

PD AAP-511

ISA 35502

PROJECT REVIEW SUMMARY

PROJECT TITLE: Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural  
Planning Network

DATE OF REVIEW 2/82

PROJECT NO. 931-0236.07

OSB OFFICE/DIV. S&T/AGR/EPP 000180

| List actions to be taken (or issues to be resolved) as a result of Project Review Meeting                 | Action Officer  | Date Action to be Completed |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Hold briefing for LAC/DR/RD concerning LACPLAN's activities  | R. Hanson<br>S&T/AGR/EPP<br>and<br>D. Jessee<br>LAC/DR/RD | 9/82                        |
| 2. Discuss with Office Director the possibility of freer line of communication with IICA/San Jose office. | R. Hanson<br>S&T/AGR/EPP                                  | 10/82                       |
| 3. Hold discussions with IICA and LAC/DR/RD concerning LACPLAN presentation in Washington                 | R. Hanson<br>S&T/AGR/EPP                                  | 3/83                        |
| 4. Write SOW for final evaluation   | R. Hanson<br>S&T/AGR/EPP                                  | 5/83                        |

S&T/AGR/EPP, Ralph Hanson  
Project Manager

S&T/AGR, Anson Bertrand  
Office Director

Clearance: S&T/AGR/EPP: RSutton Date \_\_\_\_\_

S&T/PO, FCampbell Date \_\_\_\_\_

Attachments: ABS Project Data Sheet  
Project Review Information Sheet  
Other:

Distribution: Project Files  
DS/DAA  
DS/PO: Program Analyst

Clearance: S&T/AGR: MZozynski Date \_\_\_\_\_

## PROJECT REVIEW INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning Network DATE OF REVIEW February, 1982

PROJECT NO. 931-0236.07

- I. Briefly state principal subject(s) to be discussed during the review.
  - (1) To provide AID/W with an update on current activities and progress of LACPLAN project;
  - (2) To discuss the USAID/PROPLAN relationship and how to improve it.
  - (3) To determine what AID initiatives might be required at this time.
  
- II. Please respond to the following questions. Additional detail can be given below if warranted or necessary.
  - a. Is project implementation on schedule as planned in the PP or implementation plan? Yes
  - b. Are there any short falls or delays of project inputs? See attachment A
  - c. Are project assumptions holding up? Yes
  - d. Are progress/annual reports being submitted in a timely fashion? Yes  
Are such reports informative? Yes See attachment A
  - e. Is there any monitoring/progress information being received from other than project or contractor personnel (e.g., project manager site visits, USAID reports etc.)? Yes, see attachment A.
  - f. Has an evaluation been carried out? Yes, attachment A
  - g. Are there any audit or evaluation recommendations outstanding? No
  - h. Are there any special or restrictive requirements imposed by LAC or stipulated in the PP? No

## ATTACHMENT A

### II.

- b. There are no significant shortfalls but there has been some delay in completing the training materials. On August 3, 1982 an unfunded extension through June 30, 1983 was signed which will provide the needed time to complete these documents.
- d. Yes. An annual report is submitted by IICA each January outlining the planned activities for the coming year. This plan of work is discussed with and settled on by the AID project manager before IICA proceeds with the plan. The 1982 plan of work is attached as Appendix A.
- e. The AID project manager along with a representative from LAC/DR/RD made a site visit in February, 1982. The AID project manager also consulted with USAID officials in Guatemala, El Salvador, Costa Rica, and the Dominican Republic concerning the LACPLAN project. The IICA project manager has also visited Washington to further discuss the progress of the project.
- f. An in-depth team evaluation was held in July, 1979. A final team evaluation is scheduled for the Spring of 1983.

///

**LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN  
AGRICULTURAL PLANNING NETWORK**

**931-0236.07**

**MANAGEMENT REVIEW**

14

## LACPLAN HISTORY

The Latin American - Caribbean Planning Network (LACPLAN) was initiated in 1977 with the purpose of improving and building the institutional capabilities for agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin American and Caribbean countries principally by use of the InterAmerican Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA). This five-year project was initially funded for three years with the funding for years four and five dependent on the recommendations of a comprehensive evaluation to be held during the third year. The project plans included arrangements for a contract with IICA and cooperative agreements with Michigan State University and Iowa State University for the purpose of enhancing the institutional capacity of IICA to expand the agricultural and rural sector planning capabilities of Latin American - Caribbean planning agencies. I.S.U. and M.S.U. were to provide technical assistance to IICA on matters pertaining to agricultural planning and policy analysis.

Subsequently, based on the evaluation during the third year, IICA's contract was extended for years four and five and the cooperating universities were given unfunded extensions of their agreements to give them the needed time to complete their work. Currently both M.S.U. and I.S.U. have completed their involvement in this project and IICA is in the final year of its contract. LACPLAN is officially scheduled to terminate on June 30, 1983.

### Management Review

For several days during February 1982, representatives of S&T/AGR/EPP and LAC/DR/RD visited with representatives of IICA/PROPLAN, principally Dr. P. Lizardo de las Casas, to discuss both the progress of the subject project as well as the potential for future collaboration with USAID missions. Discussions were subsequently held with persons familiar with IICA/PROPLAN work in Costa Rica and the Dominican Republic in order to gain another perspective. This report does not detail those discussions but rather presents background information and conclusions.

The Division de Planificacion Manejo de Proyectos (DPMP or PROPLAN), under the Direccion de Proyectos Multizonales in IICA, is partially funded by A.I.D. contract number AID/ta-C-1432 which began September 1977 and which has a total budget of \$713,390. As of the end of CY 1981, \$311,000 remained unspent. This management review by AID/W in February 1982 coincides with the preparation by DPMP of the "Activity Report for 1981 and Program of Work for 1982" and a request by DPMP for a unfunded extension of the contract from 10/31/82 to 6/30/83.

The evolution of the DPMP has evidenced a synthesis of policy analysis and project administration. Created in 1980, DPMP capitalizes on the experience gained during the previous decade with PEPA (Preparacion y Evaluacion de Proyectos Agricolas), the Programa de Gestion, the Programa de Manejo de Proyectos, and the first phase of PROPLAN (Proyecto de Planificacion Agropecuaria y Analisis de Politicas para America Latina y el Caribe, now known as PROPLAN/AP), each funded by A.I.D. except for PEPA, which was funded by IDB. Today, DPMP manages two related projects. PROPLAN/AP focuses on policy analysis at the national

level and its application to the regional level. PROPLAN/A (Proyecto de Planificación y Administración para el Desarrollo Rural) on the other hand focuses on the "micro-area" level, and from the aggregation and/or coordination of the micro-areas moves to the regional level. PROPLAN/AP is presently supported by IICA core funds and by the A.I.D. monies mentioned above. (LACPLAN became PROPLAN when translated to Spanish, and then was differentiated as PROPLAN/AP when PROPLAN/A was initiated in 1980.) PROPLAN/A is presently supported by IICA core funds and by a Kellogg Foundation grant through 1984. PROPLAN/A being the "new kid on the block," has received considerably more attention recently than PROPLAN/AP. This can be evidenced by the recent low levels of expenditures under the A.I.D. contract.

