Outputs (continued)

tions between elements of the LDC infrastructure.

Best Available Document

PD-AAR-704
4/22

AID 1020/25 (10-70)

REPORT U-446

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD:	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
931-11-995-029	4/72 TO 5/73	Worldwide	73-1

5. PROJECT TITLE

Strengthening the Scientific and Technological Capabilities of the Developing Countries

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 70 Ends FY 75	7. DATE LATEST PROP 1/5/70	8. DATE LATEST PIP --	9. DATE PRIOR PAR --

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $ 1,765,000 (T.O.#1)	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $ 600,000 (T.O.#1)	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $

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

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
1. National Academy of Sciences	CSD/2584
2.	
3. Host Country (Worldwide)	

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

A. ACTION OFFICER (A. ACTION (X))	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
Robert Goeckerman TA/OST	**Re overall contract**	
NAS	(1) Prepare and issue new circular airgram describing contractor, program, potentials, etc., to (a) elicit greater Mission understanding and funding, and to (b) elicit greater LDC awareness (through Missions) of program and benefits.	1 Aug 1973
NAS	(2) Contractor should expand LDC and Mission awareness through a series of mini-studies done in selected LDC's to illuminate the level and nature of the S&T contribution in various sectors. In LDCs where NAS has had previous activity, the studies should include an evaluative component.	1 Nov 1973
NAS	(3) Initiate work on new proposal for Basic Ordering Agmt. (contractor)	1 January 1974
	Re Task Order #1	
NAS	(1) Prepare and submit new proposal for next (FY74) funding cycle (estimated $560,000/9mos., beginning 1 October 1973) (contractor)	1 Jul 1973
Robert Goeckerman SER/CM/COD/TAB	(2) PIOT preparation and submission for next funding cycle.	1 Aug 1973
	(3) Amend contract as required, and fund next cycle.	30 Sep 1973
	Other	
	AID/W and the Academy should arrive at a realistic time frame for its report production, number of reports to be distributed worldwide, and mechanism for distribution and publicity that would best encourage utilization, and amend the contract accordingly.	
	Regional workshops should be used infrequently, with limited, relevant subject matter, and geographical participation, with careful attention to participants.	

D. REPLANNING REQUIRED

REVISED OR NEW: [X] PROP [ ] PIP [ ] PRO AG [X] PIO/T [ ] PIO/C [ ] PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW

PROJECT MANAGER TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE	MISSION DIRECTOR TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
Wm. H. Littlewood 5/14/73	H. Arnold 5/14/73

level and interests, and with built-in follow-up activities designed to encourage utilization of conclusions and recommendations.

The Academy should more carefully select topics and approach special studies (e.g. what special studies do LDC's desire?) insuring maximum relevancy to real problems. Bilateral workshop activities may take precedence over special studies if funds become short. (This may require contractual amendment). Studies should include a sector on ways of utilizing or encouraging utilization of the studies' conclusions and recommendations.

The innovation program should be continued, with more attention on developing realistic mechanisms to encourage utilization.

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?

[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:

[ ] Outstanding [x] 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. 7/

a. Was actual performance less than planned target?

[ ] YES [x] 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?

Are they reflected in attached matrix?

[x] 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?

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

D. 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)?

E. Program Goal

11. Give statement or programming goal--if different from attached matrix--and/or key problem area addressed.

Is it same as in PROP?

☐ YES ☐ NO

12. Does achievement of project purpose--in relation to other sector or KPA activity--still have the same priority and significance in contributing to the programming goal?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Cite evidence or justification or explain change.

13. Are assumptions for achieving goal and measures of goal achievement still valid?

☐ YES ☐ NO If no, what changes are necessary?

Are they reflected in attached matrix?

☐ YES ☐ NO

14. If appropriate, comment on project interactions with (a) other interregional, regional or mission GTS projects; (b) 211(d) institutional grants; (c) interregional or mission research projects; and (d) other U.S. Government agencies.

STRENGTHENING THE SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL CAPABILITIES OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (NAS/NAE)

ISSUES NARRATIVE

This project was reviewed by a three member panel consisting of Dr. Kenneth McDermott (TA/RUR), Mr. Alan Jacobs (SA/TCD), and Mr. William H. Littlewood (TA/OST) on May 1, 1973, and by a Master Panel on May 3, 1973, and later at a review at Cornell University, May 7-10, 1973, in a broader context.

As the bilateral workshop program under the Academy concract had been reviewed in April, 1972, this review focused on (A) regional workshops, (B) special studies, and (C) innovative technology studies.

Concept, Methodology and Status

(A) A description of the regional activities is attached (#1). In addition, the panel had reports of interviews with a developing country participant for the Singapore workshop, and mission director for Central America.

(B) A listing and progress report of the special studies is attached (#2).

(C) A brief description of the innovation program is attached (#3).

Issues Discussed

(A) The timing, broadness of subject matter, level and quality of participation, relevance of subject matter of LDC situation, lack of follow-up, Mission relationship, and ultimate impact were the primary issues discussed, as problems were noted in these areas. On the other hand, an AID-funded follow-up study in Central America, and the publication of selected papers from the Singapore workshop were noted. The Guyana workshop was of a different nature, and although just completed, its impacts appear impressive already.

(B) The problem of late reports (sometimes 1 year), report distribution, selection of subjects, impact and its measurement, awareness in AID and LDC's of the Academy's capability for such studies, financial problems, and follow-up activity were discussed.

