

1. PROJECT NO. 581	2. PAR FOR PERIOD 3/7/75 TO 4/20/76	3. COUNTRY Ethiopia	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 93/0581-2 PD-AA6-213-B1
5. PROJECT TITLE Transportation Planning		RAC Approval	

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 75 Ends FY 77	7. DATE LATEST PROP 2/21/74	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR 3/10/75
10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$252,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$190,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ 442,000

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)	
a. NAME Massachusetts Institute of Technology	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. Contract TA-c-1102

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

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID/W	HOST		
	MIT		1. Prepare and submit second annual progress report to TA/OST, SER/ENGR, and TA/RES by June 30, 1976.	
	TA/OST		2. In cooperation with MIT, prepare for final project review in April, 1977.	
	SER/ENGR		3. Arrange mutually convenient time during the summer of 1976 for briefing by Dr. Moavenzadeh and MIT colleagues of SER/ENGR staff on project results now immediately useful for road assessment	

D. RE-PLANNING REQUIRES						E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW	
REVISED OR NEW:	<input type="checkbox"/> PROP	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP	<input type="checkbox"/> PRO AG	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	
PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE John Fry 4/20/76				MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE Office Henry Arnold 4/20/76			

III. Standard/Key Questions

1. Are key inputs being supplied according to plan by AID, action agent, and cooperating countries? All, yes.
2. Are assumptions regarding supply of inputs still Valid? Yes.
3. Rate performance of action agent against plan. Excellent.
4. Is the management hypothesis that the totality of resources applied to the project will be sufficient to produce the predetermined outputs by the specified target dates still valid? Yes.
5. Is the approach or course of action originally selected, i.e., project design and/or methodology, still the most appropriate? Yes.
6. In regard to output indicators:
 - a. Was actual performance less than planned target? No.
 - b. What changes, if any, are necessary in outputs, output indicators, target dates, and assumptions? Minor changes have been made. No additional changes are needed at this time.
 - c. Do action agent's reports provide adequate progress data for monitoring and analysis? Yes.

IV. Narrative

The project was reviewed on April 20, 1976 by an informal evaluation panel consisting of Mr. Palmer Stearns, SER/ENGR; Mr. Ric Machmer, AFR/ESA; Mr. John Fry, TA/OST; and Dr. Michael Rechcigl, TA/RES meeting with Dr. Fred Moavenzadeh and colleagues of MIT. Mr. Robert Mills, TA/PPU, was invited to the meeting but could not attend.

The panel was pleased by progress in the research described by Professor Moavenzadeh and documented in the attached progress report. New actions to be taken are identified on the facesheet.

Attachment:

cc: Mr. Stearns, SER/ENGR
Dr. Rechcigl, TA/RES
Mr. Machmer, AFR/ESA
Mr. Mills, TA/PPU
Dr. Moavenzadeh, MIT.

TA/OST:JFRY:mhc:4/21/76