

20-APP-111
1979-1983

TEAM EVALUATION REPORT

The Latin American and Caribbean
Agricultural Planning and Policy Analysis
Project (LACPLAN)

931-0236.07

Interamerican Institute of Agricultural Sciences
Iowa State University
Michigan State University

San Jose, Costa Rica July 19-21, 1979
Washington, DC July 26, 1979

Team Members:

Virginia Perelli, AID/CM/COD
William Goodwin, AID/LAC/DR/RD
Boyd Wennergren, Utah State University

Project Manager:

Rex D. Rehnberg, AID/DS/AGR/ESP

- 1 -

PROJECT BACKGROUND

- A. Expanded Program
- B. LACPLAN Project Within the Expanded Program
- C. Implementation Plan
- D. Roles and Strategies of the Contracted Parties
- E. Objectives, Activities and Outputs
- F. Methodology and Activities of Evaluation Team

II. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

- A. Project Design Strengths and Weaknesses
 - 1. Strengths
 - a. Regional Impact
 - b. Programmatic Design
 - 2. Weaknesses
 - a. Coordination and Collaboration of Contract Groups
Invalidity of pre-project
 - b. Assumptions
 - c. Scopes of Work
- B. Financial Aspects
 - 1. Budget
 - 2. Expenditures
 - 3. Funds Remaining
- C. Project Management
 - 1. AID
 - 2. Contractor and Cooperating Institutions
- D. Progress Toward Completion of Activities and Outputs
(Years 1 and 2)
 - 1. Conceptual Framework
 - 2. General Surveys
 - 3. In-Depth Surveys
 - 4. Latin American Seminars
 - 5. Training Design and Development of Materials
 - 6. Assisting Country Analysis and Implementation
 - 7. Network Development and Operation
 - 8. Other Activities
 - 9. Level of Input Efforts

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. Project Leadership and Direction
 - 1. Contract Revision
 - 2. IICA Leadership Role
 - 3. Cooperators Role and Responsibilities
- B. Changes in Scopes of Work
 - 1. In Depth Assistance
 - 2. Training Materials
 - 3. Short Term Technical Assistance
 - 4. Restate Network Activity
 - 5. Extension of Completion Date
- C. Plans of Work - for Year 3
 - 1. Procedural
 - a. Planning Meeting
 - b. IICA Leadership
 - c. Consolidated Budget
 - 2. Content
 - a. Focus on Training
 - b. Training needs
- D. Overruns and Funding - for Phase II, Year 3.
- E. Continuation and Funding in Years 4 and 5

I. PROJECT BACKGROUND

A. The Expanded Program

The Expanded Program, which comes under the aegis of the Development Support Bureau, Office of Agriculture, Economics and Sector Planning, was created to provide a mechanism for developing and carrying out activities in the area of Agricultural Planning and Sector Analysis. The Program, which was approved in principle in December 1975, (see PP 931-0236) states as its goal, purpose and end-of-project results, the following:

Goal - The improvement of the performance and contribution of the agricultural and rural sectors in LDCs in achieving their overall economic and social development objectives.

Purpose - The expansion and strengthening of the capability of LDCs to identify and analyze the consequences of alternative policies, programs and projects for agricultural rural development in terms of their multiple economic and social goals.

End of Project Results - An improved information and analytical base for decision making on agricultural and rural development strategies, interventions, and investments; the increased capability of LDC personnel to evaluate the consequences of alternative policies, programs and projects, the establishment of linkages between organizational units and policy makers in LDCs and, lastly, the establishment of a joint AID-U.S. university system enabling U.S. professionals to collab-

orate with LDC personnel on a wide variety of country-specific, problem-oriented analyses involving different degrees of methodological sophistication and adapted to the needs and utilization possibilities within the LDCs.

The original PP 931-0236, which approved the Expanded Program in December 1975, authorized a level of funding in a not-to-exceed amount of \$5.3 million. In December 1978, approval was granted for its extension and the use of the funds therefor through September 30, 1979.

B. The Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning and Policy Analysis Project (LACPLAN) within the Expanded Program

The LACPLAN project was one of the very first to be implemented under the Expanded Program.

As stated in the Activity Paper for this project (PP 931-0236.07) the goal of this project is:

--- to improve and expand institutional capabilities for agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin America through the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA) which operates in 23 member countries.

Important elements of the activity are to include

- an assessment of the needs for planning and policy work within IICA and its member countries;
- the development of training materials;
- the conduct of training courses and seminars;
- the selection and testing of planning and policy methodologies

appropriate to target countries; and
--- specific planning assistance to some of the least developed of
the 23 member countries.

Procedurally, the project is divided into two phases.

Phase I involves a general survey of agricultural planning procedures in some twenty countries and an in-depth survey in four to six countries to be followed by a seminar in which the results of the survey are presented to representatives of the participating countries. Following the seminars, training materials were to have been developed and produced for use in the conduct of workshops and short courses.