#### A.I.D.'s Consultations With PROPLAN - February 1982

The present management review has three purposes: (1) to provide AID/W with an update on progress of the project; (2) to discuss the prospects of collaboration of PROPLAN and USAID Missions following the completion of the project; and (3) to determine what A.I.D. initiatives might be required at this time. This does not pretend to be a complete final evaluation of the project. The final evaluation of the project is scheduled for the Spring of 1983. These, rather, were informal consultations.

#### Project Components

A review of progress will briefly address the four major areas of activity LACPLAN is concerned with: (1) training materials; (2) seminars

and workshops; (3) technical cooperation; and (4) network coordination and management.

- (1) Training materials - Seven documents are currently in draft or final form. These documents cover the topical areas of policy analysis, operational planning project identification, project management, and other areas.

These training documents do not include materials which are developed principally for training purposes and which are suitable for those purposes. Some materials may meet one or the other, but not both, criteria. The document series published by IICA provide a conceptual framework and case studies which could be incorporated into a training program but do not constitute training material per se anymore than for example, journal articles. Iowa State has produced a training manual on price analysis and market intervention policy but, due to its highly technical nature, it is currently being rewritten to be put into a usable form. Discussions have been held with IICA concerning this issue and actions are being taken to correct this problem. IICA is planning an in-depth two to four week policy analysis course to be held in early 1983 which will use revised versions of the training documents mentioned above.

The fact that more training materials have not been completed to date can be at least partially explained by the fact that PROPLAN is simply moving in other directions than the provision of formal training. The emphasis appears to be placed on "on-the-job training" of collaborators on projects in various countries. The definition of planning in IICA is in the process of a metamorphosis as PROPLAN/A experience accumulates. This fact inhibits the preparation and maintenance of a training program because materials must be regularly revised and there is greater uncertainty about what actually should be presented; there may be no "tried and true" methods.

On the other hand, IICA may be missing an important opportunity. The Oficina de Planificacion Sectorial Agropecuaria in Costa Rica was, in February 1980, negotiating with ILPIS and the University of Costa Rica to develop a masters program in planning. Should such a program develop, PROPLAN should collaborate.

- (2) Seminars and workshops - This component has been very active throughout the length of the project. Seminars have been held in all three regions of Latin America;

in San Jose, Costa Rica for the countries of Central America; in Lima, Peru for South America; and in Kingston, Jamaica for the English speaking countries of the Caribbean. During 1981, a seminar on project evaluation was conducted in the Dominican Republic for technicians working in the Planning Bureau of the Agricultural Secretariat. Two workshops on project identification were conducted, one in Grenada and one in Dominica. Other seminars were also held in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic and Panama.

During 1982 seminars will be held in the Andean Region, Central America, and most likely the Dominican Republic. The longer two-to-four week agricultural policy analysis course will also be held but its site is as yet undetermined.

- (3) Technical Cooperation - The ultimate aim of the project is to provide planning assistance through IICA, on a request basis, to planning agencies throughout Latin America. This component of the project has been active in nearly every country in the region. Over the first four years activities under LACPLAN have occurred in Dominica, Guyana, the Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, El Salvador,

Costa Rica, Panama, Columbia, Peru, Venezuela, and Chile. Currently activities under this component are winding down. During 1982, plans for assistance on operational planning are scheduled for Panama, the Dominican Republic, and Venezuela.

- (4) Network Coordination and Management - The networking component is the most difficult to quantify. Networking seems to be perceived by IICA as a by-product of the other LACPLAN activities. The PROPLAN office has never assigned an Activity Manager for this component.

An odd and sterile sort of network was envisioned in the project design. It consisted of paths between PROPLAN and the client agricultural sector planning offices in the various IICA countries. It was a faulty design and depended upon the provision of services by PROPLAN to the clients.

A very different sort of network can be envisioned, namely a network of paths among the agricultural sector planning offices and/or among the practitioners. These offices and individuals often work isolated one from the other. Communication and collaboration among

themselves could have important benefits in terms of professional support. It is suggested that PROPLAN considers the usefulness of this alternative concept of a network and that it pursue a role as a facilitator for such a network through establishing regular communication media such as a newsletter, a journal, a professional organization sponsoring annual conferences, and/or an exchange program among countries. Discussions have been held concerning the printing of a newsletter but any more elaborate mechanism is beyond the funding or time limitations of the LACPLAN project.

For further details on all four of these activities see the attached report, "Activity Report for the Period January - December 1981 and Program of Work for the Period January - December 1982", Appendix A.

#### PROPLAN - USAID Relationships

In general, working relationships do not exist between PROPLAN and the USAID missions. There is very little if any sharing of information presently. PROPLAN has not seen the USAID missions as potential clients and has not sought their business nor have the missions seen PROPLAN as a potential contractor, due either to a lack of information or to a negative impression gained in early contracts.

IICA and AID have agreed to increase their collaboration at various levels. The most concrete efforts could occur at the level of the USAID

and IICA country missions. Should the missions in a particular country begin to work more closely, there presently exists no mechanism to facilitate USAID mission-PROPLAN collaboration unless there happens to be a professional planner associated with the IICA mission who takes it upon himself to stay informed with respect to PROPLAN activities, personnel, and capabilities. There are few such persons presently in the IICA missions.

It is recommended that the Costa Rica office of PROPLAN consider USAID missions to be potential clients and that the office seek short-term contracts from the missions in much the same way as a consulting firm seeks such contracts: publishing their capabilities and type of contracts sought; following up personally with the missions seeking contract opportunities, and then building a reputation on successful work.

During a recent visit to Washington by Dr. Lizardo de las Casas, S&T/AGR/EPP sponsored a briefing to the Latin American Bureau concerning the activities and capabilities of PROPLAN and held a discussion on the mechanisms for improving the working relationship between the USAID missions and PROPLAN. The major effort for improving this relationship will have to come from the PROPLAN office and the technical staff of LAC/DR/DR via the Latin American USAIDs.

