Improved public policy and environmental regulations.

Intermediate Result 1.2: Improved urban environmental management.

Sub-Intermediate Result 1.2.1: Improved urban policies and information flow.

Sub-Intermediate Result 1.2.2: Improved municipal technical and financial management systems.

Sub-Intermediate Result 1.2.3: Increased local capacity to implement urban environmental improvements.

Intermediate Result 1.3: Improved industrial environmental performance.

Sub-Intermediate Result 1.3.1: Increased corporate commitment to cleaner production.

Sub-Intermediate Result 1.3.2: Outreach/advocacy mechanisms to increase dialogue established.

Sub-Intermediate Result 1.3.3: Enabling environment for improved corporate environmental performance created.

Intermediate Result 1.4: Increased transfer of U.S. environmental technology, expertise and practices to Asia through trade and investment.

#### 2. New or Revised Indicators

##### a. Indicators Being Reported in This R4

The following *old* performance indicators are being reported in this year's R4:

Indicator 1a: New partnerships between U.S. and Asian institutions.

Indicator 1b: Continuing partnerships with US-AEP support.



---

Indicator 1c: Partnerships that became self-sustaining in FY 2000.

Indicator 1d: Institutions, U.S. and Asian, impacted by US-AEP activities.

Indicator 1e: Resources leveraged by the US-AEP from non-USAID sources.

Indicator 1.1a: Environmental laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities.

Indicator 1.2a: Municipalities engaged in US-AEP-supported improvements in environmental management.

Indicator 1.4a: The dollar value of US-AEP-assisted sales of U.S. environmental equipment and services.

Indicator 1.4b: The number of US-AEP-assisted business transactions, other than sales, by U.S. and Asian companies.

#### **b. Indicators to Be Reported in the Next R4**

The following indicators (new, revised or unchanged from FY 2000) will be reported in the next R4 (March 31, 2002):

Indicator 1a: The number of new, continuing and self-sustaining U.S.-Asian partnerships. (This indicator is a consolidation of old Indicators 1a, 1b, and 1c.)

Indicator 1d: The percentage of total resources (used to support US-AEP activities) that are leveraged from non-USAID sources. (This indicator is a refinement of old Indicator 1e.)

Indicator 1.1a: The number of environmental laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities. (This indicator has been refined.)

Indicator 1.2a: The number of local units and public agencies implementing urban environmental management best practices and policies. (This indicator is a revision of old Indicator 1.2a.)

Indicator 1.3.2a: The number of US-AEP-supported networks and associations established and/or strengthened to promote environmental management systems and cleaner industrial production. (This is a new indicator.)

Indicator 1.4a: The dollar value of US-AEP-assisted sales of U.S. environmental equipment and services. (This indicator has been refined.)

Indicator 1.4b: The number of US-AEP-assisted business transactions, other than sales, between U.S. and Asian companies. (This indicator has not been changed.)

The seven pages that follow provide Performance Data Tables (with new baselines and performance targets) for the seven aforementioned indicators to be reported next year.



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.							
<b>Performance Indicator 1a-b-c:</b> The number of new, continuing, and self-sustaining U.S.-Asian partnerships.							
<b>Approved:</b> October, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)							
<b>Intermediate Result:</b> n/a							
<b>Performance Indicator:</b> n/a							
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> 1a (new ), 1b (continuing) and 1c (self-sustaining) partnerships.							
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of partnerships reflected in one of three milestones: a) new partnerships created in the reporting year; b) continuing partnerships (still operative with US-AEP support); and c) self-sustaining (still operative, but no longer relying on US-AEP support).</p> <p><b>Source:</b> All US-AEP partners in the U.S. and Asia.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Formal partnerships ( based on a written agreement between U.S. and Asian public and/or private institutions, or other relationships where both partners have committed significant financial/human resources) created with US-AEP assistance to address environmental issues.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> Formal relationships between private sector entities for the purpose of doing business are not considered to be partnerships for this Indicator.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>			<b>Actual</b>		
		<b>1a</b>	<b>1b</b>	<b>1c</b>	<b>1a</b>	<b>1b</b>	<b>1c</b>
	1999 (Baseline)				48	54	3
	2000	5	102	3	72	118	16
	2001	5	102	3			
	2002	10	110	3			
	2003	10	115	3			
	2004	10	125	3			
	2005	10	135	3			



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1d:</b> The percentage of total resources (used to support US-AEP activities) that are leveraged from non-USAID sources.			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result:</b> n/a			
<b>Performance Indicator:</b> n/a			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> Contributing partners in the U.S. and Asia.			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The percentage of the total resources available to support US-AEP programs and activities that is contributed by U.S. Federal Agencies (other than USAID) and U.S. state agencies, and other public and private sector partners in the U.S. and Asia.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> Partners own financial records.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> The dollar value of the funds, in-kind support, and/or pro bono services provided by other partners, as compared to the dollar value of the total funds available for US-AEP activities (including funds allocated to the US-AEP by USAID) in a given fiscal year.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comment:</b></p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1999 (Baseline)		33 %
	2000	33 %	38 %
	2001	33 %	
	2002	33 %	
	2003	33 %	
	2004	33 %	
	2005	33 %	



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.							
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a							
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)							
<b>Intermediate Result 1.1:</b> Improved public policy and environmental regulations.							
<b>Performance Indicator 1.1a:</b> The number of environmental policies, laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities.							
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other); also: <i>by Asian country</i> .							
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Three milestones: 1) new/strengthened policies; 2) new/strengthened regulations; and 3) improved compliance with regulations or enforcement actions.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> US-EPA and all other public and private sector partners in the U.S. and Asia engaged in activities calculated to strengthen policies, laws and regulations.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Any environmental laws and regulations newly drafted and/or revised by Asian governments at the national, provincial, or municipal level, as a result of advice and assistance through a US-AEP program or partner. "Strengthened" includes improved regulatory compliance/enforcement.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comment:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001. A baseline will be established on the basis of FY 2001 results and performance targets will then be set.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>			<b>Actual</b>		
		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
	2001 (Baseline)						
	2002						
	2003						
	2004						
	2005						