Phase II involves the implementation of the seminars, workshops and short courses (prepared in Phase I) to be followed by in-depth assistance to one or more countries, along with short-term assistance to an unspecified number of countries. Finally, a network is to be established which will continue the program after AID's involvement and related funding terminates.

C. Implementation

As stated in the LACPLAN activity paper (referenced above), the implementation of the project was to have been accomplished by the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA), located in San Jose, Costa Rica, and two (2) U.S. institutions, Iowa State University (ISU) and Michigan State University (MSU), with resources provided by A.I.D. from funds allotted to the Expanded Program.

Further, it was intended that the two (2) U.S. institutions, which were preselected and identified by name in the activity paper, would work with IICA

by providing manpower and other inputs necessary to achieve the project purposes. In addition, representatives of DS/AGR/ESP and LA/DR were to have taken an active role in the administrative aspects of the activity by contributing professional inputs into the coordination, management and evaluation of the networking system - the ultimate output of the project.

Thus, to implement the project, three contractual instruments were executed, one each with the two U.S. institutions, and one with IICA. The document entered into with IICA is a cost-sharing contract with an estimated value of \$288,390 for the initial three year period of the project. Cooperative Agreements executed with ISU and MSU have estimated values of \$368,612 and \$100,171, respectively, for the same three year period.

D. Roles and Strategies of the Contracted Parties

The basic structures of both the contract and the two cooperative agreements established IICA as responsible for a series of activities in the two phases of work briefly outlined above (described in more detail in the LACPLAN activity paper), with each of the two universities assigned to assist IICA in basically the same set of activities. The distinction between the contract and the two agreements is that final responsibility for project outputs was placed with IICA whereas the role of the two universities was one of leadership with respect to the technical assistance they were to provide to IICA to accomplish stated project outputs.

Under the terms of the two cooperative agreements, ISU was assigned a leadership or primary role and MSU a lesser or secondary role in providing this assistance.

E. Objectives, Activities and Outputs

The completion of all stated activities would result in the production of a series of outputs that would have the effect of achieving the objectives of the project, stated in all three instruments as follows:

- "To improve and build institutional capabilities for agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin American and Caribbean countries.
- To facilitate implementation of agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis process in the appropriate ministries and planning institutions of IICA target countries."

The activities under this project within its associated phases of work contemplated that the outputs would be as follows:

- "(1) obtain benchmark data for determining present capacities in performing sector analysis and planning activities and in implementing public sector strategies for agricultural development, and
- (2) develop procedures for increasing the capacities of countries to do their own agricultural sector analysis and planning work, including workshops, seminars, training courses, developing training materials and backstopping countries for specific activities in sector planning and analysis requirements." (See Section II. C. for detail of Activities and Outputs).

F. Evaluation Methodology

This evaluation was originally scheduled to be conducted at the end of the second year of the Project to "serve as the basis for determining whether

or not the activity will be funded for a fourth and fifth year." Even though the Activity Paper (See Page 23) limited the evaluation findings to only a recommendation for Activities and Funding for Years 4 and 5, the actual scope of work (included below) which was presented to the evaluation team requested findings pertaining to 10 other issues plus a summary of such findings.

1. Project design: adequacy, manageability (logical framework).
2. Personnel: Staffing adequacy, balance, supervision.
3. Management of project operations: within IICA and with supporting institutions.
4. Performance toward achieving targets of the project: output, purpose, goal.
5. Adequacy of project strategy, resource input, implementation plan and implementation management.
6. Reporting and information dissemination.
7. Beneficiaries: Identify direct and indirect beneficiaries of this project.
8. Impact of unplanned events.
9. Budget: adequacy, allocation, adjustments.
10. Panel recommendations for second phase of project (year 3).
11. Panel recommendation for activities and funding years 4 and 5.
12. Summary of the evaluation.

The evaluation activities were performed by Dr. Boyd Wennergren, contracted from Utah State University, Virginia Perelli, AID/CM/COD, and William Goodwin, LAC/DR/RD. Materials and discussions which served as sources for the findings of this evaluation include:

1. the original IICA proposal
2. AID - IICA contract and modification

3. cooperative agreements with ISU and MSU
4. LACPLAN Activity Paper issued under the Expanded Program of Economic Analysis (no. 931-0236.07, dated February 8, 1977).
5. Annual Reports from IICA, ISU, and MSU
6. Discussions between the evaluation team, IICA personnel and Darrel Fienup of MSU, July 19-20, 1979, and with Lehman Fletcher July 26, 1979.
7. An accounting of IICA and MSU expenditures for years 1 and 2.
8. Suggested activities and proposed budget for Year 3 and Years 4 and 5 from IICA and MSU.
9. Questionnaires used in general survey.
10. Proplan documents No. 1 through 10
11. Minutes of LACPLAN meetings, and trip reports and seminars
12. Expanded Program Project Paper (931-0236)

The team received excellent cooperation from all parties associated with the LACPLAN project. We are especially appreciative of the willingness of those with whom we spoke to be candid about the project.

II. FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

A. Project Design Strengths and Weaknesses

The original design of the project has resulted in several strengths and weaknesses which we believe are of considerable relevance to the future performance of the contract. In fact, we find that the contract success to date has been accomplished in the face of some rather serious deficiencies in both project design and operation.

1. Strengths

a. Regional Impact. The project has demonstrated a definite strength in the regional aspects related to the planning efforts. The

presence of a functioning regional organization like IICA has greatly enhanced the project's success. Opportunities have been provided to work with all nations in the region which leads to natural cross-fertilization of ideas and approaches to planning. There is also a tendency to encourage reciprocal training opportunities for planning personnel among participating countries. Efficiencies are also realized in the preparation of planning materials whereby they can be produced for more than one nation and area. This effort has been assisted by the internal network of IICA which has representatives in 23 nations. The early results of the program has seen some internalization of project impacts within IICA as the capability and interest of IICA personnel have increased. Similar results have been observed in individual country situations, such as Costa Rica, but the internalization of the project is still in its infancy. We urge a constant re-evaluation of this phase of the project since its ultimate success should be measured in terms of the extent to which project impacts influence the policy and planning at country levels.

b. Programmatic Design

The programmatic design of the project provided a viable conceptual base for the programmed activities. Reliance on a diagnostic phase to ascertain the felt needs and deficiencies within participating nations as the basis for establishing training needs and subsequent technical assistance activities has proven to be a sound concept although greater participation by the cooperators is needed. The general and in-depth surveys have provided a wide variety of useful information upon which to construct the program of training

materials development. The involvement of host - country nationals in seminars to elicit comments and report findings has generally proven successful in improving attitudes and cooperation. Overall, there appears to be a strong initial acceptance by participating nations of the role to be played by IICA.

2. Weaknesses

a. Coordination and Collaboration of Contract Groups

The presence of three participating groups with essentially the same contract objectives has resulted in coordination deficiencies which have had negative impacts on contract outputs. Some of these problems have arisen from the geographic separation of the three groups with the obvious problems related to communications which might be expected.

b. Pre-Project Assumptions

A basic assumption of the project was that the nature and structure of Policy Analysis and Planning are well known and that general agreement on methodological and philosophical issues could be readily reached by all parties concerned with the project. Such an agreement could form the conceptual base for project operations. The experience of the first phase operations have found the contrary case. In fact, the conceptual differences found among the participating groups were fairly extreme and required an inordinate amount of contract time and resources to reconcile the positions. The problem was complicated by the need to produce a fairly non-

political approach to planning which could meet the diverse needs of the nations in Central and South America plus the Caribbean Area. This was accomplished with the publication of PROPLAN Document No. 1 which sets forth the conceptual model but which represents a much greater effort than was initially contemplated.

c. Scopes of Work

Both the IICA contract and the two cooperative agreements contain very general Scopes of Work which were extracted from the Project Activity Paper.

In fairness to the authors of the activity paper, it must be mentioned that these scopes of work were deliberately vague and imprecise so as to enable both the contractor and the two cooperators the desired flexibility which is essential in a project such as this, whereby the final producer is being led and influenced in his activities by two external parties.

The lack of specificity in the scopes of work could have been compensated for by concise and precise Plans of Work but, unfortunately, the plans of work in each instrument are no more specific than the scopes of work.

Notwithstanding these obvious deficiencies in both the scopes and plans of work, it has been determined that the Contractor (IICA) did accomplish stated activities in Phase I (Years 1 and 2) with the exception of one major activity further discussed in detail below. [See Recommendations for detailed changes in Scope of Work].

B. Financial Aspects

1. Budget Allocations

The budgets of the two agreements and the contract are as follows:

	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
IICA	\$288,390	38
ISU	368,612	49
MSU	<u>100,171</u>	<u>13</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$757,173</u>	<u>100%</u>

The allocation of the overall project funding demonstrates that, even though IICA was charged with the responsibility for the final products of the project, ISU was to have had a greater input into their accomplishment than IICA. Further, it was assumed that the three parties would have pooled their financial resources, in a budget sense, so that each activity would have been costed out on the basis of each party's allocation of its own resources to each specific activity. This was never done. Each party expended its own resources without apparent consideration or even possible awareness of the other parties' expenditures for the same set of activities. As a consequence, funding was fragmented and IICA assumed greater financial responsibility than it should have done, which has caused serious funding problems within the IICA contract budget.

2. Expenditures

As illustrated in the attached TABLE I - Budgeted and Estimated Expenditures for LACPLAN - Years 1 and 2, incurred expenditures to date by ISU and MSU show that both are well within the funding limits of their re-

spective agreements. Further, both cooperators appear to have experienced underruns by not having achieved the level of expenditures which were anticipated for Years 1 and 2 of the project, as set forth in the budget tables of their agreements.

In the case of MSU, the rate of expenditures incurred to date appear to be equal to the level of effort which was expended.