#### A.I.D. Initiatives

More emphasis needs to be placed on informing the USAIDs of PROPLAN's capabilities. There are plans for this to be done through the PROPLAN office and LAC/DR/DR.

A more direct, immediate line of communication needs to be opened up between S&T/AGR and the PROPLAN office. A freer access to telephone communications would make this possible.

An in-depth briefing by PROPLAN of the LACPLAN activities to be held in Washington, D.C. for donor agencies is being discussed for the Spring of 1983. A close monitoring of this process by A.I.D. is needed.

Information Garnered in an Interview at SEPSA with  
Ing. Oscar Chacon (Director), Lic. Jauquin Pacheco, 17 Feb., 1982

The agricultural sector planning office was set up evidently around the beginning of 1977 and was then known as the Oficina de Planificacion Sectorial Agropacuaria. Through the IICA office for Costa Rica, PROPLAN was engaged to produce a description of the existing process for policy analysis in the agricultural sector. This coincided with PROPLAN's need to conduct several case studies. IICA hired a Costa Rican national as full-time staff for the period of some four months of the study and contributed the time of three of its own staff on a part-time basis. Two documents were produced. PROPLAN Document #3 was published as "El Proceso de Analisis de Politicas en el Sector Agropecuario de Costa Rica." A second document, which was perhaps more critical and which contained specific recommendations for change, was not published, but served as the basis for the formulation of new legislation concerning the planning function for the agricultural sector.

Ing. Chacon emphasized that this sort of help was quite useful during the early stages of the operation of the office. PROPLAN/SEPSA collaboration now would (and does) take a different form. SEPSA presently has a well-trained and experienced staff and has developed its own sense of direction.

There evidently has been at least an informal relationship between PROPLAN and SEPSA in the sense of consultants being provided occasionally through the auspicious of the IICA office for Costa Rica. That same office transmits the various IICA publication including those of PROPLAN. Almost all communication is channeled through this IICA office.

There are presently three IICA persons working in SEPSA, but they are not related to PROPLAN. A possible collaboration between PROPLAN/A and SEPSA is presently being negotiated for a small area development project in the area south of San Jose. The negotiations have been stalled by the existance of a lame duck government, until May.

The personnel training strategy presently being pursued by Ing. Chacon is to facilitate a formal education in agricultural economics and then to facilitate the participation in short courses in planning. Presently an 8 week course co-sponsored with PROCADÉS (Proyecto Regional de FAO, PNUN, CEPAL) and managed by ILPES (Instituto Latinoamericano de Planificacion Economica y Social of Santiago, Chile). In fact, tentative negotiations are underway to establish one or two such courses every year to be

given by the Department of Agricultural Economics (Facultad of Agronomía). The fact that SEPSA is turning to ILPES rather than PROPLAN raises questions about the flexibility and/or the capabilities of PROPLAN.

The Consejo Regional de Coordinacion en Agricultura (CORECA) consists of the ministers of agriculture of Central America and the Dominican Republic. IICA/PROPLAN serves as the secretariat for the Consejo and the heads of the agricultural sector planning offices meet perhaps 3 times annually to exchange information and to coordinate policies. Through this mechanism, SEPSA has an active communication link with sister offices in the region. Similar links apparently do not exist with South America and the Caribbean. Ing. Chacon professed a need for better communication.

PROGRAM: CENTRALLY FUNDED

ACTIVITY DATA SHEET

PROJECT MANAGER: Rex Schberg

|                                |                                     |  |   |                                  |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| TITLE IA Planning Network      |                                     | STATUS Agriculture, Rural Development and Nutrition  | PROPOSED OBLIGATION (in thousands of dollars) |                                  |
| NUMBER 911-0236.70             | NEW <input type="checkbox"/>        | PROJECT REFERENCE FY 81 Annex V Centrally Funded, p. | FY 82 75                                      | LIFE OF PROJECT 1,102            |
| GRANT <input type="checkbox"/> | CONTINUING <input type="checkbox"/> |  | INITIAL OBLIGATION FY 77                      | ESTIMATED FINAL OBLIGATION FY 82 |
|                                |                                     |  | ESTIMATED COMPLETION DATE OF PROJECT FY 82    |                                  |

**Purpose:** To improve and build institutional capabilities for agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) countries through the facilities of the InterAmerican Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA).

**Background and Progress to Date:** The project was initiated in late 1977. Following the development of a conceptual model of the planning process, a general survey of the state of the art in planning was conducted in 23 LAC countries. In addition, case studies which probed special aspects of planning were conducted in five countries. These activities resulted in seven publications.

These materials provided the background for a series of three seminars held for officials engaged in the planning process; in San Jose, Costa Rica for the countries of Central America; in Lima, Peru for South America; and in Kingston, Jamaica for the English speaking countries of the Caribbean. The results of each seminar were published for wide distribution. In addition, English versions of the conceptual framework and the general survey were published.

The ultimate aim of the project is to provide planning assistance through IICA, on a request basis, to planning agencies in the region. Examples of such assistance include drastically changing the organization of the units concerned with planning in the Government of Costa Rica in order to improve its effectiveness. Training activities were conducted in Peru, Guyana, El Salvador and Honduras. IICA in-country personnel have responded to requests for assistance in Chile, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela.

Training materials are now being prepared to facilitate further training activities.

**Host Country and Other Donors:** IICA is using part of its core budget to expand activities beyond that portion financed by A.I.D. In addition \$1.5 million are being expended on other planning projects within the IICA program. Countries benefitting will ultimately include all countries of the LAC region.

**Beneficiaries:** The immediate beneficiaries are the planning personnel in the countries receiving assistance with the ultimate beneficiaries being the food producers and consumers who are directly affected by improved policies and planning in their respective countries.