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> October, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result 1.2:</b> Improved urban environmental management.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.2a:</b> The number of local government units and public agencies implementing urban environmental management best practices and policies.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other); and by <i>Asian country</i> .			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of local government units and public agencies.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> Lead partners for all US-AEP-supported urban activities.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Local government units and public agencies that are implementing recognized best practices and environmental policies related to US-AEP assistance; examples include formal urban environmental plans, EMS for transit authorities, ICLEI program adoption, solid waste management plans, etc.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comments:</b> This Indicator was revised at the start of FY 2001. A baseline will be established on the basis of FY 2001 results and performance targets will then be set.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	2001 (Baseline)		



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> October, 2000 <b>Organization:</b> The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)			
<b>Intermediate Result 1.3.2:</b> Outreach/advocacy mechanisms to increase dialogue established.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.3.2a:</b> The number of US-AEP-supported networks and associations established and/or strengthened to promote environmental management systems and cleaner industrial production.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>geographic origin</i> (regional/inter-country/intra-country); and <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management; energy; medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other).			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of networks and associations.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> The Louis Berger Group (a US-AEP partner).</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> Networks are defined as formal partnerships and institutional arrangements between companies, industrial/trade associations, chambers of commerce, governments, civil society, NGOs, etc., that have the purpose of promoting environmental systems and cleaner industrial environmental performance. Strengthening can include enhanced sustainability, increased outreach or communication programs, and establishment of best-practice/benchmarking programs.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comments:</b> This Indicator was newly created in FY 2001. A baseline will be established on the basis of FY 2001 results and performance targets will then be set.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	2001 (Baseline)		
	2002		
	2003		
	2004		
	2005		



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000		<b>Organization:</b> United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)	
<b>Intermediate Result 1.4:</b> Increased transfer of U.S. environmental technology, expertise and practices to Asia through trade and investment.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.4a:</b> The dollar value of US-AEP-assisted sales of U.S. environmental equipment and services.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other). Also: <i>U.S. state and company size</i> (small < 500 employees; medium – 500 to 1000 employees; large > 1000 employees).			
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> The U.S. dollar.	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
<p><b>Source:</b> Primary data source is the Commercial Service Success Story Record, a report required of the U.S. Technology Representatives and Urban Infrastructure Representatives in Asia; secondary sources include GTN-ETNA (trade leads program), NASDA, CSG, WEF, A&amp;WMA, ACEC, IIE and the TSSC.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> Any sales in Asia by U.S. companies that can be attributed to: a) the support/assistance that the companies received through one or more US-AEP programs, e.g., the trade leads, ETF, SEI, EEP, etc., and/or b) ad hoc advice and assistance that the companies received from the Tech Reps or Urban Infrastructure Reps.</p> <p><b>Comment:</b> The total for FY 2000 includes \$128,288,475 in confirmed sales in FY 2000, plus an additional \$23,838,830 in newly reported and confirmed sales in prior years.</p>	1999 (Baseline)		\$21,660,902
	2000	\$70,000,000	\$152,127,050
	2001	\$70,000,000	
	2002	\$70,000,000	
	2003	\$70,000,000	
	2004	\$70,000,000	
	2005	\$70,000,000	



## FY 2001 Performance Data Table

<b>Strategic Objective 1:</b> Sustained impact on the key people, institutions and forces that drive the movement to a clean revolution in Asia.			
<b>Objective ID:</b> n/a			
<b>Approved:</b> February, 2000		<b>Organization:</b> United States-Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP)	
<b>Intermediate Result 1.4:</b> Increased transfer of U.S. environmental technology, expertise and practices to Asia through trade and investment.			
<b>Performance Indicator 1.4b:</b> The number of US-AEP-assisted business transactions, other than sales, between U.S. and Asian companies.			
<b>Disaggregated By:</b> <i>primary environmental category</i> (water, waste water, solid waste, air pollution, environmental management, energy, medical waste, instrumentation, hazardous waste, and other. Also: <i>U.S state and company size</i> (small < 500 employees; medium – 500 to 1000 employees; large > 1000 employees.			
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> The number of individual transactions.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Source:</b> Primary data source is the Commercial Service Success Story Record, a report required of the U.S. Technology Representatives and Urban Infrastructure Representatives in Asia; secondary sources include GTN-ETNA (trade leads program), NASDA, CSG, WEF, A&amp;WMA, ACEC, IIE, and the TSSC. The <i>original</i> data source is the U.S. or Asian firm involved in the transaction.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Description:</b> The legally binding signing of an agreement (including agent/distributor, representation, joint venture, strategic alliance, licensing, and franchising agreements) or the signing of a contract by the client, with sales expected in the future. The business transaction must be one that can be attributed to the assistance that the U.S. and/or the Asian companies received through one of more US-AEP programs or partners, e.g., NASDA's ETF.</p> <hr/> <p><b>Comment:</b> Because it often takes years for sales to result from US-AEP assistance, this measures business transactions that have the potential to produce sales in the future.</p>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	1999 (Baseline)		27
	2000	5	21
	2001	11	
	2002	11	
	2003	11	
	2004	11	
	2005	11	



---

## **B. Institutional and Organizational Development**

The required Agency table that relates the US-AEP's institutional and organizational development activities to its Intermediate Results and their performance indicators appears on the following page. It should be noted, however, that the US-AEP also has two performance indicators at the *Strategic Objective* level that relate directly to institutional and organizational development:

Indicator 1a: Number of new, continuing, and self-sustaining partnerships

Indicator 1b: Number of U.S. and Asian institutions participating in US-AEP- supported knowledge transfer activities.