However, in the case of ISU, it appears as though the expenditures which have been incurred are inconsistent with the technical inputs that were provided or required. The ISU technical assistance which was provided to IICA fell far short of the obligations set forth in the ISU agreement.

At the first glance, IICA's financial picture appears to be sound. The attached budget shows claimed expenditures for Phase I totalling \$183,058, which would leave an unexpended balance of \$105,332. Were this the case, sufficient funding might exist in the contract for unfilled activities, including the carryover training component, during Phase II. Unfortunately, these figures do not reflect expenditures of May and June 1979.

According to IICA, current expenditures to date total \$209,275 for Phase I, leaving a net balance of \$79,115 for Phase II. IICA has experienced what the evaluation team views as a legitimate overrun of expenditures due to the increased costs of programming activities during the first two years of the program.

TABLE I
BUDGETED AND ESTIMATED EXPENDITURES FOR LACPLAN
Years 1 and 2

<u>CONTRACTOR</u>	<u>BUDGETED</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES TO DATE**</u>	<u>Available Year 3</u>
IICA	\$288,390	\$209,275	79,115
Iowa State	368,612	192,803	175,809
Michigan State	100,171	41,858	58,313
TOTAL	<u>\$757,173</u>	<u>\$443,936</u>	<u>\$313,237</u>

**Accumulated expenditures through May 31, 1979

Assuming that claimed expenditures in the amount of \$209,275 is accurate, there exists an unexpended balance of \$79,115 to be carried into Year 3. Had IICA spent its funds in accordance with an expected pattern of 2/3 expenditures at the end of Year 2, there would currently exist \$96,130 to enter with into Year 3, in which case the total shortfall would only be \$17,015.

However, given the fact that one of the major activities, i.e. the development of training materials, remains uncompleted at the commencement of Year 3, it is obvious that the real overrun is considerably greater than these statistics show. (See Section III. D. for details).

In addition to the expenditures discussed herein, IICA claims to have expended \$135,658 of its own funds and \$1,495,639 of Line VII counterpart funds to accomplish project activities to date in Years 1 and 2. (See TABLE 2 - IICA Counterpart Contributions for LACPLAN).

The evaluation team has no basis for verification of claimed expenditures, including IICA counterpart contributions. It is believed that an interim management/financial audit to be conducted by AAG/W at this time would provide concrete evidence of progress achievements versus claimed expenditures. The expenditures by MSU are considered too insignificant to require AAG/W audit at this time, but an interim audit of ISU is also recommended.

3. Funds Remaining

As illustrated in TABLE 1 - LACPLAN Funds Remaining, there exists a total of \$313,237 (approximately) spread among the three parties to accomplish unfulfilled project objectives. As mentioned in the Section III. C. of this report, the evaluation team recommends the presentation to AID/W of a con-

TABLE 2

IICA COUNTERPART CONTRIBUTIONS FOR LACPLAN

Years 1 and 2, Estimated Year 3

<u>TIME PERIOD</u> ^{1/}	<u>EXPECTED</u>	<u>ACTUAL</u> ^{2/}
7/77 to 6/78	\$349,000	\$619,388
7/78 to 6/79	383,900	876,251
7/79 to 12/79	211,150	265,361
1/80 to 12/80	<u>464,525</u>	<u>661,320 (est)</u>
Totals	\$1,408,575	\$2,422,320

Notes:

^{1/} IICA is changing from fiscal year to calendar year budgeting.

^{2/} Portion of "Linea VII" apportioned to "Formulation of Agrarian Policy and Sectorial Planning"

solidated budget expressed in terms of total remaining resources to be allocated to project inputs.

Both MSU and IICA have submitted to the evaluation team, their individual budget estimates, by project activities, for Year 3. Neither budget reflects the resources remaining under the ISU agreement nor has ISU submitted any individual budget for Year 3. Both cooperators have expressed their intentions of being substantially involved in the development of training materials, which should be the first and primary activity of Year 3. Thus, it becomes imperative to know the manner in which remaining activities will be divided and funds expended.

As for the IICA's projected budget for Year 3, no attempt was made to conduct a detailed analysis of the total amount, although backup data in support of most of these estimates was obtained, to the extent available. (See Section III. D. for details).

C. Project Management

1. AID Management

The LACPLAN project has received a higher relative degree of management efforts in terms of investment of managerial time from DS/AGR/ESP, contracts and LAC/DR/RD than the majority of AID projects. Nonetheless DS and LA Bureaus experienced a lack of continuity in person responsible for project management.

Even though a mechanism for AID approval of projected Annual Program Activities existed, there is no evidence of insistence on AID's part for detailed plans of work and budget guidelines. Even with the absence of a detailed plan of work or proposed expenditure by activity for the institutions involved, AID

management should have recognized early on that the actual rates and levels of expenditures were not in line with overall budget projections.

