

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

9310962 (6)

1. PROJECT NO. 931-11-995-962	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: 11/71 TO 4/73	3. COUNTRY Worldwide	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 73-3 4
----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------

5. PROJECT TITLE

Scientists and Engineers in Economic Development

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 72 Ends FY 74	7. DATE LATEST PROP 6/21/71	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
---	--------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 100,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 200,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$300,000
------------------	--	--	---

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

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
National Science Foundation	TA (NA) 6-72

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

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
AID/W	PROG	OFFICE		
X	X		(1) Concentrate focus of project in FY 74 (NSF and R. Goeckermann)	August 1973
X	X		(2) Program development to increase quality and quantity of proposals and improve responsiveness to LDC initiatives (NSF and R. Goeckermann)	December 1973
X			(3) Analysis of future course of concept revision of PROP (R. Goeckermann)	May 1974

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES

REVISED OR NEW:

PROP
  PIP
  PRO AG
  PIO/T
  PIO/C
  PIO/P

E. DATE OF NEXT REVIEW

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

Robert H. Goeckermann

*RHG*

MANAGER DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

Office Henry A. Arnold

5/1/73

*Henry A. Arnold*

CONTENT AND FORMAT OF TAB PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT

- I. Page 1 PAR Face Sheet, AID 1020-25 (10-70)
- II. Matrix (revised and/or updated as necessary)
- 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. See Issues Narrative

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      See Issues Narrative  
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. ? See Matrix

- a. Was actual performance less than planned target?

YES       NO      If <sup>yes</sup> no, explain.

? 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? Minor changes  
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?

- 
- C.6.a. (1) Interest of LDC institutions in participating in the program.

An adequate number of proposers obtained the necessary support of LDC institutions for their proposals in FY 72 and FY 73. There is no information on the number of potential proposers who were unable to elicit LDC interest. There is no information on any initiatives taken by LDC institutions to stimulate proposals.

- (2) Continuation of activity after departure from LDC of U.S. grantee.

There are several cases from FY 72 travel grantees' reports where on-going activities were allegedly stimulated. The FY 72 research teaching grantees have not yet departed from the host institutions. It is premature to attempt a statistical analysis of this indicator.

- (3) Continuation of long-term linkages.

It is premature to assess this indicator (see (2) above).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

# SCIENTISTS AND ENGINEERS IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

## Issues Narrative

This project was reviewed by a three-member panel consisting of Guy Baird (TA/AGR), Thomas Hazard (LA/DR), and Robert Goeckermann (TA/OST). A report of this review was presented to a Master Panel whose comments are included in this PAR.

(1) The project should be much more tightly focused to achieve a impact on this scale - e.g., restrict the number of countries and institutions; confine to LDC institution which received major AID assistance previously, restrict the professional fields for proposal etc. The contractor and project manager will study such possible restrictions for the FY 74 program.

(2) The project should better utilize USAID Mission knowledge of mental needs, elicit more LDC institutional interest, and be more sensitive to LDC initiatives. The contractor and project manager will take program development to evolve mechanisms for accomplishing the ends and stimulate program interest.

(3) The project should provide some follow-on to R/T grants to be the collaborative linkages. The contractor will investigate in FY the interest of selected FY 72 R/T grantees in travel back to their host institutions.

(4) The major issue is the future goal of this program concept on assumption the experimental phase is relatively successful. TA/OST will analyze this issue in the light of AID strategy and related projects in the revision of the PROP.

The panel considered that NSF had done an excellent job of program development, grant selection, and grant administration for an outstanding performance.