Both indicators relate to all three types of institutions: public sector, private for profit and private non-profit.



### Institutional and Organizational Development Table

Verification	Objective ID	IR No.	IR name	Indicators	Public sector	Private for profit	Private non-profit
Y	499-001	IR 1.1	Improved public policy and environmental regulations	Number of environmental policies, laws and regulations strengthened through US-AEP activities	Y	N	Y
X	499-001	IR 1.3	Improved industrial environmental performance	Number of US-AEP-assisted companies with production facilities in Asia recognized for corporate sustainability principles	N	Y	N
Y	499-001	IR 1.2	Improved urban environmental management	Number of local government units or public agencies implementing urban environmental best practices and policies.	Y	N	N



---

## C. Global Climate Change

### 1. The US-AEP Approach to Global Climate Change (GCC)

The bulk of the US-AEP efforts to mitigate emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) focuses on resource efficiency in the industrial and urban sectors. Improving the efficiency with which a society makes use of its resources means that for each product or service a society produces to advance itself, it depletes fewer of the resources needed for current and future generations and emits fewer pollutants, including GHGs. It is from this economic and public health perspective that Asian entities work with the US-AEP to improve the efficiency with which they use resources such as fossil fuels, heat, electricity, materials for manufacturing, natural resources, water, and waste. About half of the funding for FY 2000 projects that help reduce GHG emissions was devoted to increasing energy efficiency, improving environmental and energy management in cities and energy-intensive industries, and enhancing efficiencies in manufacturing processes. The next greatest focus area was waste: minimizing its production, converting it to energy and products, and recovering, recycling and reusing it in order to reduce the demand for raw materials. The remainder of the program impacting GCC—a little less than 30%—reduced carbon dioxide produced as a result of transportation, promoted the adoption of renewable energy, and reduced the carbon intensity of the power sector. Some of the important progress made during FY 2000 in helping Asia reduce its GHG emissions is described below.

### 2. Illustrative Progress in FY 2000

#### a. State of Hawaii Helping the Philippines Promote Energy Efficiency, Performance Contracting

Through its partnership with the Council of State Governments, the US-AEP provided support to the State of Hawaii to promote an energy services industry in the Philippines. Most of the project was implemented by a partnership between the Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism and the Philippines Department of Energy (PDOE). The Hawaii team launched the project with a series of workshops for the Philippines on demand side management, performance contracting, and energy service companies (ESCOs). The Hawaii team recommended steps to PDOE to create and develop an energy services industry in the Philippines, which PDOE endorsed. One result of this is that the Philippines government created ESCO, Inc. (as a subsidiary to the National Power Corporation of the Philippines) which will provide energy retrofit services to industry and the public sector. ESCO Inc. is currently searching for U.S. partners for energy service projects. The Hawaii team provided technical assistance to ESCO Inc., including the preparation of a manual over 500 pages long on energy performance contracting in the Philippines.

To generate interest in the Philippines for performing contracting, PDOE selected a food processing plant in Manila, the Rosario Plant of Universal Robina Corp (URC), to serve as a model performance contracting project, the first in the Philippines. The Hawaii team and their PDOE counterparts helped URC prepare a detailed request for proposals for energy performance contracting services. Four companies have formally expressed an interest in the contract, one of which (Honeywell) has already conducted a preliminary audit on the site and is analyzing the results. This pilot has enormous potential for widespread impact because the parent company to URC—JG Summit Holdings, Inc.—announced that if the Rosario plant project is successful they will solicit performance contracting services for their 14 other industrial plants *plus* other



commercial enterprises of the company such as hotels, shopping centers, banks, an airline, and power generating companies. PDOE also compiled a list of government facilities for the Hawaii team with potential for performance contracting, ranging from small buildings to a central bank complex using nearly 28 million kWh per year, representing a tremendous opportunity for U.S. ESCOs.

Another result of the project is that the Philippines government is taking strong steps to increase efficiency at the federal level. Philippine Undersecretary of Energy Ben-Hur Salcedo and the Hawaii team drafted a Presidential Executive Order to encourage performance contracting and energy efficiency measures at all or most of the nation's government buildings and facilities. PDOE requested assistance in designing a program similar to the U.S. Federal Energy Management Program, which the U.S. Department of Energy has agreed to provide during FY 2001.

#### **b. Philippines Clean Cities Center Established with 24 Clean Cities Participating**

Another grant awarded through the Council of State Governments went to the Pacific Northwest Economic Region Clean Washington Center (CWC) to establish a Clean Cities Center (CCC) in the Philippines. The purpose of the Center is to work with mayors and municipal managers to develop and implement local action plans on clean production, waste management, and waste minimization. The Center also gives mayors and municipal managers the ability to screen new investment proposals for their cities and to direct the proponents to qualified technical assistance to help improve the environmental performance of new investments. As a result of the partnership between CWC and the League of Cities of the Philippines, a Philippines Clean Cities Center has been established and is operational. Twenty-four cities are participating in the pilot Clean Cities program, and the Center has trained a city industrial extension officer in each pilot city to assist local industries with waste minimization plans. A newsletter has been developed to share best practices among the participating cities, and CWC developed a web site for the program (<http://www.cleancities.net/>). The pilot Clean Cities, although only recently established, are beginning to make progress. For example:

- Antipolo has established a waste minimization plan and a pollution prevention (P2) group, and a P2 plan had been drafted for the city.
- Due to training CWC conducted for two hospitals in Dagupan City on waste minimization, the city plans to expand the number of hospitals receiving training, and the city's CCC extension officer provided waste minimization training to the National Food Authority office and warehouse there.
- Naga City intensified their waste segregation, recycling, collection, and disposal, and trained a Green Brigade with the Association of Youth, training the members in waste minimization.