(C) This specialized series of special studies was discussed with respect to its innovative quality, relative cost, report delay, spin-off of articles in CERES (FAO magazine) its special "operational" characteristic, present and future impact, and follow-up activities.

Assessment and Recommendations

(A) The Panel and the Academy shared doubts as to the relative value of broad, regional workshops when compared to bilateral workshops, or more precise, regional workshops. The recommendation was that they should be used infrequently, and only when the subject matter clearly called for regional participation and potential collaboration. The subject and the participants should be carefully chosen, and follow-up activities and funding should be included in early planning. The Guyana workshop activity may prove a better model.

(B) The Panel felt the topics and approach for special studies should be more carefully selected, and that more public relations work and follow-up activity was required to accelerate widespread utilization of recommendations. The panel agreed that until more money was available this activity should not have new starts. The Cornell review suggested, however, a study on science policy methodology would be useful. In general, studies should flow from real problems, and not a "solution looking for a problem". Report production should be accelerated as much as possible.

(C) The Panel felt this program was particularly attractive in concept, as long as the topic responded to a real need, and an "operational" aspect could be held, perhaps as a follow-up activity, to assist utilization. Again, report production should be accelerated, and more attention given to distribution worldwide, especially developing practical mechanisms and activities which encourage utilization. The Academy should not take cover under its "advisory role", but should recognize that "advice" has little meaning unless utilized.

5/15/73 Wm. H. Littlewood, TA/OST

KPA Science and Technology Institutional Dev.

Project No. 029 Title Strengthening Science and Technology Capabilities

Contract/PASA No. csd-2584 Name National Academy of Sciences T.O. #1

Project Officer R. Goeckermann Extension 27971

Worldwide Technical Assistance and Research

FY 1975/76 Technical Assistance Bureau Program Submission
Project and Budget Analysis Matrix

Major Country/Countries
Worldwide

KPA No. 19-1907

Obligation: Initial FY 1970 Final FY 1975

Service : Start FY 1971 End FY 1976

RAC/PROP Status: Project approved thru FY 1974*
Section 211(d): Project approved thru FY 19
Evaluation Scheduled 11 (Month) 74 (Year) C (Type)

* Project extension thru FY 75 requested 5/10/74.

On-Going Only

Narrative

B1 PURPOSE:

1. Stimulate more effective ordering of research priorities upling of science with development, preparing and using scientific personnel and organizing scientific and technology efforts. 2. Develop framework and impetus for more effective mobilization of US scientific and engineering talent in foreign assistance efforts. 3. Identify opportunities for technological innovation in LDCs. 4. Develop specific project opportunities for LDC and AID consideration.

C1 OUTPUTS:

1. More effective use of limited LDC technical resources. 2. Increased LDC understanding of technological opportunities, payoff from science in development, and barriers to applying science to development problems. 3. Methodologies and techniques for increasing effectiveness of science infrastructure in LDCs. 4. Technical reports on specific technologies and other subjects of interest to many LDCs. 5. Improved communications between elements of the LDC infrastructure.

D1 INPUTS:

1. Qualified technical staff and contributed services of US expert panels and boards.
2. Contributions of NAS/NAE committees.
3. Matching contributions of counterpart organizations in LDCs--contributions are both substantive and financial.
4. Contributions of individual experts throughout the US and developed and developing countries.

Objectively Verifiable Indicators

B2 End of Project Status:

1. LDC recognition of the importance of more deliberate and structured efforts to incorporate science and technology into short and long term development planning. 2. Increased awareness among development planners of the approaches to science and technology that offer the highest promise of economic payoff. 3. Increased responsiveness of LDC scientists to development needs. 4. Improved congruence of research objectives and development objectives in LDCs.

C2 Output Indicators:

1. LDC contribution to NAS activities. 2. LDC adoption of workshop recommendations. 3. Specific follow-on projects attributable to workshops, studies, etc. 4. LDC adoption of innovative uses of technology identified by NAS. 5. Changes in LDC budget priorities research policies, and organizational arrangements. 6. LDC interest in NAS reports.

B3 Progress to Date:

Five LDCs have changed budget and research priorities, five have created new national science organizations and three have included recommendations in national development plans as a result of workshop programs.

C3 Progress to Date:

1. LDCs sharing costs of joint activities (workshops, study groups) in all cases.
2. On average approximately one-half of major workshop recommendations are being implemented.
3. In majority of countries substantial specific follow-on projects have resulted from workshops/studies.
4. NAS identification of innovative uses of technology has aroused great LDC interest but it is too early to evaluate the impact.
5. NAS continues to receive requests from LDCs for technical reports issued under this program.

D2 Budget Summary (in thousands of dollars)

All Prior Year	(1) Personnel Dollars	(2) MM	(3) Commodities	(4) Other Costs	(5) Total	(6)** Expenditures	(7) June 30 Pipeline	(8) Funding Period Month	Year
1. Thru FY 1973					2,462	2,063	399 ***		
2. Actual FY 1974	345	215		480	825	833	369 ***	9	74
3. Estimated FY 1975	345	215		480	825	950	264 ***	9	75
4. Proposed FY 1976**					875	875	264 ***	9	76
5. All other						264	0		
6. Total					$4,985	$4,985			

** Estimate

*** Expenditure year for NAS runs from Oct. 1 to Sept. 30--therefore pipeline at June 30 is larger than usual.

**Expenditures are to be computed on an accrual basis.

7/23/74

28

48