

# PLANNING

**Thomas E. Naughten**

*Director of USOM to Thailand*

I am honored to be invited to contribute an article to this very fine professional publication, the first of its kind in Thailand. The United States Operations Mission to Thailand's assistance in the establishment of the Institute of Public Administration indicates its deep and continuous interest in the field of public administration.

Of particular interest to me, and a subject on which I'm sure we have all read widely, is the basic need to establish the necessary administrative processes and institutions required in providing newly demanded public services in support of the economic development of a country. Elements of the problem are a shortage of the "Three M's"; that is, materials, money and properly trained men. The process, usually deficient, which is basic to the application of the "Three M's" is planning.

To some extent the presence or lack of planning is a cultural characteristic; hence it must be viewed in this broader context. As a process, however, it pervades all government activities, at all levels. Planning must be done by the Section Chief with regard to the operations of his section. And it must be done at the highest level of government by a planning office concerned with development of an economic blueprint for the country.

For example, a nation's budget is a plan designed to carry out the Government's programs at a definite cost for a set period of time (usually a year). The cost involved is determined by analyzing availabilities and requirements in terms of the

---

"*Three M's*" which after all are the tools the budget is designed to provide for implementation of the government's programs.

It is my observation that much of the literature in public administration deals with the organics of the subject matter, i.e., principles of organization, theory of budgeting, etc. I should like to take a different approach in order to illustrate the importance of the planning process.

I, as Director of USOM to Thailand, am a manager, directing a variety of offices and divisions in varied subject matter fields, all of which must be coordinated and related to produce the end results for which USOM as an organization exists.

I, as Manager, must periodically ask and examine the following questions:

1. What is to be done?

What are the objectives and specific goals to be reached? What is the planning to accomplish these?

2. How will the work be done?

Techniques and procedures which will be required to carry out the operations must be identified.

3. What will the work be done with?

What materials, facilities and money are available and required to carry out the work in the optimum magnitude? How can we meet the short fall often existing between availabilities and requirements?

4. How to divide the work?

This raises the question of available manpower, proper organization, etc., and how to distribute responsibilities within the limitations of availabilities.

5. When will the work be done?

A time schedule based on establishment of priorities for the different elements of the total task must be fixed.

---

**6. How well should the work be done?**

What standards of quality of performance should be set in order to enable comparison of actual with expected performance?

**7. How well IS the work being done?**

This is the evaluation, the follow-up to compare quality standards with objectives as projected in a time schedule.

Thus, the 7 steps listed above can be simply summarized by stating they constitute a conscious process of selecting and developing the best courses of action to accomplish objectives. More specifically, in terms of practical government administration, the clear assignment of responsibility for the planning of any given project is paramount. Then, in order to insure the most effective use of the resources of the Government, there must be a clear cut assignment of functions which implement the planning which I maintain is prerequisite to implementation.

For example: A Ministry of Education should have primary responsibility for the initial planning of education projects. To permit various other line agencies to build schools and supply educational instruction for the children of their employees, outside the context of an agreed-to national program, contravenes planning discipline and can be wasteful of expenditures, through duplication and otherwise.

Once the assignment of the responsibility for the planning of a project is determined, usually at the departmental level, and reviewed at the ministry level within its own terms of reference, the planned project should then come within the purview of the national economic planning agency of the country, which should have the responsibility for developing a long-range comprehensive plan for economic and social development. This process of long-range planning must include the review of the various planned projects of the various ministries and the fixing of priorities

---

among the projects presented. The establishment of priorities is vital to the most effective use of all resources.

In a parliamentary type government, the comprehensive national plan must be approved by the Cabinet of Ministers and the National Assembly. In cases where a ministry does not agree with the recommendations of the national planning agency, this is resolved at the Cabinet level, in which case the planning which has gone into the preparation of the various projects should have produced sufficient information on which a resolution may be made by the Cabinet.

The national plan, as finally adopted by the government, cannot be considered a rigid and inflexible document. Economic, social and political in any country change periodically. Thus, adjustments in scope, timing, etc. must be made.

I have already mentioned that a shortage of managerial skills hinders economic development. Equally important as an inhibitive factor is the lack of capital formation necessary for an increase in the per capita income growth, with its resultant impact on socio-living standards. A major factor in the accelerated industrial development of the United States was the influx of foreign capital and technical personnel, primarily from Europe.

Such external capital, particularly in the form of loans but also in terms of investment capital, is forthcoming only if there has been a generous element of planning contained in developing any specific project. Without it, capital is not forthcoming.