The project also included capacity building by the CWC team for Philippines environmental professionals and technical assistance for industries. Over 150 environmental professionals from 85 Philippine businesses were trained on solvent recovery techniques, through a series of workshops conducted in partnership with the Philippines Industrial Technology Development Institute. CWC also conducted a waste stream analysis on 12 plants in the Laguna Technopark industrial estate, the largest in the Philippines and owned by the Philippines' largest land developer. The team made recommendations for each site to reduce the consumption of water, energy and materials, and minimize the generation of waste. The team then designed an Industrial



Extension Program for the park, one of the first in Asia, in which the 66 companies in the park will work cooperatively towards ISO 14000 certification. The members of the park will finance the project on their own.

### **c. Public-Private Partnership for Inspection and Maintenance of Motor Vehicle in India**

This is a comprehensive program to establish viable inspections and maintenance (I&M) programs in India's mega-cities and promote an acceptance within the culture of complying with them. The project began as a public-private partnership of the Society of Indian Automotive Manufacturers (SIAM), the Automotive Research Association of India (the non-profit research arm of SIAM), Indian manufacturers of two-wheel motor vehicles, and Delhi and Central government agencies to improve inspections and maintenance (I&M) of two-wheel motor vehicles in Delhi. The work, still ongoing, is in the process of expanding to other mega-cities and to three- and four-wheeled vehicles.

The project began with extensive data collection and analysis. The Society of Indian Automotive Manufacturers and various partner organizations conducted the largest ever series of series of innovative inspection and maintenance camps in Delhi ("pollution control camps"), drawing over 65,000 drivers. In the process, an extensive set of data was collected on emissions, fuel efficiency, the vehicles, and drivers. In early FY 2001, the project brought in Oak Ridge National Lab (with other USAID funding) to complete a high-quality statistical and policy analysis on the data and train SIAM to manage the database and conduct additional analysis. The analysis will be used to improve emissions inventories and design future regulations and voluntary programs that promote regulatory compliance. In the expansion phase of the project, SIAM was given technical assistance in designing camps for other cities and developing a data collection protocol for them. Data collection at the camps is now underway in all of India's mega-cities. The project is also in the process of expanding to include 3- and 4-wheelers.

In the outreach part of the project, a school campaign was designed in partnership with the Indian environmental NGO CONSERVE to get students to encourage their parents to get a "Pollution Under Control" (PUC) I&M sticker for their vehicle. The project is also helping to create an Indian affiliate of the U.S. Earth Communications Office, ECO India, which will promote PUC compliance through an advertising campaign through TV, radio, and movie theatres. ECO India will be based in Mumbai in order to link to the Indian film industry and major corporations. Recruitment has begun for the Executive Board, Board of Advisors, and Indian partners.

### **d. Regional Center of Excellence in Livestock Waste Management**

This project exemplifies US-AEP's partnership with advanced developing countries in Asia to have them serve as a model and demonstrate their environmental leadership in the region to benefit the lesser developed countries (LDC's). The LDC's often aspire to reach the technological and economic level of their advanced neighbors such as Taiwan or Singapore because they believe such development levels are achievable within a generation's time—versus the levels of the United States or Europe.

In this case, the US-AEP and Taiwan jointly created and established a state of the art Environmental Center for Livestock Waste Management (ECLWM) at the National Pingtung University of Science and Technology. The Center's mission is devoted to the development, demonstration, documentation, and training of waste management technologies that allow



profitable production of livestock, poultry, and dairy products without adversely affecting environmental quality.

The creation of ECLWM is a model of public-private collaboration dependent on the leadership of US-AEP to form a consortium with Taiwan and the other Asian nations, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), American equipment manufacturers, and U.S. universities. The American companies donated their pollution prevention equipment, academia provided technical ideas and designs, and Taiwan paid for the construction of a prototype waste treatment system on a working farm. In total, every USAEP dollar was matched by almost nine dollars. Two formal training courses have already been conducted at the Center for Malaysian senior officials and producers with other international programs being planned.

In February 2000, USDA presented their prestigious International Honor Award to the original U.S. and Taiwan team members who were responsible for establishing the Center. The President of National Pingtung University of Science and Technology is expected to complete his tenure and become the Director of ECLWM to continue management of the Center with funding from other sources and promoting outreach to address the problems and remedies of livestock waste management in the Asia region.

#### **e. Korea Technology Cooperation Agreement Pilot Program (TCAPP)**

The Technology Cooperation Agreement Pilot Program (TCAPP) is a pilot program of the U.S. Government to explore a methodology for fulfilling U.S. requirements under the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to provide for the transfer of technologies and practices which mitigate greenhouse gas emissions to developing countries. TCAPP seeks to achieve technology transfer by lowering barriers to private sector participation and investment. The technologies on which Korea has chosen to focus are: energy management; methane capture from municipal waste, and waste heat recovery using heat pumps. The National Renewable Energy Lab (NREL) and the Korea Energy Management Corp. (KEMCO) are the project facilitators, helping private sector partners overcome barriers to technology transfer.

