

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

931093L (5)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|
| 1. PROJECT NO. 720-936 | 2. PAR FOR PERIOD 10/1/72 TO 9/30/73 | 3. COUNTRY NA | 4. PAR SERIAL NO. NA <i>37</i> |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|--|

PD-AAC-985-F1

Agricultural Management

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 71 Ends FY 76? | 7. DATE LATEST PROP 1971 | 8. DATE LATEST PIP ----- | 9. DATE PRIOR PAR NA |
|--|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|

| | | | |
|------------------|--|--|---|
| 10. U.S. FUNDING | a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 595M | b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 155M | c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ 600M? |
|------------------|--|--|---|

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

| a. NAME | b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Harvard Business School | AID/csd-3153 |
| | |
| | |

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

| A. ACTION (X) | B. LIST OF ACTIONS | C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE |
|---|---|--|
| AA XXXX AID/W XXXX Other | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub-contract- HBS/SEARCA 2. Abstract-Contractors Report 3. Action Plan- draft 4. PIO/T 5. L.A. Seminar- Agenda 6. Publication Version-Contractors Report 7. Short- Course Training Plan (draft) 8. Network-Conceptual Design 9. International Institute-Conceptual Design 10. PROP (revision) | <p>11/30/73 10/30/73 11/30/73 11/30/73 1/1/74 1/1/74 3/15/74 3/31/74 5/30/74 6/30/74</p> |

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

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW: **10/1/73**

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE **G. F. Horne**

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE **Office Jack Koteen** *GR October 3, 1973*

TAB Project Appraisal Report

III. 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?

YES NO If no, explain.

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

YES NO If no, explain.

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

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?

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?

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. 7/

- a. Was actual performance less than planned target?

YES NO If no, explain.

7/ 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? NA

Are they reflected in attached matrix?

 YES NO

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

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