Naturally, in view of my firm convictions as to the importance of the planning process, I welcomed the action taken last year by the Government of Thailand when it established the National Economic Development Board. Such world-wide lending institutions as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development the Inter-American Development Bank and the Development Loan Fund make their loans to a large extent on the basis of the quality of the loan justification, which is predetermined by the quality of project planning. As applied to Thailand, this requirement of the lending institutions

---

makes it all the more important that careful, balanced and mature planning be done in the preparation of loan applications.

External investment capital is vital to Thailand in its economic development, and particularly if Thailand wants to accelerate this growth in order to reach the self-sustaining era. I am convinced Thailand does want to accelerate its economic development. It is my opinion that one of the principal obstacles to be overcome by Thailand in its economic development program is the inadequacy of planning for capital projects.

I realize that this takes time. The development of a planning consciousness among the myriad economic development activities of any country requires an ever-increasing supply of trained administrators and managers thoroughly trained in the planning process as opposed to meeting at the moment unanticipated problems which would never have arisen had there been proper planning in the first place.

Fortunately, Thailand has a large number of well-trained people who can staff and implement planning programs. As in most countries, the basic dilemma is to institutionalize a framework to allow such personnel to work in an atmosphere which promotes the most productive efforts.

**ย่อเรื่อง**

บทความนี้เป็นบทความพิเศษของ **มร. ไชยยศ อ. นอร์เทม** ผู้อำนวยการองค์การบริหารวิเทศกิจแห่งประเทศไทย มีเนื้อความย่อๆ ดังนี้

ในการดำเนินการบริหารและจัดตั้งสถาบันเกี่ยวกับการบริหารให้สอดคล้องกับการพัฒนาเศรษฐกิจของประเทศนั้น ย่อมขึ้นอยู่กับปัจจัยสำคัญ ๓ ประการ คือ วัตถุประสงค์ เงิน และผู้ปฏิบัติงาน แต่การนำปัจจัยทั้งสามมาใช้โดยมากมักจะไม่ประสพผลสำเร็จเท่าที่ควร เนื่องจากยังไม่มีการวางแผนงานที่ถูกต้อง

ผู้เขียนกล่าวว่าการวางแผนงานนั้นเป็นหน้าที่ และความรับผิดชอบของเจ้าหน้าที่ผู้สูงสุดในหน่วยงานแต่ละหน่วย และในการวางแผนงานนั้น มีข้อสำคัญที่จะต้องพิจารณาดังอยู่ ๗ ข้อด้วยกันคือ จุดหมายที่ต้องการบรรลุถึง, วิธีการทำ, สิ่งที่ใช้ในการดำเนินงาน, การแบ่งงาน, กำหนดเวลา, มาตรฐานของงานที่วางไว้, และการประมาณผลงานที่ทำไป

ยิ่งในการบริหารงานของรัฐบาล การวางแผนงานจะยิ่งทวีความสำคัญมากขึ้น แผนงานของชาติไม่ควรจะเป็นแผนงานที่ตายตัว แต่ควรจะเป็นแผนงานที่สามารถเปลี่ยนแปลงปรับปรุงให้เข้ากับสถานการณ์ และเวลาได้

ในตอนท้าย ผู้เขียนกล่าวว่าการขาดการลงทุนซึ่งจะนำไปใช้เป็นเครื่องมือในการเพิ่มพูนรายได้ของประชกรนั้น เป็นเครื่องหน่วงเหนี่ยวการพัฒนาทางเศรษฐกิจของประเทศที่สำคัญเท่า ๆ กับการขาดความชำนาญการ สำหรับประเทศไทยนั้น เงินลงทุนจากต่างประเทศนับว่าเป็นปัจจัยสำคัญในการพัฒนาเศรษฐกิจ ตามทรรศนะของผู้เขียนเห็นว่าสิ่งที่เบียดเบียนต่อการดึงดูดการลงทุนจากต่างประเทศในขณะนี้คือ การขาดแผนงานที่เกี่ยวกับการใช้ทุนการแก้ไขข้อบกพร่องอันนี้ต้องใช้เวลานาน แต่ผู้เขียนหวังว่าประเทศไทยคงจะแก้ปัญหาให้ลุล่วงไปได้ เพราะว่ามีเรามีผู้มีความรู้ในด้านนี้ พอเพียงถ้าหากว่า จะสามารถให้ บุคคลเหล่านั้น ได้มีโอกาสใช้ความรู้ความสามารถของเขาอย่างเต็มที่