The project made good progress in FY 2000 in the area of energy management, in response to the high priority placed by the Korea Team on strengthening Korea's energy service company (ESCO) industry. NREL recruited several U.S. ESCOs to visit counterparts in Korea as well as Korean companies interested in energy management services. As a result, the U.S. ESCO Sempra conducted an initial energy survey at Hyundai Motor's Ulsan plant, the world's largest auto manufacturing plant. Encouraging by the results, Sempra returned and conducted a more extensive energy survey on the site, in conjunction with KEMCO and EPS Korea, a Korean ESCO. The purpose of the audit was two-fold: 1) for Sempra to build the capacity of KEMCO and EPS Korea to conduct audits; and 2) for Sempra to show Hyundai the energy it could save with certain improvements, with the expectation of being contracted by Hyundai to carry out those improvements. Sempra analyzed the data collected at Ulsan and presented the results to Hyundai and their Korean counterparts. In February 2001, however, the highest managerial levels of Sempra decided to cease all operations in Asia (not just Korea) in order to concentrate on Europe. Nonetheless, Hyundai still plans to implement some or all of Sempra's proposed energy efficiency improvements, and Sempra is continuing to provide assistance to Hyundai and KEMCO regarding the options they proposed. Sempra also plans to host a visit by the Hyundai/KEMCO/EPS team to show them projects with the proposed equipment installed.



---

The U.S. and Korean teams also defined specific opportunities to advance market development for methane recovery from municipal waste and low temperature heat recovery using heat pumps. A pilot project has been identified for methane gas recovery in the city of Taegu with a Korean company, and several U.S. ESCOs (particularly Duke Engineering) have expressed interest in assisting in the project. Cost share in Korea TCAPP has been significant, nearly four to one without counting the two full time staff KEMCO has devoted to the project.



**Table 3.4**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 4: Strategies/Audits that Contribute to the Avoidance of Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Activity	Number of audits or strategies completed	Number or audit recommendations or strategies implemented	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Steam & Combustion Efficiency Pilot Project	41	35	2.1	CN-577-92
<b>India:</b> A work plan was developed for the Energy Management Cell of the Pune Municipal Corporation (created in this activity) to make Pune’s municipal operations more efficient, and to increase PMC’s ability to work with industries in and around Pune, increasing their desire and ability to adopt energy efficiency technologies and practices.	1		1	CN-238
<b>India:</b> Voluntary program in Delhi to improve inspections and maintenance of two-wheel motor vehicles.	1	1	1	CN-238
<b>Korea:</b> As part of Korea TCAPP (Technology Cooperation Agreement Pilot Project), a U.S. ESCO (Sempra) conducted an extensive initial energy survey on the Hyundai Motor Ulsan site, in conjunction with the Korea Energy Management Corp. (KEMCO) and EPS Korea (a Korean ESCO). The purpose of the audit was two-fold: 1) for Sempra to show Hyundai the energy it could save with certain improvements; and 2) for Sempra to conduct a joint audit with KEMCO and EPS Korea to build their capacity in techniques of energy auditing.	1		1	CN-238
<b>Philippines:</b> A Clean Cities Center (CCC) has been established in the Philippines. Twenty-four cities are implementing the pilot CCC program, developing and implementing local action plans on clean production, waste management, and waste minimization technologies. CCC has trained a city industrial extension officer in each pilot city to assist local industries with waste minimization plans.	1	1	1	CN-238
<b>Thailand:</b> experts from EPA and the City of Denver worked with a Thai environmental group, Magic Eyes, to develop a GreenFleets program (to reduce emissions from vehicle fleets) with private vehicle fleets. The program was piloted with 10 private companies.	1	1	1	CN-238
<b>Total:</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>		

**TABLE 3.5**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 5: Value of Public and Private Investment Leveraged by USAID for Activities that Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW

Activity	Source of Leveraged Funds	Methodology for determining amount of funding	Direct Leveraged Funds	Indirect Leveraged Funds	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
National Renewable Energy Program	Dept. of Energy, World Bank-GEF	DOE direct buy-in to USAID. In FY99, GEF funded replication of NREP activity begun in FY98, called the Renewables for Economic Devt Proj.	\$120,000	\$2,500,000	2	CN-577-92
Matching grants by the National Association of State Development Agencies to small- and medium-sized U.S. private sector firms.	12 private sector firms	Direct contributions to the activities	\$586,332		1	CN-238
Environmental Exchange Program (EEP) professional exchanges, study tours, and training.	Private sector (U.S. and Asian) and Asian government participants	Contributions in travel costs and salaries	\$1,095,426		1	CN-238
Council of State Governments New Mexico/Idaho Partnership for Catalyzing Pollution Prevention and Energy Efficiency Technologies in India	The New Mexico and Idaho partners	Direct contributions to the activities	\$171,367		1	CN-238
Council of State Governments Kentucky – India partnership on conflict resolution and environmental remediation for dams	The Kentucky partners	Direct contributions to the activities	\$154,883		1	CN-238
Council of State Governments partnership of the Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNWER) Clean Washington Center with the League of Cities of the Philippines to establish a Philippines Clean Cities Center.	PNWER partners	Direct contributions to the activities	\$65,000		1	CN-238



**TABLE 3.5 (continued)**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 5: Value of Public and Private Investment Leveraged by USAID for Activities that Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