2. Contractor and Cooperating Institutions Management

Our review shows a large number of meetings were held in the initial stages of the project, most of which were intended to coordinate project activities. But the greater problem has arisen in that the project seems to have suffered from lack of adequately defined leadership responsibilities. The universities (especially Iowa State) did not provide the technical direction intended by the original agreement and reflected in the three-year budget allocation which gave them upwards of one-half of the monies allotted for the project.

IICA has assumed considerable project responsibility which has led in large part to the successes to date. But there is still a lack of a clear role definition and relative project responsibilities among the three groups. For example, IICA representatives indicate an absence of strong direction from Iowa State even while a future project coordinator was employed on the ISU campus by the project. The universities, on the other hand, indicate a lack of IICA inquiry and request for assistance in various contract-related activities where coordination was called for.

The problem has been aggravated also by the failure of the universities to respond in a timely manner when collaborative assistance was requested. The inflexibility of university scheduling and the lack of long term planning (which in turn is likely related to the absence of strong leadership) resulted in reduced inputs by the universities in several contract activities and has forced

IICA into the role of handling the day to day activities of project management without significant inputs from the two collaborating universities. As a result, there appears to be an imbalance between budgeted money and project efforts among the three collaborators which has increased the program burdens for IICA without compensating budget resources.

D. Progress Towards Completion of Activities and Outputs for Years 1 and 2.

1. Conceptual Framework

The first activity envisioned for the project was to design and develop a "conceptual framework," "framework of analysis," or "meaningful scheme for the study," as stated in the different agreements. This activity was to be begun in July 1977 and last for 1 month. It was expected that this activity would logically provide the conceptual framework for a questionnaire to be administered to agricultural planning departments in Latin American and Caribbean countries, serve as a basis for analysis of the status of agricultural planning in the region, and give a frame of reference for future LACPLAN activities in training and technical assistance. What had apparently been envisioned as a six week task in actuality resulted in a laborious time-consuming effort. Serious efforts began in September 1977 and lasted until the publication of a conceptual document in December 1978. This extended time reflected some of the fundamental problems of miscommunication, lack of coordinated effort and an inordinate amount of time spent in meetings (estimated at nine international meetings and workshops) to produce a final document, which typified many of the project activities.

Apparently the initial reasons for the delay in producing this framework lay in very different conceptions between IICA and ISU of what should constitute

the frame of reference or "macro methodologies". This effort was then interrupted to develop and implement the general survey.

In order to arrive at a consensus on this subject and finalize the conceptual framework, approximately 10-15 working documents were written by IICA (Silos and las Casas) and four by ISU (Van de Wetering) with MSU intermittantly reviewing drafts. The May 1978 meeting in Mexico represented the point where the differing ideologies apparently converged. De las Casas and Cobas then published, in February 1979, the Spanish version of "Conceptual Framework of the Agricultural Planning Process in Latin America and the Caribbean: A Comprehensive View of the Policy Analysis and Decision-Making Processes in the Agricultural Sector." An English version was published prior to the Kingston seminar. On this activity proportional level of efforts are estimated as 65% - IICA, 30% - ISU, 5% - MSU.

These documents have been presented at the three regional seminars where they were enthusiastically received and sparked, at times, spirited discussions on the agricultural planning process.

2. General Surveys

The second major activity was to design, develop, administer and analyze a general survey in at least 75% of IICA member countries. This activity would provide an instrument to assess the capacity, constraints and needed improvements in agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis. The original Activity Paper, approved by LAC/DR, referred to these activities in light of AID's mandate, "particularly as relating to the rural poor." Results of this general (and the in-depth) survey and analysis would allow the institutions to identify gaps in training and technical assistance and would guide them in the development of programs to meet these identified needs.

As originally outlined in IICA's proposal, six weeks would be spent beginning in 8/77 to develop, discuss and pretest the questionnaire. The survey would be implemented during the next six weeks by IICA planning representatives in each country. Data processing and analysis of the results would then continue for four months, ending in 3/78.

Findings Summary: The original scope was expanded from a general survey to essentially an in-depth series of surveys. Questionnaire development was delayed, data processing and analysis consumed more time and resources than originally expected, and the final publication was essentially an IICA exercise with "less than minimal input" from the cooperating universities. The resulting publication has been instructive for IICA, and IICA member countries, but seems to have less impact upon the cooperators view of the needs for future training and technical assistance than anticipated. Level of efforts are estimated as 60% - IICA: 20% - ISU: and 10% - MSU.

Detailed Findings: Originally the questionnaire was to be developed and administered to only the sectorial planning units of the IICA member countries. The survey would assess the total system for planning, policy formulation and implementation including:

- (1) Institutional framework for planning and policy analysis.
- (2) Data and information systems
- (3) Quantity and skill level of trained manpower and salary scales relative to similar professionals in other private and public agencies
- (4) Extent of participation of target population in planning and project implementation at the local level." (Activity Paper, pg. 24)

The scope of the survey was expanded to include the national planning agencies, the sectorial planning unit and institutions involved in the implementation of agricultural programs. Additionally considered was a query of farmers and/or target group rural poor to evaluate the impact of country agricultural programs--this effort was finally eliminated. Basically two rather lengthy questionnaires evolved; one to be used for the national and sectorial planning units and a second for surveying the implementing agencies.