**FY 82 Program:** The program during this year will consist of additional assistance to specific countries in response to individual requests. Major activities will consist of workshops, short courses and individual consultations.

| Major Outputs (and A.I.D. Unit Cost):       | (\$ thousands) |             |
|---|----------------|-------------|
|   | All Years      | unit (cost) |
| Country Assessments                         | 23             | ( 4)        |
| Training Courses and Workshops              | 20             | (22)        |
| Country Level Technical Assistance Programs | 15             | ( 7)        |
| Network Development Programs                | 23             | ( 6)        |
| <b>A.I.D. Financed Inputs:</b>              |                |             |
|   | <b>FY 82</b>   |             |
| Personnel (7 person months)                 | 45             |             |
| Support, Travel, and other direct costs     | 10             |             |
| Seminars and Workshops                      | 20             |             |
|   | <b>TOTAL</b>   | <b>75</b>   |

MINIMUM  
(0)

CURRENT  
(0)

PROPOSED  
(75)

INCREMENT I  
(0)

INCREMENT II  
(0)

| U.S. FINANCING (in thousands of dollars) |            |                         |                      | Funding Period  | Principal Contractor or Agency  |
|--|------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---|
|  | Obligation | Expenditure             | Subsidized           |                 |   |
| Through September 30, 1978               | 752        | 443                     | 313                  |                 | InterAmerican Institute of Agricultural Sciences (IICA)<br>Iowa State University (ISU)<br>Michigan State University (MSU) |
| Estimated Fiscal Year 1980               | 725        | 538                     |                      | 10/1/80-9/30/80 |   |
| Estimated through September 30, 1980     | 982        | 882                     | 100                  |                 |   |
| Proposed FY 1981                         | 125        | 150                     |                      | 10/1/81-9/30/81 |   |
| Estimated through Fiscal Year 1981       | 1,107      | 1,032                   | 75                   |                 |   |
| Proposed FY 82                           | 75         | Future Year Obligations | Estimated Total Cost | 10/1/81-9/30/82 |   |
|  |            | - 0 -                   | 1,107                |                 |   |

13

Topic Title & Number Latin American Agricultural and Rural Sector Planning and Policy Analysis Network

Best Available Document

| OPERATING OBJECTIVE  | CONCRETELY MEASURABLE INDICATORS   | STAYS OF VERIFICATION  | IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Operative Objective:</b> To create conditions which encourage countries to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To improve and build institutional capabilities for agricultural &amp; rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin America and Caribbean countries through IICA.</li> <li>2. To facilitate implementation of agricultural &amp; rural sector planning &amp; policy analysis processes in the appropriate administrative &amp; planning institutions of the IICA target countries.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Indicators of Civil Administration:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Host country institutions or state of institutions that are able to prepare agricultural development plans and policy positions reflecting analytically sound economic and social thought processes.</li> <li>2. Host country governments that implement programs and policies derived from decisions based on analytical methods.</li> </ol>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Planning documents and policy position papers.</li> <li>2. Government actions that reflect implementation.</li> </ol>  | <p><b>Assumptions for policy analysis:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Economic systems requiring public sector interventions in order to meet socially desirable goals.</li> <li>2. Host governments committed to development planning as a means to obtain socially desirable goals.</li> </ol>  |
| <p><b>Operative Objective:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To assess the capacity, constraints &amp; needed improvements in agricultural planning &amp; policy analysis in Latin America &amp; Caribbean.</li> <li>2. To identify gaps in training and technical assistance programs in agricultural planning &amp; policy analysis.</li> <li>3. To design specific training activities to improve agricultural planning capabilities in IICA &amp; their target countries &amp; obtain a long-term multiplicative effect of IICA activities in sector planning &amp; policy analysis.</li> <li>4. To assist in (a) undertaking specific sector planning &amp; policy analysis activities in one or more countries &amp; (b) developing mechanisms for institutionalization &amp; implementation of planning &amp; policy analysis processes in other IICA target countries.</li> <li>5. To manage the Latin American and Caribbean agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis network.</li> </ol>   | <p><b>Indicators of Planning and Policy Analysis:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Research data on where countries are in sector planning and policy analysis capabilities and what are some of the constraints.</li> <li>2. (a) Knowledge of gaps in training and technical assistance programs. (b) A set of training activities that are incorporated by IICA as part of their normal programs. (c) A set of published materials used by IICA and host governments for training programs.</li> <li>3. (a) Institutional capabilities and specific results in planning and analysis activities for one or more countries chosen for participation. (b) Policy analysis activities in institutions that previously had little or no activity.</li> <li>4. A continuous involvement of professionals and governments in network activities.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Survey instruments completed for all IICA target countries.</li> <li>2. (a) Perceptions by knowledgeable individuals and recommendations for training programs. (b) List of activities. (c) List of published training materials.</li> <li>3. (a) Government planning and policy documents. (b) Consultants report to host governments. 4. Communication materials.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Assumptions for training program:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Host country governments that are agreeable to survey work. That planning processes can be reduced to a descriptive analysis. That IICA views this as an integral part of their 1977 program of work.</li> <li>2. That host governments can identify centers and training participants. That sufficient data and information can be generated from case studies in time to be used for training materials and courses. That sufficient professional talent is available at IICA and the Cooperator(s) to staff the program.</li> <li>3. That technical assistance in sector planning and policy analysis will be requested by target countries.</li> <li>4. IICA and the Cooperator(s) are able to identify activity managers early on.</li> </ol> |
| <p><b>Output:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. (a) A documented analysis of agricultural &amp; rural sector planning &amp; policy analysis capabilities in IICA target countries. (b) An assessment of the need for increasing capabilities in planning &amp; policy analysis among IICA target countries.</li> <li>2. (a) A series of workshops, seminars &amp; training courses designed to improve agricultural planning &amp; policy analysis procedures &amp; for training materials. (b) A series of training materials for use by IICA in obtaining a multiplicative effect of sector planning &amp; policy analysis results in target countries.</li> <li>3. (a) A methodology for sector planning &amp; policy analysis activities jointly determined by the host country, IICA, and Cooperator(s). (b) Results of training activities in one or more countries. (c) Results of sector planning &amp; policy analysis activities available for use in training courses &amp; training documents. (d) Sector guidelines for implementation &amp; institutionalization of sector planning &amp; analysis in the appropriate administrative &amp; planning institutions of IICA target countries.</li> <li>4. An integrated planning &amp; policy analysis network effectively accomplishing activity goals.</li> </ol> | <p><b>Aspirable Output:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least one publication submitted to all detailing output.</li> <li>2. (a) Workshops, seminars &amp; training courses. (b) Two training documents.</li> <li>3. (a) A documented methodology. (b) Results for one or more countries. (c) Several country requests for assistance.</li> <li>4. A continuous flow of sector planning &amp; policy analysis information and data.</li> </ol>  |  |  |



# INTER - AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR COOPERATION ON AGRICULTURE

PROPLAN Internal  
Document-69  
January, 1982

## LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT PROPLAN/AP

ACTIVITY REPORT FOR THE PERIOD  
January-December 1981  
and  
PROGRAM OF WORK FOR THE PERIOD  
January-December 1982

OFFICE OF MULTIZONAL PROJECTS  
DIVISION OF PLANNING AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
PROPLAN

The Institute is an agency of the Inter-American System, specialized in agriculture. It was established by the governments of the Americas to stimulate, promote and support the efforts of the Member States to achieve agricultural development and well-being for the rural population. The Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, founded on October 7, 1942, was reorganized under its new name, the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture, under a Convention entered into the signatures of the American States of March 6, 1979. It went into effect in December 1980.