PLEASE SEE DEFINITIONS BELOW

Activity	Source of Leveraged Funds	Methodology for determining amount of funding	Direct Leveraged Funds	Indirect Leveraged Funds	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Council of State Governments partnership of the Pacific Northwest Economic Region (PNWER) Clean Washington Center with the League of Cities of the Philippines to establish a Philippines Clean Cities Center.	PNWER partners	Direct contributions to the activities	\$65,000		1	CN-238
Council of State Governments partnership of a group of Hawaii partners (led by the Hawaii Dept. of Business, Economic Development and Tourism) and the Philippines Dept. of Energy promoting energy efficient practices in the Philippines through the use of e	Hawaii partners	Direct contributions to the activities	\$78,468		1	CN-238
Asia Regional Environmental Center for Livestock Waste Management	North Carolina Council of State Governments partners, Gov't of Taiwan, U.S. industry, U.S. universities.	Taiwan contributed the costs of building the Center, U.S. industry donated equipment, and universities donated technical assistance.	\$3,058,043		1	CN-238
Council of State Governments Louisiana – Taiwan partnership on clean energy technologies for Taiwan.	Louisiana partners	Direct contributions to the activities	\$330,000		1	CN-238
Korea Technology Cooperation Agreement Pilot Program	Sempre (a U.S. ESCO) and the Korea Energy Management Corp.	Labor (by Sempra) and travel costs (both). (Note that the cost share given on this line for Korea TCA PP does not include \$175,040 in cost share for exchanges, which is included on the EEP line above.)	\$115,800		1	CN-238
Resource Cities Program between Seattle and Hai Phong, Vietnam	World Bank and City of Seattle (\$250,000 each)	Direct contributions to the Program.	\$500,000		1	CN-238
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$6,155,319</b>	<b>\$0</b>		

**Definitions: Funding Leveraged**

<b>Direct Leveraged Funding</b>	Funding leveraged directly in support of USA ID activities and programs, including: - funding leveraged from partners for joint USA ID activities; - funding for activities in which USA ID developed enabling policies, regulations, - obligated or committed funding for direct follow-on MDB loan programs - obligated or committed funding for direct follow-on private-sector funded - joint implementation investments; - Development Credit Authority investments.
<b>Indirect Leveraged Funding</b>	Funding dedicated by other donors or governments to replicate programs that USA ID initiated, but which USA ID does not or will not itself fund.



**TABLE 3.6a**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 6a: Increased Capacity to Address Global Climate Change Issues**

Types of institutions strengthened to address GCC issues	Number of Institutions Strengthened	Names of Associations, NGOs, or other Institutions Strengthened	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Ex: NGOs	3	Center for Cleaner Production, Association of Industrial Engineers, National Solar Energy Foundation, Clean Air Alliance, Institute for Industrial Efficiency	2.4	CN-577-92
NGOs	7	<b>Malaysia:</b> Malaysian Energy Centre. <b>Philippines:</b> Philippines Clean Cities Center, League of Cities of the Philippines, Association of Barangay Captains, The Association of Youth, Solid Waste Association of the Philippines. <b>Taiwan:</b> Taiwan Energy Commis	1	CN-238
Private Institutions	29	<b>Bangladesh</b> newspapers: Daily Star, Financial Express, Independent, Daily Janakantha, Prothom Alo, United News of Bangladesh, Bangladesh Observer, Daily Ittefaq, Daily Dinkal, Daily Inqilab. <b>India:</b> Society of Indian Automotive Manufacturers, Society of	1	CN-238
Research/Educational Institutions	2	<b>Taiwan:</b> National Pingtung University of Science and Technology. <b>Thailand:</b> Chang Man University.	1	CN-238
Public Institutions	20	<b>India:</b> Pune Municipal Corporation, Parvati Water Works, Maharashtra State Electricity Board. <b>Indonesia:</b> PJB-II Muara Karang Power Plant, Directorate General of Electricity and Energy Development. <b>Korea:</b> Korea Energy Management Corp., Korea Electric P	1	CN-238
<b>Total Number of Institutions Strengthened:</b>	<b>58</b>			



**Table 3.6b**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 6b: Technical Capacity Strengthened through Workshops, Research, and/or Training Activities**

Category	Types of Support Provided (Enter the number of Training/TA activities for each category)		List the Activities that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
	Training	Technical Assistance			
<b>Example: Use of renewable energy technologies</b>	1	3	Developed sustainable markets for renewable energy technologies. Over 200 renewable energy systems installed. Training for utilities, government officials, NGOs. Study on renewable energy applications completed.	2.4	CN-577-92
<b>Improved demand-side management or integrated resource planning</b>		3	<b>Bangladesh:</b> support for participation in workshop on Least Cost Planning for Electrical Utilities. <b>Nepal:</b> workshop for hotel owners, maintenance chief engineers, and property managers in Nepal to demonstrate that there can be significant energy conserv		
<b>Competitive energy markets that promote market-based energy prices, decrease fossil fuel subsidies, or allow open access to independent providers</b>		1	<b>Bangladesh:</b> study tour to U.S. and Canada on energy sector issues for 10 Bangladeshi environmental and energy journalists.	1	CN-238
<b>Installation of energy efficient or other greenhouse gas reducing technologies, including improved efficiencies in industrial processes</b>	6	18	<b>Regional:</b> technical workshop in Seoul in energy efficiency technologies and practices (such as energy auditing) for monitoring and reducing energy use in industry, including developing and financing successful energy efficient program; regional group st	1	CN-238



**Table 3.6b (continued)**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 6b: Technical Capacity Strengthened through Workshops, Research, and/or Training Activities**

