9810149 (5)
PD-AAL-595-G1

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD	COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
931-11-995-149-73	May 1974 TO May 15, 1975	Worldwide	

3. PROJECT TITLE

211(d) Grant: Employment Generation Through Stimulation of Small Industry

(4p)

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 73 Ends FY 78	7. DATE LATEST PROP 1972	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR 5/15/74 18th mo review

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $800,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $0	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $ 0

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
Georgia Institute of Technology	Grant AID/CM/ta/G-73-18

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X) USAID	AID/W	HOST	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
			None	

D. IF PLANNING REQUIRES REVISED OR NEW: ☐ PROP ☐ PIP ☐ PRO AG ☐ PIO/T ☐ PIO/C ☐ PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW N.A.

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
William H. Littlewood, TA/OST May 15, 1975

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
N.A.

148

Standard/Key Questions

A. Project Inputs

1. Are key inputs being supplied according to plan by: (a) AID, (b) action agent, (c) cooperating countries, (d) multilateral organizations, and/or (e) other donors?

[X] YES [ ] NO If no, explain.

2. Are assumptions regarding the supply of inputs still valid?

[X] YES [ ] NO If no, explain.

3. Rate performance of action agent(s) against plan:

[X] Outstanding [ ] Satisfactory [ ] Unsatisfactory

Comment on key factors determining rating.

B. Transformation of Inputs into Outputs

4. Given the answers above, i.e., progress to date in supplying inputs, changes in assumptions, etc., is the management hypothesis that the totality of the resources applied to the project will be sufficient to produce the predetermined outputs by the specified target dates still valid?

[X] YES [ ] NO If no, explain.

5. Is the approach or course of action originally selected, i.e., project design and/or methodology, still the most appropriate?

[X] YES [ ] NO If no, what changes need to be made in either inputs, workplans and/or output expectations?

C. Project Outputs

6. List the output indicators, their planned targets, and the actual performance achieved for each during the period under review. 2/ See Matrix

a. Was actual performance less than planned target?

[ ] YES [X] NO If no, explain.

Performance equal to planned target.

2/ For this and any other questions or statements, if adequate, reference may be made to the project matrix, issues narrative, action agent's report, worksheets, or any other attached or readily available documentation.

b. What changes, if any are necessary in outputs, output indicators, target dates, and assumptions?

None

Are they reflected in attached matrix?

☒ YES ☐ NO

c. Do action agent's reports provide adequate progress data for monitoring and analysis?

☒ YES ☐ NO If no, what action will be taken to correct situation?

NOTE: At the discretion of the Office Director, the following questions may be omitted in an informal (Option A) evaluation.

Omitted

-. Project Purpose

7. Give statement of purpose as currently conceived if different from attached matrix.

a. Is it same as in PROP?

☐ YES ☐ NO

b. Same or consistent with contract/PASA/grant?

☐ YES ☐ NO

8. List conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved--if different from those in attached matrix--or at any other particular point in project implementation and cite or refer to evidence to date of progress towards conditions (EOPS).

9. Are critical assumptions for achieving purpose still valid?

☐ YES ☐ NO If no, explain.

10. Is the development hypothesis that the aggregate production of outputs will lead to the creation of a set of conditions at the end of project, i.e., achievement of project purpose still valid?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Is the rationale as stated in the PROP still sound.

☐ YES ☐ NO

If answer to either question above is negative, what changes are necessary (e.g., redesign, extend or terminate project, increase amount of inputs or production rate, change action agent)?

150

151

Activity Appropriate Industrial Technology
Project No. _____ Title: Employment Through Small Industry (Ga Tech)

Project Manager H. Arnold Extension 28937
Contractor/P.A. Ga. Tech Contractor No. _____
Contract PASA _____ Extension _____

* tentative

RESEARCH AND SECTION 211(d)

FY 1974 Interregional Program Budget Review
Project and Budget Analysis Matrix

Major Country/Countries
Kenya, Paraguay, Indonesia (tentative)

Obligations: Begin 19 73 End FY 1973
Work Begin 19 73 End FY 1977
Approval Status RIGC Approved Thru FY 19
RAC Approved Thru FY 19
RAC Approval Required FY 19
Estimated Submission Date Sept. 1972
Evaluation Schedule month year

Narrative

A1 PURPOSE: To develop multidisciplinary capability in technical assistance, research, education, and training at a US university directed to the contribution of intermediate technologies to increasing employment opportunities while raising overall national productivity. Particular emphasis will be placed on the analytical and technological basis for more effectively employing the labor, capital, and natural resource endowments of developing countries in manufacturing processes and subprocesses and in transportation and construction activities.

C1 OUTPUTS Improved understanding and application of: (1) methods for assessing direct and indirect impact on employment of introduction of specific types of technologies, including US-LDC case studies; (2) techniques for identifying those aspects of manufacturing, construction, and transportation activities which are susceptible to labor/capital tradeoffs and impact of tradeoffs on economic viability and quality of activity (e.g., assembly of electrical machinery, packaging, public works, cargo handling); (3) technological innovations which can stimulate employment pockets in rural areas; (4) technological opportunities to enhance the capability & employability of unskilled labor force; (5) modifications in plant process, and product design which enhance commercial viability of manufacturing processes in areas of high unemployment; and (6) technologies for increasing value added locally to natural products (e.g., woods, ceramics, fibers, leather).

D1 INPUTS (1) 211(d) funds which support: (a) graduate courses directed to optimal use of labor, capital, and natural resource endowments; (b) resource materials & documentation of methodologies & experiences of US, LDCs, other donors, and international organizations; (c) fellowships supporting collaborative US-LDC research, (d) linkages with 4 LDC counterpart institutions; (e) staff development. (2) Matching contribution from university and LDC institutions. (3) Technical assistance contracts and research grants from development agencies.

Objectively Verifiable Indicators

B2 End of Project Status:
(1) A significantly expanded US institutional capability which is providing high quality services and new knowledge of major benefit to LDCs.
(2) The US link in the growing international network of institutions--in the LDCs and in the donor--concerned with intermediate technology.
(3) The employment oriented link in the US network of universities concerned with more effective application of science and technology to development.

C2 Output Indicators:
(1) Extent to which university is meaningfully involved in development activities.
(2) Impact of university activities on LDC planning and projects.
(3) Extent of US and LDC specialist participation.
(4) Impact of program on activities of international network of organizations concerned with intermediate technology.
(5) Impact of program on activities of other US organizations concerned with intermediate technology.

Important Assumptions and Progress to Date

B3 Assumptions
(1) The labor/technology equation will remain of priority concern.
(2) US engineering, industrial analysis, entrepreneurial, extension, and economic skills can be more effectively harnessed.
(3) There will be opportunities for US inputs--either bilaterally or through multilateral organizations--that can significantly influence LDC actions.

C3 Progress to Date:
(1) Preliminary survey of candidate US institutions conducted.
(2) Discussions held with UNIDO, NAS and other organizations with expertise in this field.
(3) NAS literature search and panel on this topic underway.
(4) Preliminary AID interbureau discussions being held.
(5) Informal consultations with other donors and Georgia Tech.

D.2 Budget Summary (in thousands of dollars)

	(1) Personnel Dollars	(2) Personnel MM	(3) Participants Dollars	(4) Participants MM	(5) Commodities	(6) Other Costs	(7) Total	(8) Expenditures	(9) [illegible]	Terminal [illegible]
All Prior Years Thru FY 1971										
Actual FY 1972										
Estimated FY 1973										
Proposed FY 1974							800			
All Other										
Total							800			

*Expenditures [illegible] to [illegible]