15

## INTRODUCTION

In 1977 IICA and USAID agreed to finance a project "...to improve and build institutional capabilities for agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin American and Caribbean countries..." and to "...facilitate implementation of the agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis process in the appropriate ministries and planning institutions of IICA target countries." 1/

Although originally designed for a three year period, it was extended for two more years and extra funds were allocated.

This report covers the activities undertaken during 1981, the fourth year of the project, and the activities projected for 1982, the fifth and final year of the project according to contract requirements.

In order to facilitate understanding and follow-up, the activities will be presented under the four areas into which they have been classified:

- Development of training materials
- Seminars and workshops
- Technical cooperation
- Network coordination and management

In the fourth year of the project, emphasis has been placed on the development of training materials. As agreed, technical cooperation activities during the year have been a vehicle for testing materials through on-the-job training or "learning by doing". On more than one occasion the need for additional training material has emerged from these technical cooperation activities.

Therefore, the technical cooperation was developed partly in accordance with the plan presented to AID,2/ but also in response to demands from IICA offices in different countries. This means that changes had to be introduced in some of the expected end products, as will be seen for each area.

Specifically, demand has been high for project identification and for project monitoring and evaluation. Also there is an increased concern with operational planning to link the budgetary process to the real activities performed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning and Policy Analysis Project (PROPLAN/AP)

<sup>2</sup> See "Activity report for the period January-December 1980 and Program of work, for the period January-December, 1981" and "Detailed Work Plan for 1981 and 1982."

1/6

It is important to note that the 1981 activities received additional financial support from sources which had not been foreseen. This support was provided for country activities: seminars, workshops and technical cooperation. This meant that the use of AID funds was lower than had been expected.

## I. ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN DURING 1981

During this fourth year of the project, emphasis was placed on testing some of the training materials through seminars, workshops and technical cooperation, and developing new ones that, although were not previously programmed, has been identified during the technical cooperation activities.

### A. DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

As was stated in our 1980 report, several documents have been developed.

#### 1. Basic documents

Policy analysis: through the work of a group of professionals hired for this purpose, a first draft has been prepared on policy analysis in the context of the planning and implementation process. So far this document is available only in Spanish. In 1982, it will be revised, edited and translated into English.

The main purpose of the document is to conceptualize the policy analysis process in planning and implementation, in order to answer two basic questions: What is policy analysis and how does it relate to decision-making? How is it done?

Two additional documents were drafted on how policy analysis is conducted at two different policy levels. One explains how to prepare a basic document clarifying the doctrinal position of governments. This is the first policy level. The second discusses the preparation of a document giving basic guidelines to orientate the planning-implementation process as a second policy level.

Projects: the basic document was revised. The need for a section on project management was identified, and this section should be completed during 1982. Its main purpose is to present an integrated view of projects with the planning-implementation process. In the past, such projects have been viewed as isolated events. Also in the project area, a document has been prepared on project identification. It fits project identification into the policy analysis process, thus ensuring consistency with the government's goals and the socioeconomic situation. Project/program identification is viewed as the first in a series of actions that link policy analysis to implementation of specific policies and actions.

Operational planning: the basic document was finished. It presents operational planning in the context of the planning-implementation process, stressing the fact that operational planning combines the short-run planning with the budgetary process.

It should be noted that this area also falls into the domain of the Management for Rural Development Project (PROPLAN/A), which emphasizes the local level and its relationships with the regional level. PROPLAN/AP, by contrast, places emphasis on operational planning at the national level and its relationships with the regional level. As a result, these two projects are mutually supportive.

## 2. Applied research documents

In this series the case study reports on operational planning in Peru and Chile were revised and are now complete in Spanish.

A case study on the ex-post evaluation of a rural development project is being prepared for completion in 1982.

## 3. Complementary documents

As stated in our 1980 report, complementary documents are prepared by cooperating universities (MSU and ISU). They were developed during 1980 and finished in 1981.

These documents are:

- a. "A guide to information and policy analysis for agricultural decision-making," completed by MSU.
- b. "Manuals for policy analysis price and market-intervention policies," by ISU.

The total amount of funds used by IICA for these activities was \$40,900 (see Annex 1).

## B. SEMINARS AND WORKSHOPS

In these areas, the project was very active during 1981. Several seminars and workshops were used to test training material. The two country-level workshops set as a goal for these activities surpassed all expectations.

Two workshops on project identification were conducted: Grenada in February and Dominica in June. They trained national junior technicians

and technicians from neighboring islands. A list of project ideas consistent with the countries' basic strategic guidelines for the development of the agricultural sector was revised. A project idea was selected, and a project profile was prepared. This was done in 15-day workshops in the two countries.

A seminar on project evaluation was conducted in the Dominican Republic for technicians working in the Planning Bureau of the Agricultural Secretariat. It was based on the material developed by PROPLAN/AP on the planning process, on the role of evaluation as a feedback mechanism for the planning and implementation process, and the material prepared for the ex-post evaluation of a rural development project financed by AID in the Dominican Republic.

PROPLAN/AP was also present in two seminars organized for technicians working in different institutions of the agricultural sector in Central America and Panama. The first was on project identification and project preparation, linking project identification to the policy analysis process. The second seminar, attended by heads of the agricultural sectoral planning offices of the same countries, was held in Santo Domingo. The work on planning systems was presented at that time.

The project was also active in IICA's in-house training activities and meetings. Presentations were made to two IICA Headquarters seminars. A third presentation was made to a seminar organized by IICA's Office of Rural Development.

Because the main source of funding for these activities was outside the project, AID funds used for this purpose totalled only about US\$6,000.

## C. TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Technical cooperation activities were also important during 1981. They made it possible to test materials as they became ready, allowed for "on the job training" in accordance with the Institute's philosophy of institutional strengthening.

### 1. Colombia

Under an agreement signed by IICA with the Ministry of Agriculture to develop a policy analysis and project planning system, PROPLAN provided support in establishing a framework for the analysis of the Colombian sectoral project system.

The work was done by Colombian personnel hired by the project, with the participation of PROPLAN headquarter personnel.

Participation was also strong in the area of policy analysis. Documents prepared by Colombian personnel were reviewed, and guidelines on how to conduct the process were discussed.

The agreement with the Ministry, slated for expiration in 1981, was recently extended for two more years.