Types of Support Provided (Enter the number of Training/TA activities for each category)		List the Activities that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Training	Technical Assistance			
Category		<p>environmentally beneficial buildings and industrial processes. <b>Indonesia:</b> study tour by Government of Indonesia representatives to the U.S. on efficient power plant operations. <b>Korea:</b> two-day training course on advanced energy auditing techniques for the Korea Energy Management Corp. (KEMCO) and Korean ESCOs; study tour to U.S. on energy efficiency and renewable energy in the U.S.; hands-on training by Sempra (a U.S. ESCO) for KEMCO and EPS Korea (a Korean ESCO) on energy auditing; professional exchange on waste-to-energy technology; <b>Malaysia:</b> Livestock Waste Management Training course with the Malaysian Department of Veterinary Services (DVS) for Malaysian swine raisers on effective swine waste management techniques, and to assist DVS to identify appropriate US swine waste management practices and technologies. <b>Nepal:</b> professional exchange on environmental management systems and waste minimization on the automotive sector (an energy-intensive industry). <b>Philippines:</b> training on solvent recovery techniques;</p> <p>study exchange between the Solid Waste Association of North America (SWANA) and the Solid Waste Association of the Philippines (SWAP) to develop a relationship between them that will building technical capability in SWAP; support for an Energy Performance Contracting Technical Workshop in the Philippines; series of workshops and a technology demonstration at Laguna Technopark on recovering multiple solvents, wastewater reuse, and waste minimization. <b>Thailand</b> and the <b>Philippines:</b> Industrial estate managers trained on how to use EPA'S Eco-Industrial Estates Software to increase resource efficiency and reduce waste by applying the industrial ecology concept. <b>Singapore:</b> workshop to reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) from the petrochemical industry [VOCs convert in the atmosphere to carbon dioxide]; workshop on energy management to highlight the latest US technologies in energy saving devices and energy efficiency; support to the Singapore Productivity Standards Board workshop on Waste Minimization for the Precision Engineering Industry.</p> <p><b>Vietnam:</b> exchange of responsible officials at the Ho Chi Minh City Department of Science, Technology and Environment (DoSTE) to see, compare and learn from experiences of a similar program in the Philippines.</p>		
Use of renewable energy technologies			1	CN-238



**Table 3.6b (continued)**

**Result 3: Reduced Net Greenhouse Gas Emissions from the Energy Sector, Industry and Urban Areas**

**Indicator 6b: Technical Capacity Strengthened through Workshops, Research, and/or Training Activities**

Types of Support Provided (Enter the number of Training/TA activities for each category)					
Category	Training	Technical Assistance	List the Activities that Contribute to Each Capacity Building Category	SO Number for Activity	CN/TN Number for Activity
Use of cleaner fossil fuels (cleaner coal or natural gas)		1	Korea: Professional exchange from the U.S. to Korea on a clean coal technology that produces natural gas from dirty coal.		
Introduction of cleaner modes of transportation and efficient transportation systems	2	2	<b>Regional:</b> study tour to California on Environmental Technology and Management of Mobile Air Emissions on U.S. strategies for technology and management options for improved air quality and increased energy efficiency in urban transportation; training on v		
Use of cogeneration					
Other (describe)					
Other					
<b>Total number of points for Training/Technical Assistance:</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25</b>			



---

## D. Success Stories

### 1. The Unleaded Gasoline Campaign

Over the past several years the US-AEP has been successfully working with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Asian Development Bank (ADB), the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (TDA), the World Bank and Asian governments on a regional air quality improvement campaign, beginning with the phasing out of lead from gasoline as a critical first step. Leaded gasoline is one of the leading causes of serious health and intellectual growth problems among people in Asia, and studies have shown that Asian children are the most vulnerable victims of leaded gas emissions, with significant effects on their motor and intellectual skills.

The initial success in eliminating leaded gasoline was in the Philippines. The US-AEP and its partners were instrumental in drafting the country's Clean Air Act of 1999, which mandated the elimination of leaded gasoline in the country by the end of 2000. In 1999 they hosted a workshop to promote a "Public Awareness Campaign for Eliminating Leaded Gasoline," to support implementation of the Clean Air Act. The law became effective on November 16, 2000 with the signing of Implementing Rules and Regulations that the US-AEP and its partners helped draft.

*Leaded gasoline was actually phased out in Metro Manila on April 1, 2000, eight months sooner than the law required. The phase out in all of the Philippines was completed by January 1, 2001.*

Building on their success in the Philippines, the US-AEP, EPA and the World Bank started working with the Government of Vietnam on a program to also eliminate leaded gasoline throughout that country. The US-AEP sponsored a workshop on "Phasing Out Leaded Gasoline in Vietnam." The EPA arranged for Vietnamese officials to meet with their counterparts in the Thai Pollution Control Department to study Bangkok's program to promote alternative fuels and eliminate leaded fuel. As a result of the workshop and exchanges the Government of Vietnam has accelerated the phase-out of leaded gas throughout the country. A directive that mandates the phase-out by July 1, 2001 was drafted with US-AEP assistance and signed by Vietnam's Prime Minister, and a public outreach campaign to support the phase-out has been launched. The US-AEP staff in Vietnam is currently working with the Government to meet the deadline.

Last year the US-AEP and ten other major donors launched a campaign in Indonesia to improve the overall level of air quality starting with the elimination of leaded gasoline. The US-AEP co-hosted a donor conference in Jakarta in June of 2000 focusing on "International Sustainable Transport and Clean Air." The conference effectively launched an effort to phase-out leaded gas throughout the country. It was a prime factor in the Government's directive to eliminate leaded gas in Jakarta and its suburbs (with a population of 23 million) by July 1 of 2001. This year the US-AEP is supporting a project involving EPA and U.S. Centers for Disease Control to collect and present data that shows how leaded gasoline is undermining the health of all Indonesians, especially children. The project is aimed at the total elimination of leaded gas in Indonesia.

Removal of lead from gasoline is not only important for children's health, but also necessary for adequate functioning of catalytic converters, and, therefore, an important first step for additional efforts to lower vehicular emissions. US-AEP regional efforts to improve air quality in Asia also includes promotion of Green Fleets in Thailand. The alternative fuels program in Thailand is likewise supported by US-AEP partners. The EPA works with the Bangkok Metropolitan Authority and private companies in Bangkok to assist them in "greening their fleets" and



---

reducing harmful fuel emissions. The City and County of Denver are also working on this project through a US-AEP grant.