Instead of the questionnaires being administered by in country IICA representatives in one week after explanations in regional workshops, project personnel from the three cooperating institutions conducted the interviews which took up to three weeks to complete including follow-up efforts from in-country IICA staff members. The target date for the completed surveys was 8/77; actual completion was 5/78, nine months behind schedule. The breakdown on individual efforts for implementing the surveys are as follows:

MSU: Guyana, Trinidad and Tobago (Fienup)

ISU: Jamaica (Fletcher)

Guatemala (Van de Wetering)

Colombia*, Ecuador*, Peru*, Bolivia* (de las Casas)

IICA: Venezuela, Barbados, Haiti, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Paraguay, Uruguay (26 IICA personnel)

*Finished by IICA personnel.

In total, 136 professionals were interviewed in 23 countries, together with the collection of secondary information. Estimated efforts are IICA - 70%; ISU - 20%; MSU - 10%.

ISU prepared a detailed, lengthy outline document for the analysis for the general survey data which was apparently not used. MSU, which has a recognized experience in this type of analysis, took no discernable initiative to assist in this phase. Analytical efforts in IICA were delayed when Jose Silos took a higher administrative post in IICA. The planned LA seminar was delayed due to a lack of timely results. Finally, Eduardo Cobas, a recent graduate of ISU, was sent to San Jose in 8/78 and budgeted for four months by ISU to collaborate with the new project coordinator, Dr. Lizardo de las Casas, and data processing personnel at IICA central in San Jose to process and begin analysis of the survey data. Work was completed in 3/78 instead of the projected 9/77 date in the Activity Performance Indicator Network Chart. Level of effort: IICA - 60%, ISU - 40%.

Subsequently, Cobas was hired by IICA and collaborated with de las Casas to publish the Spanish revision of "Analysis of the Operation of the Sectorial Planning Units within the Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning Process: Their Participation in the Agricultural Sector's Policy Analysis and Decision-Making Processes" in February 1979. An English version was published to be used at the Jamaica seminar.

These publications represent a valiant attempt to analyze a rather cumbersome set of data. An estimated 80 percent of the total information remains to be analyzed. The documents are more descriptive than analytical and indicate that a tremendous amount of more detailed information could yield valuable results (e.g., a more detailed, in-depth analysis of needs for training and technical assistance by regional and/or country grouping would guide future efforts).

Efforts for this activity: IICA - 90%; ISU - 10%.

3. In-depth Surveys

Four to six countries were to be selected for in-depth surveys of their planning formulation and implementation. Each country would be visited for a two-week period by a team of three experts. These surveys were to be conducted during the third quarter of the first year of implementation. A standard form was to be developed prior to conducting the in-depth surveys to assure comparability of results, and emphasis placed on obtaining detailed descriptions of the planning and analysis processes for the various countries. The anticipated procedure was to develop questionnaires for the in-depth survey; hold a workshop to finalize the survey, select countries and outline a scope of work for each; administer the in-depth survey in four to six countries, analyze the results together with data from the general survey to determine training and technical assistance needs; and present the results at the Latin American seminar. The criteria for selecting countries for in-depth evaluation included:

- (1) Contrasts of planning styles or planning methods including degree of centralization of decision making.
- (2) Contrasts of institutional differences
- (3) Contrasts of levels of development
- (4) Size and quality of planning staffs and differences in pay scales
- (5) Emphasis placed on linkages between planning and implementation agencies
- (6) Extent of regionalization and sectorization of planning processes.

Summary Findings: Focus was changed from in-depth surveys to country case studies; five country case studies produced, one of which effected fundamental changes in the country's planning system and should be considered as in-depth technical assistance; studies required twice the amount of programmed time and were almost exclusively an IICA effort with the universities unable to respond.

Detailed Findings: The focus of the in-depth country survey with comparable standard questionnaires evolved into case studies planned for six countries, each one corresponding to a phase of planning and policy analysis presented in the conceptual framework. This departure from the original plan was apparently occasioned by lengthy discussions among the cooperating institutions that produced no consistently workable plan of action followed by IICA taking the initiative to carry out this activity alone under pressure of the ensuing seminar. IICA produced a plan of work (the first evidenced in the evaluation) that assigned a list of tasks, target dates and responsibilities for the three institutions for the second year's activities. The case studies plan and results are as follows:

a) Formulation of Agricultural Policy: An all-IICA effort led by Jose Silos. Published "La Etapa de Formulacion del Proceso de Planificacion Agricola en Venezuela," PROPLAN Document No. 5 in Caracas, 2/79.

b) Implementation of Agricultural Policy: Honduras selected with Mayo Vega (IICA) and Cobas de las Casas; either Fisher or Van de Wetering (ISU); and GOH personnel. ISU backed out with the excuse that the "political climate was uncomfortable for US personnel"