## 2. Dominican Republic

As stated in our 1980 report, PROPLAN was heavily involved in the ex-post evaluation of a rural development project financed by AID. The methodologies and data collection were designed in 1980 and analyzed during 1981. The primary purpose of this activity was to test methodologies for ex-post evaluation. All the data are now ready for PROPLAN to begin documenting the experience.

The work was done by national technicians of the Ministry of Agriculture, with PROPLAN's cooperation on methodological aspects and information analysis. The report prepared by the Ministry has already been published.

## 3. Guatemala

The Guatemalan Government asked IICA to help prepare a methodology to evaluate the on-going sectoral development plan so it could serve as input for the preparation of the subsequent plan.

PROPLAN Headquarters personnel collaborated on this task, with the assistance of a consultant. The work produced a methodology for evaluation.

## 4. Panama

PROPLAN has supported IICA's activities for institutional strengthening of the Ministry of Agricultural Development, collaborating in the design of methodologies for analyzing the Ministry's operational planning process.

Also, in answer to a request from the Minister of Agricultural Development PROPLAN has opened conversations to assist high-level Ministry officials in the definition of sectoral policies. A preliminary agreement has been reached and, as part of a case study on policy analysis, the project will be involved in the definition of basic guidelines for the development of the agricultural sector.

## 5. Venezuela

In the last quarter of the year, PROPLAN was called upon to assist IICA's office in Caracas in the preparation and implementation of an integrated rural development program in the Valley of Aroa, mainly in the

establishment of project priorities and the design of programs. As a result, assistance was requested for 1982 on methodologies for project monitoring and evaluation and on operational planning.

Overall, these activities required approximately US\$26,000.

#### D. NETWORK MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

The Planning and Project Management Division (PROPLAN) has completed its second year of operation. It is important to note that the project has now been fully institutionalized within IICA's structure. This means that PROPLAN/AP is no longer an isolated project, but complements other projects in a mutually beneficial working relationship.

PROPLAN/AP clearly benefits from other projects. Actual achievements went far beyond original projections, with a substantial reduction in expenditures. The AID fund used during 1981 for the project totalled US\$82,000. Other projects, which financed certain of PROPLAN/AP activities, benefited from the material generated by PROPLAN/AP and from the experience of PROPLAN's core group. This should be included as a very important output of this group of activities.

##### 1. Network management

These activities included preparing reports to AID and programming project activities for 1982.

It also involved monitoring 1981 activities and reformulating activity plans in view of ongoing changes in circumstances.

The operational program for 1982-83, as is now required by IICA, was prepared and discussed with personnel of IICA's Planning Office.

Also, certain requested changes were clarified, and other information was provided throughout the year, as requested by AID.

As stated previously, the use of AID funds was much less than expected. As part of the institutionalization process, other complementary sources were used to finance some of the training and technical cooperation activities.

##### 2. Network coordination

As indicated in last year's report, any discussion of network coordination should distinguish between two levels. One is the inner IICA network and the other is between IICA and country institutions or other international organizations.

On the first level, within IICA, two types of activities have been conducted. One is to link PROPLAN/AP's generation of training material with requests from IICA's offices, based on their needs to provide technical cooperation to Latin American and Caribbean countries. The second includes presentations in seminars organized by different IICA units, as well as a presentation made to IICA's Board of Directors.

On the second level, PROPLAN/AP supported a consultation meeting with Chief of Agricultural Officers and other high-level decision makers from several East Caribbean countries. This consultation meeting covered areas of work and modes of operation for the countries. PROPLAN/AP presented its approach to project identification in the context of a planning-implementation process. The necessary link between policy analysis and project identification was emphasized. PROPLAN/AP has also met with heads of agricultural sectorial planning offices from Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic. PROPLAN's areas of work and approach were presented in this meeting. The necessary actions to work out a mechanism to improve communication and coordinations among their offices were also discussed at this meeting.

## II. OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS

The additional year of operation of PROPLAN/AP has provided contact with technicians, producers and the rural population in general in Spanish and English-speaking countries in South America, Central America and the Caribbean. This has verified the urgent need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of those government organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean that generate the goods and services required for agricultural development and rural welfare.

PROPLAN/AP operations spotlighted a major stumbling block that prevents public sector action from guiding the development process: the limited ability of the government to formulate and successfully implement agricultural development and rural welfare plans, programs and projects. Limitations on the public sector's ability to guide the development process are largely the result of an approach emphasizing a separation between the definition of policies and their implementation.

As indicated before, the roots of this situation can be traced back to mid-century when, efforts to institutionalize planning as a government task were widespread throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, and "Administrative reforms" were carried out. The main idea in both cases was to convert the public apparatus into a smooth-running entity capable of meeting the development needs of the countries. The problem encountered by these efforts, however, was that they were not based on an integrated concept of action in the public sector. Planners were relegated to the task of defining policies and formulating plans, and the remainder of the bureaucratic apparatus was in charge of implementing policy in a mechanical fashion, closely following the pre-set plans.

To complete the foregoing picture, it should be noted that most of these efforts were directed at strengthening agencies at the national level, at the expense of regional and especially local agencies. What clearly emerges is the weak and often nonexistent participation of the rural population in the decisions affecting their lives, and a corresponding lack of flexibility on the part of the organizational structures of the public sector to respond to change.

To cope with this problem, PROPLAN's action follows a strategy of strengthening the mechanisms of the directive systems for managing the planning-implementation process of agricultural development and rural welfare policies. If strengthening is to help the planning-implementation process respond effectively and efficiently to the needs of agricultural development and rural welfare, it must operate within a consistent pattern of:

- i) redefining the planning and implementation of policies, to form a single process in which the analysis of strategic and operational policies merges with program and project management;
- ii) redesigning the role of directive systems at local, regional and national levels since the mechanisms for planning and implementing policies (although they may vary at the different levels) form a coherent whole within which any partial action will fall short of the mark.
- iii) restructuring the relations among the public sector, the private sector and the marginal, rural poor, with an eye to ensuring the active participation of the rural masses in managing the planning and implementation process of agricultural development and rural welfare policies. This is crucial, both for grasping actual needs and for generating an effective response.

One important point to consider in terms of agricultural development and rural welfare in the countries is the coordination necessary between defining policy and implementing it. Merging these into a single planning-implementation process gives continuity to government action, and the strategic and operational decisions of governments become mutually compatible.

Like any social process, policy planning and implementation is characterized by an ensemble of activities that give it its specific nature. This ensemble of activities covers four stages: formulation, preparation for execution, execution, and control-evaluation. These four stages can be separated for purposes of analysis, but in practice, they comprise ongoing activities and interdependent processes that give the sense of continuity which should persuade all "government action" to guide the agricultural development and rural welfare process.