The US-AEP's next target country for the Green Fleets Program is India. Drawing on lessons learned from its US-AEP-supported work in Thailand, the EPA is launching a Green Fleets Program in India in 2001 to focus on alternative fuels for the vehicle fleets in India's major cities, namely Delhi, Chennai, Mumbai, and Calcutta.



---

## 2. The Involvement of U.S. States and Cities

One of the US-AEP's most notable achievements has been its success in engaging the U.S. states, counties, and cities in its programs in Asia. Both sides benefit substantially from these partnerships. The US-AEP is able to draw on considerable human and financial resources of its domestic partners in transferring U.S. environmental technology to Asia. The American public sector and not-for-profit institutions gain valuable international experience and new insights into how to tackle environmental problems at home, while the U.S. private sector firms gain access to new markets and business opportunities in Asia.

The US-AEP's engagement with public and private sector entities in the U.S. is based on its collaboration with four domestic partners: the National Association of State Development Agencies (NASDA), the Council of State Governments (CSG), U.S. International City/County Management Association (ICMA), and the State Legislative Leadership Foundation. In FY 2000:

- A total of 272 U.S. institutions were engaged in various US-AEP-supported exchanges, trade missions, trade shows, trainings, pilot demonstrations, workshops, seminars and the like, many of them funded by NASDA grants. Of the total, 197 institutions *hosted* one or more such activities involving visitors from Asia. They included the *city* governments of: Berkeley, Portland, San Diego, Albany, San Francisco, Sacramento, Baltimore, Chicago, Sunnyvale and Mountain View (CA), Long Beach, Denver, and Los Angeles (plus another dozen *county* government offices). Seventy-five U.S. institutions *participated* in the US-AEP activities, usually working in Asia. They included a host of academic institutions including the state universities of Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Florida, Virginia, and Washington.
- Fifteen consortia of public and private sector institutions of American states were engaged in implementing environmental projects with counterpart institutions in Asia, most of them by grants from the US-AEP's State Environmental Initiative managed by the CSG. These included city/state partnerships between: Portland, Oregon and Rayong, Thailand; separate partnerships between various Indian institutions and U.S. consortia from California, Kentucky, and New Mexico; 3 partnerships between Thai institutions and U.S. consortia from Hawaii, Minnesota, and New Jersey; 6 partnerships between Philippine groups and U.S. consortia from Arizona, California, Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, and Washington; and 2 partnerships between Colorado/Nepal and Vermont/Indonesia.
- To illustrate just one example of the U.S. state institutions that make up a consortium, the Thailand/Minnesota partnership involves: Applied Quality Systems; Environmental Industry Association of Minnesota; Global Resources Associates; Minnesota Office of Environmental Assistance; Minnesota Pollution Control Agency; Minnesota Technology, Inc.; Minnesota Trade Office; Minnesota World Trade Corporation; U.S. Export Assistance Center – Minneapolis; and the University of Minnesota's Freeman Center for International Trade and Economic Policy.

By the end of FY 2000 more than 400 mostly small and medium-sized American companies had received US-AEP assistance, primarily through matching grants from NASDA, to gain access to the environmental market in 15 Asian countries. Many of these companies, *from 46 different states*, were thus enabled to do business in Asia and to affect a significant transfer of American



---

environmental technology to Asia. The dollar value of their confirmed sales since the start of the US-AEP program in 1992 is \$1.3 billion. Estimates on the value of the sales that these companies have *not* reported to the US-AEP range as high as \$500 million.



---

### 3. Women in Development

An increasing number of Asian women are impacted by the US-AEP through their participation in workshops, training, exchanges, trade shows, trade missions, and study tours organized by various partners. A growing number of US-AEP projects are targeting women and stressing their role in addressing environmental problems that affect community health. For example, in FY 2000:

- The Women's Institutions for Local Development (WILD) project in Indonesia (jointly funded by the US-AEP and USAID/Jakarta) strengthened the capacity of 25 women's institutions in central Java, Sumatra, and Banjarmasin through a training program that taught hundreds of women how to spread information on the use of clean water for sanitation and health in the home.
- The US-AEP Office of Technology Cooperation in Seoul collaborated with the Korean Women's Development Institute in a gender initiative that emphasized the role of women in health and environmental issues.
- In India, more than 100 women working in care facilities in Tamil Nadu and another 30 working in care facilities in Andhra Pradesh were trained in bio-medical waste treatment and disposal in workshops organized by the US-AEP Office of Technology Cooperation in Chennai.

New US-AEP activities in FY 2001 that target women include:

- A project with USAID in the Indian city of Thiruvananthapuram, entitled *Making Cities Work*, that focuses on increased women's participation in urban development.
- A *Women in Development* activity in Singapore that aims at making women more environmentally conscious and willing to serve as a role model in addressing urban environmental issues.
- An urban infrastructure project in Calcutta, entitled *Solid Waste Management by Addressing Women's Issues*.

An increasing number of public institutions and NGOs in Asia with which the US-AEP has established a supportive partnership relationship are led by women. A representative list of women in key policy-making positions in Asian environmental institutions includes the following: the Director of the Environmental Resources Center in Mumbai; the President of the Environmental Engineers Association of Thailand; the Director of the Water Quality Division of the Ministry of Science, Technology and the Environment of Thailand; the Deputy Director of the Environmental Research Institute at Bangkok's Chulalongkorn University, who also serves as the Coordinator of GIN/Asia; Hong Kong's Secretary of Environment and Food and the heads of the Civic Exchange, Friends of the Environment, and Sustainability Forum in Hong Kong; the heads of the Pollution Prevention Roundtable, Business for the Environment, and the Solid Waste Management Association, in the Philippines.