(NOTE: several sources in LAC/DR have expressed surprise at this

statement, given the high level of involvement of US personnel with GOH). IICA published PROPLAN Document No. 6, "La Etapa de Instrumentacion de la Ejecucion del Proceso de Planificacion Agricola en Honduras" in Tegucigalpa, 2/79.

c) Evaluation in Planning: An all-IICA effort in Peru. Although ISU had a long involvement in Peruvian agricultural planning efforts, they did not participate in this study. De las Casas and other IICA personnel published "La Etapa del Proceso de Planificacion Agrario en El Peru," PROPLAN Document No. 7, Lima, 2/79.

d) Administration, Socio-Economic Factors and the Planning System:

Primarily an IICA effort with a one week visit for initial discussions by Fletcher (ISU). IICA in-country personnel (Grajales and Quiroga) published "El Sistema de Planificacion Agrario en Bolivia," PROPLAN Document No. 4 in La Paz, 2/79.

e) Information for Planning: Brazil selected and team proposed to consist to Fienup (MSU), IICA/SU and IICA/Brazil personnel. The latter apparently was eager to conduct the study, but MSU had other commitments and could not respond; IICA/SJ staff at point over-committed with other studies could not conduct the study.

f) Policy Analysis and Planning: Represents the most ambitious and productive of the case studies. Original team composed of Van de Wetering (ISU), Marambio (IICA) and COCR personnel. Problems in timing limited ISU's input to an outline document that ultimately was not used. Interest and proximity of Costa Rican government led to an expansion of original scope of work. In-depth insti-

tutional study commenced which resulted in a presentation of conclusions for internal review by the CR National Agricultural Council (CAN), and the subsequent drafting of a new law for agricultural planning. Minister of Planning Jiminez presented some of the results at the San Jose Seminar. IICA published "El Proceso de Analisis de Politicas en el Sector Agropecuario de Costa Rica," PROPLAN Document No. 3, 2/79.

Observations on Case Studies: The results of the case studies were fairly well received at the seminars, although only one each was presented in San Jose and Kingston. IICA gained credence for a technical assistance role through the studies' presentations. Documents tended to be descriptive and diagnostic with little emphasis on identifying needs for IICA in the areas of training and technical assistance as originally designed. Effort levels judged to be: IICA - 95%; ISU - 5%; MSU - 0.

4. Latin American Seminar

A five day Latin American-wide seminar was designed to be held at the end of the first year of implementation to review results of the country surveys and identify needs for training and technical assistance. The major purposes of the seminar were to:

(1) present the role of governments in public sector development planning and policy analysis, (2) review results of the country surveys showing levels of development in public sector planning and administration, (3) present alternative and contrasting methods and models for agricultural planning and policy analysis and (4) identify needs in IICA target countries for planning assistance.

The seminar was to be conducted by IICA and the Cooperators. One planning technician from each of the 23 countries was to be invited to attend plus IICA field planning specialists. In addition, special invitations to key planning technicians in Latin America would be provided. Each of the participants was to receive a stipend to cover costs of travel and per diem.

Summary Findings:

Even though the contract called for a single seminar following the completion of the studies to report the findings and plan future activities, the decision was made to hold three regional seminars because of the size, number and diversity of the participating countries. AID gave notice that it would not cover expenses above those budgeted for a single seminar, where upon IICA contributed the difference for the 2 additional meetings. Seminars have been generally well received and conducted, with the possible exception of language difficulties experienced in the Caribbean. Primarily an IICA implemented activity.

Detailed Findings:

Three regional seminars have been held, two of which were attended by evaluation team members (San Jose and Kingston). More than 50 people attended each of these seminars, whose roles can be classified as seminar leaders, participants, cooperating institutions observers and USAID representatives;

a) Seminar Leaders (IICA) for both San Jose and Kingston

Jose Silos - Moderator

Lizardo de las Casas - Project Manager

Eduardo Cobas

Alberto Franco

b) Participants - Usually a government official from both the national and the agricultural sector planning offices attended, rather than one representative originally planned for. The following countries attended the regional meetings:

<u>San Jose</u>	<u>Lima</u>	<u>Kingston</u>
Costa Rica	Argentina	Antigua (ECON)
Dominican Republic	Bolivia	Barbados
El Salvador	Brazil	Guyana
Guatemala	Colombia	Jamaica
Haiti	Chile	Surinam
Honduras	Ecuador	Trinidad-Tobago
Mexico	Paraguay	
Nicaragua	Peru	
Panama	Venezuela	

c) Cooperating Institutions

<u>San Jose</u>	<u>Lima</u>	<u>Kingston</u>
I. Van der Wetering	H. Riley - MSU	L. Fletcher - ISU
D. Fienup - MSU		

d) Observers - IICA staff members from the respective countries.