The conclusion that emerges from PROPLAN's studies is that government action should be viewed as a single process of planning/implementation, with an analysis of the problem at hand, stating the alternatives available, deciding among them, and taking action. This concept provides a well-ordered, coherent view of "government action" for orienting development in the respective countries.

It should be noted that this attitude implies a shift in emphasis, from a stance concerned solely with formulating strategic decisions, to one also concerned with the "quality of action." In other words, the emphasis is less on the mental process and more on devising concrete relationships between thought and action, theory and practice.

PROPLAN's sphere of action is limited by the directive systems of the ensemble of public agencies primarily concerned with agricultural development and the welfare of rural people.

PROPLAN's approach sees the planning and decision-making systems unified under a directive system with the goal of producing action to direct or manage the actions of the main system as a whole. This requires a clear understanding of the functions and performance of the subordinate systems. So the approach presented here emphasizes strengthening the directive system for it to have a comprehensive impact of the main system. Since the action of this system is manifested through the planning-implementation process of agricultural development and rural welfare policies, it has been determined that the strengthening action should target the mechanisms that actually direct the process, that is, the so-called directive mechanisms.

To achieve its objective, the directive system has a series of functions. These include the interpretation of socioeconomic and political problems; establishment of objectives and strategies; definition of strategic and operational policies; definition of the institutional organization; programming of specific actions and allocation of resources and responsibilities; setting up inter-institutional coordination for the execution of specific actions; monitoring of specific actions, and the behavior of factors arising from the socioeconomic sphere; and lastly, evaluation of accomplishments and their impact.

The directive system carries out these functions through various activities with features particular to each country. These may vary in accordance with the role and specific characteristics of each of the public sectors, and with each level of operations (local, national, etc.) Each directive activity implies analyzing (identification of problems, formulation of alternatives to solve these problems), advising (proposing alternative decisions), and making decisions. These lead to the accomplishment of specific actions.

The ensemble of activities (analyzing, advising and decision-making), and the corresponding interrelationship between them and accomplishment of specific actions within a given organizational context, comprise the mechanisms used by the directive system to manage the planning-implementation process.

Thus PROPLAN's approach seeks to strengthen the directive mechanisms of the planning-implementation process at these different levels of coverage, thus promoting greater efficiency and effectiveness in the public agencies in Latin America and the Caribbean that generate the goods and services required for agricultural development and rural welfare.

24

This is the broad picture that the PROPLAN/A and PROPLAN/AP projects have helped to construct. In turn, it is in this context that the areas of actions for both projects have been defined. These areas reflect the functions of the directive system for which the Latin American and Caribbean countries need support.

The following chart gives the areas covered by PROPLAN's projects. It also shows the integration between the two projects and how each one can profit from the other within the same conceptual and methodological focus.

In this way, PROPLAN's approach links the policy analysis process, as a basis for decision-making, with the implementation process, mainly program and project management. Up to now, these had been treated independently.

25

| AREAS OF PROPLAN WORK  | SPHERE OF PROPLAN/A   | SPHERE OF PROPLAN/AP   |
|--|---|--|
| <p><u>BASIC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Planning-implementation process of agricultural development and rural welfare policies</li> <li>. Public sector directive system.</li> <li>. Process of policy analysis</li> <li>. Information systems for managing planning/implementation process.</li> </ul>   | <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p>  | <p></p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p>  |
| <p><u>SPECIFIC</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>. Specification and interpretation of socioeconomic problems</li> <li>. Identification of performance and capability of public sector to formulate and implement programmes</li> <li>. Definition of strategic and operational policies.</li> <li>. Preparation of development plans and programmes</li> <li>. Identification, prioritization and preparation of projects.</li> <li>. Preparation of operational plans and programmes.</li> <li>. Program and project management</li> <li>. Design of inter-institutional coordination mechanisms.</li> <li>. Design of monitoring and evaluation systems to measure achievements and impact.</li> </ul> | <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> | <p></p> <p></p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p>X</p> <p></p> <p>X</p> |

2/1

### III. ACTIVITIES PROGRAMMED FOR 1982

The tasks programmed for the year are directed towards the consolidation of materials already developed and the dissemination of results through workshops and a course to be held before the end of the year.

#### A. DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING MATERIALS

##### 1. Policy Analysis

As stated, the revised version of the basic document will be written, along with a guide for conducting case studies in selected countries. The revision implies, first, updating certain parts of the basic document with the developments made by PROPLAN's core group in other areas. It also implies the incorporation of the knowledge gained from the case studies to be conducted. A maximum of three case studies<sup>3/</sup> will be carried out by consultants and PROPLAN staff. They should provide the basis for preparing complementary documents to support specific aspects of the policy analysis process.

##### 2. Projects

A complementary document will be prepared on the ex-post evaluation experience in the Dominican Republic.

A document on project monitoring and evaluation<sup>4/</sup> will also be prepared during the second half of the year. Also the documents on project identification will be reviewed. This should include the experiences gained from testing this material in country application.

##### 3. Operational planning

Between May and September, guidelines will be prepared for the preparation of operational plans. By the end of the year, the basic document for operational planning will be revised in light of experience gained from our technical cooperation activities.

#### B. TRAINING

As stated, 1982 will be devoted mainly to the consolidation of materials through training activities.

In this sense, PROPLAN/AP will organize two seminars on operational planning. One will be held in Panama and the other is being programmed for the Dominican Republic.

---

<sup>3/</sup> An unfunded extension through June 30, 1983 is being requested. If it is approved, one case study should be postponed to early 1983.

<sup>4/</sup> This will be a joint effort with PROPLAN/A. Due to a lack of time, it may not be feasible unless other actions are postponed for 1983. This will depend on the approval of the unfunded extension.

21

A policy analysis course will be held in late 1982<sup>5/</sup>. Materials developed by the project will be presented to medium to high level officials of national planning offices. The length of this course has not been determined yet, but it should last from two to four weeks.

Also, two short seminars for national planners will be held: one will be for technicians of the Andean Region, and the other, for technicians from Central America and the Caribbean.

These courses and seminars will make use of the materials developed during the project, through technical cooperation activities and case studies in 1981 and 1982.

A total expenditures of US\$1140000 from AID funds is anticipated for these activities (see Annex 2).

### C. TECHNICAL COOPERATION

As was stated, these activities allow PROPLAN to develop, test and improve the training materials.