c) AID Mission Representatives

<u>San Jose</u>	<u>Lima</u>	<u>Kingston</u>
T. Robertson - Guatemala	J. D. Flood - Peru	K. Ellis - Jamaica
F. Manteiga - Dom. Rep.	J. O'Donnell - Peru	P. Morris - Jamaica
		G. Rosell - Barbados

f) AID/Washington

San Jose

J. Day, DS/AGR/ESP

R. Rehnberg, DS/AGR/ESP

V. Perelli, CM/COD

W. Goodwin, LAC/DR/RD

Kingston

R. Rehnberg, DS/AGR/ESP

W. Goodwin, LAC/DR/RD

The seminars, extending over 2-1/2 days each, can be divided into periods devoted to three types of activities: Opening presentation (IICA objectives); reporting (transmission of information); and discussion (arriving at consensus). The early part of the program was a presentation of the conceptual framework used in the project, the results of a general survey or the "state of the arts" in agricultural planning in 23 countries and one "in-depth" look at the planning process. Finally, agreement was reached on the action that IICA should take in Phase II of the project in order to achieve the stated objective of improving the agricultural planning process in the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. This focused on probable areas for training and possible collaborative projects in planning. Three PROPLAN documents have been published on the Regional Seminars.

5. Training Design and Development (from the Activity Paper)

"During the first two years of implementation, training materials will be developed by IICA and the Cooperators to be used (1) by agricultural and rural planners to improve program design and evaluation activities, (2) in special training courses for LA technicians responsible for agricultural and rural sector assessments and analysis, and (3) for distribution by IICA for use in training programs in target countries. The training material will cover the

following general components of the overall planning and policy analysis system:

- (1) data and information
- (2) alternative methodologies
- (3) utilization of results

At least two documents will be prepared for publication:

(1) an analytical document on agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis to be used as a source reference by Latin American planning and research staffs and (2) a manual to be used in training courses at the field level and to be distributed to technicians in the target countries.

Work on developing the training materials will be carried out at the co-operators and IICA Offices in cooperation with countries selected for work in sector analysis and implementation. Translations of materials and preparation for publication will be done primarily by IICA. The final draft (in English) of the analytical document will be due and ready for translation and printing within 18 months. The training manual will be due by the end of the second year."

Summary findings: Although the previously defined activities were programmed to feed into the training effort, lack of time and loss of focus have precluded any substantial work in this area.

6. Assisting Country Analysis and Implementation

Two countries were to be selected for collaborative work by IICA and the Cooperators. One was Costa Rica, where IICA was already involved in assistance to the sector planning office, and the second was expected to be El Salvador. It was expected that this collaborative work could provide a significant part of

the source materials for preparation of training material referred to above. Final selection was to be agreed upon by IICA, Cooperators, DS/AGR/ESP and LAC/DR. The purposes of these country activities were (1) to assist in improving the countries' capacities to carry out agricultural and rural sector planning and (2) to involve IICA and the Cooperator institutions in an applied situation that can be used as "case studies" in the workshops, seminars and training activities.

This activity proposed to fund up to six months of short-term technical assistance from the Cooperators for purposes of backstopping IICA on servicing these requests.

Summary Findings: IICA and ISU were intended to work in Costa Rica. Only IICA participated (see In-depth Studies); Guatemala also requested assistance. De las Casas and Van de Watering presented papers in Guatemala. Salvador has requested assistance and the San Jose participants voted for a case study of Salvador's planning and budgetary system.

7. Network Development and Operation

This was probably the most misinterpreted portion of the project. The Activity Paper outlines these activities primarily as a management function:

"Network coordination involves management of all the specific activities described above, as well as general communication and interchange of information and talent between IICA, Cooperator(s) and the various member countries. An important role of IICA and the Cooperator(s) will be to facilitate the exchange of materials and staff between the various countries as individual country interest and possibilities permit."

At different times, all three parties have expressed their perceptions of

what constitutes this activity--almost exclusively in the most general and terms. The most concrete exposition has been given by the ex-Coordinator, Jose Silos, who now speaks of "LACPLANing" the Line VII activities of IICA which involve projects in rural sector planning. This has indeed involved considerable effort. The effective management of the project now also rests with IICA. The opinion of the evaluation team is that successful completion of the training activities will add another dimension to the natural evolution of any type of network, and that this activity will only be realized by evidence and recognition of quality responses to member countries' needs.

8. Other Activities

ISU in its first annual report mentions the financial support of students and a bibliographical exercise that do not appear to fall either under the stated activities in the Project Paper or in the resulting cooperative agreement. Limited LACPLAN funds were used to support a study by Julio Echeverria, and Eduardo Cobas' thesis was financed by LACPLAN. Extensive examination of documentation on agricultural planning using the WAERS (World Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Abstracts) was undertaken by ISU. Four bibliographies were prepared in 1977/78, but neither IICA nor MSU expressed knowledge of their existence nor contents.

9. Level of Input Efforts

Unfortunately, neither the Activity Paper nor the IICA contract and Universities' Agreements indicate the expected levels of human resources or financial inputs to be associated with the activities of the project. The evaluation team ascertained, as well as it could in the limited time avail-