During 1982 the following countries and areas may be covered.

| <u>COUNTRY</u>       | <u>AREA</u>   |
|----------------------|---|
| Colombia             | Policy analysis, planning systems, project monitoring and evaluation. |
| CDB member countries | Policy analysis for identification of investment areas.               |
| Dominican Republic   | Operational planning and project monitoring and evaluation.           |
| Panama               | Operational planning and projects.                                    |
| Venezuela            | Operational planning<br>Project monitoring and evaluation.            |

A total of US\$33000 AID funds will be devoted to technical cooperation (see Annex 2).

---

<sup>5/</sup> If the untruded extension is granted, due to the time needed for further developing the training materials, a more convenient date for the course would be April-May 1983.

**D. NETWORK MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION**

**1. Network management**

The same type of activities (programming, organizing, coordinating, and controlling project activities) is expected to continue in 1982, including annual reports to AID and quarterly reports to IICA's planning office. We will work on the preparation of IICA's program-budget, as well as the 1982 operational program for AID.

If the unfunded extension is approved the program of work would take into consideration an adjustment in time, as indicated, as well as additional actions suggested for network coordination.

**2. Network coordination**

In order to strengthen ties with other organizations and present the progress of our work, a meeting is being planned for Washington, D.C. with international development organizations involved in the field of work of PROPLAN.

Also, the participation of PROPLAN staff in technical meetings should help us attain the goal of network coordination.

A total of US\$16,000 AID funds is expected to be used in these activities (see Annex 2).

There are three additional actions PROPLAN/AP could conduct for network building in order to strengthen ties among planners in Latin America and the Caribbean. This could be done without requesting additional funds if we could have more time. One of these actions is to reorient the two short seminars in order to organize seminars with all heads of sectorial planning offices as well as other high officials, similar to the ones we had at the beginning of the project. A second additional activity would be to involve a Latin American University and/or the Graduate Training Program of CATIE in Turrialba in the organization of the policy analysis course. This could be seen as a first step toward a Training Program in Planning and Policy Analysis which could start with a regular course or long seminar once a year for technicians working in planning offices and those acting as advisors to decision makers in Latin America. There is a third additional activity which we have not been able to conduct for lack of time and an underestimation of the work it implied. It has to do with a mechanism for improving communication among planners and others interested in planning as a process for improving decision-making and its implementation. This mechanism could be a newsletter or similar device; it should be discussed with its potential public in order to get them involved in its generation.

Our experience so far tells us that the creation and coordination of a network should be built on a foundation of all other activities; it is not a separate activity in itself. This is the reason for suggesting additional actions which are linked to these programs under training.

## ANNEX 1

## SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES FROM AID FUNDS FOR 1981

| CUENTAS                                 | SALARIES*        | TRAVEL           | OTHER DIRECT COSTS | TOTALS           |
|---|------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Development<br>Training<br>material     | 27,838.58        | 11,710.41        | 1,351.72           | 40,900.71        |
| Seminars<br>workshops                   |                  | 6,097.13         |                    | 6,097.13         |
| Technical<br>cooperation                | 16,672.75        | 6,691.00         | 2,524.23           | 25,887.98        |
| Network<br>management &<br>coordination | 611              | 1,194.78         | 220                | 2,025.78         |
| <b>SUBTOTAL</b>                         | <b>45,122.33</b> | <b>25,693.32</b> | <b>4,095.95</b>    | <b>74,911.60</b> |
| Overhead (10%)                          |                  |                  |                    | 7,491.16         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                            |                  |                  |                    | <b>82,402.76</b> |
| Less:                                   |                  |                  |                    |                  |
| Adjustment due exchange<br>difference   |                  |                  |                    |                  |
| - other direct costs                    |                  |                  |                    | (488.02)         |
| - overhead(10%)                         |                  |                  |                    | ( 48.80)         |
| <b>TOTAL</b>                            |                  |                  |                    | <b>81,865.94</b> |

\* Include payments to consultants

**ANNEX 2****SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES FROM AID FUNDS PROGRAMMED FOR 1982**

|                                 | <b>Development<br/>of training<br/>materials</b> | <b>Seminars<br/>&amp;<br/>Workshops</b> | <b>Technical<br/>Cooperation</b> | <b>Network<br/>Management<br/>&amp; coordi-<br/>nation</b> | <b>Total</b>  |
|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------|
| - Salaries                      | 86,532   | 26,446                                  | 18,266                           | 2,422  | 133,666       |
| - Travel, transp.<br>& per diem | 9,500  | 78,870                                  | 13,047                           | 6,990  | 108,407       |
| - Other direct<br>costs         | <u>24,000</u>                                    | <u>8,730</u>                            | <u>1,500</u>                     | <u>6,935</u>   | <u>41,165</u> |
| Sub-total                       | 120,032  | 114,046                                 | 32,813                           | 16,347   | 293,238       |
| Overhead                        |  |   |                                  |  | <u>28,378</u> |
| Grand total                     |  |   |                                  |  | 311,616       |

**PROPLAN PERSONNEL**

**DIVISION DE PLANIFICACION Y MANEJO DE PROYECTOS (PROPLAN)**

**a) Personal - Sede Central**

Pedro Lizardo de las Casas, Jefe de la División (IICA)  
Isabel Bolaños, Secretaria (IICA)  
Vacante, Secretaria (IICA)

**Proyecto de Planificación Agropecuaria y Análisis de Políticas (PROPLAN/AP)**

Gonzalo Estefanell, Especialista en Planificación (AID)  
Fernando Del Risco, Especialista en Planificación (IICA)

**Proyecto Planificación y Administración para el Desarrollo Rural (PROPLAN/A)**

Humberto Colmenares, Especialista en Economía Agrícola (Kellogg)  
Ricardo Cáceres, Especialista en Administración para el Desarrollo (IICA)  
\*Eduardo Izquierdo, Especialista en Economía Agrícola (Kellogg)

**b) Personal-Colombia**

Francisco Barea, Especialista en Administración de Proyectos (IICA)  
Enrique Polo, Especialista en Planificación y Manejo de Programas (Kellogg)  
\*Alfonso Bejarano, Especialista en Manejo de Proyectos (Kellogg)  
Secretaria (Kellogg)

**c) Personal-República Dominicana**

\*\*Horacio Stagno, Especialista en Planificación y Manejo de Proyectos (IICA)  
Carlos Fonck, Especialista en Planificación (Fondo Simón Bolívar)  
\*Agapito Pérez Luna, Especialista en Planificación Regional (Fondo Simón Bolívar)  
Rita Herrera, Secretaria (Fondo Simón Bolívar)

**d) Personal-Brasil**

\*\*Vacante, Especialista en Planificación y Análisis de Políticas (IICA)

---

\* Profesional Nacional

\*\* Especialista Multinacional.