

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

PD-AAA-757

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Expanded Program in Economic Analysis Latin American and Caribbean Planning Network (LACPLAN)			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0236.07	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE S&T/AGR/EPP
4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)				
Terminal _____ <input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION				
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>77</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>82</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>83</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>9/77</u> To (month/yr.) <u>9/30/83</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>9/84</u>	
A. Total \$ <u>1,182,173</u>		B. U.S. \$ <u>1,182,173</u>		

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
This is the terminal evaluation, the project has been completed and no further actions are required.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P</td> <td>_____</td> </tr> </table>	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____											
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____											
11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles) S&T/AGR/EPP, R. Hanson - Project Officer S&T/AGR/EPP, P. Church S&T/PO, Frank Campbell S&T/AGR, J. Royer	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval Signature _____ Typed Name ANSON R. BERTRAND, S&T/AGR Date _____												

Project Evaluation Summary

13. Summary

The Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning Network Project (LACPLAN), 931-0236.07, officially terminated September 30, 1983. This project 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 for Cooperation on Agriculture (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. IICA's contract was later extended through FY83 so that IICA could complete their training materials. All work funded under the A.I.D. contract has now been completed.

14. Evaluation Methodology

This was the final or terminal evaluation of the LACPLAN project, 931-0236-07. This evaluation followed up a management review held in February evaluations held in July 1979 and July 1978, and an AID audit of August

The purpose of this evaluation was to measure the end-of-project progress of the various project activities, to draw out from the evaluation the lessons learned which could be helpful to A.I.D. in designing and implementing other projects in agricultural planning and policy analysis, and to assess the capability of IICA to provide services in the area of agricultural planning and policy analysis. The evaluation was conducted by the AID/W project manager and an outside consultant. Site visits were made to the IICA central office in San Jose, Costa Rica and to the two countries where LACPLAN was most active, Colombia and the Dominican Republic. In all these cases discussions were held with USAID personnel, IICA representatives involved with the project, and host government officials who had been the recipients of LACPLAN services, i.e., training or technical assistance. A complete list of the individuals contacted is attached in Annex A.

The requirement of the evaluation is stated in the evaluation section of the project paper.

15. External Factors

In addition to the external factors described in the mid-term evaluation, there is one other external factor which warrants mentioning. In 1980, IICA's PROPLAN office received major funding from the Kellogg Foundation for a new project working at the local and regional levels within a country in the area of planning and development administration.

Basically this project was using the LACPLAN methodology but on the "micro-area" level rather than at the national level. Thus LACPLAN or PROPLAN/AP focussed on planning and policy analysis at the national level and its application to the regional level. The Kellogg supported project, PROPLAN/A, focussed on the "micro-area" level, and from the aggregation and/or coordination of the micro-areas moves to the regional level. In 1980 when PROPLAN/A started IICA placed much more emphasis on this activity than on PROPLAN/AP as can be evidenced by the low levels of expenditures under the A.I.D. contract during this time period. This might have been because of the need to get the new project up and running or it may have been because IICA found it easier to implement the PROPLAN methodology at the local level. In any case the result was the need to give an unfunded extension for two years for the LACPLAN project in order to complete many of the training activities.

16. Inputs

All inputs were provided in a timely and orderly fashion. A.I.D. monies for the total project were \$1,182,173 of which 60% (\$713,390) went to IICA, 31% (\$368,612) went to Iowa State University and 9% (\$100,171) went to Michigan State University. IICA's involved last for the entire length of the project, six years, while Iowa State participated for four years and Michigan State for three years. Due to internal factors and a slight change in emphasis of project activities, IICA and Iowa State University were given unfunded extensions to complete their respective activities. Earlier IICA had their funding increased by \$425,000 to cover cost overruns during the first three years of the project and to fund years four and five.

17. Outputs

The LACPLAN project through the accomplishments of IICA, Iowa State University, and Michigan State University has clearly surpassed the project outputs envisioned in the project paper. The logframe specified four major outputs from this project:

1. At least one publication submitted to A.I.D. detailing analysis of agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis capability in IICA target countries;
- 2.(a) A series of workshops, seminars and training courses designing methods for improving agricultural planning and analysis procedures and for training planning techniques;
- (b) Two training documents for use by IICA in the presentation of their training courses on agricultural planning and policy analysis procedures;
- 3.(a) A documented methodology for sector planning and policy analysis;
- (b) Results of sector planning and analysis activities in one or more countries in Latin America;
- (c) Several country requests for technical assistance in the areas of agricultural and planning and policy analysis;
4. A continuous flow of sector planning and analysis information and data.

Item 1 was accomplished in 1979 and is published as PROPLAN documents one and two.

Item 2a has been completed through the 25 workshops, seminars, and training courses IICA has presented between 1978 and 1983. The series of

workshops, seminars, and training courses took place in 17 different countries in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Item 2b was achieved through the publication of the Agricultural Policy Analysis Manual by Iowa State (PROPLAN Document #41) and the training document for IICA's Agricultural Planning and Policy Analysis course (PROPLAN Document #39). There have been a series of other training documents published by Michigan State University and primarily IICA under this project.

Item 3a was completed with the publication of PROPLAN document #1. It has been followed up with the publication of documents #35 and #37.

Item 3b has been completed as a result of the publication of the work done in Costa Rica (PROPLAN #3), Venezuela (PROPLAN #5), Bolivia (PROPLAN #4), Honduras (PROPLAN #6), Peru (PROPLAN #7 and #11), Chile (PROPLAN #15), the Dominican Republic (PROPLAN #24), and Colombia (PROPLAN #17).

Item 3c was achieved as a result of various requests for assistance from 11 different Latin American and Caribbean countries.

Item 4 has been achieved through the continuing series of seminars, workshops and training courses and the publications of the IICA Proplan activities.

18. Purpose

As stated in the logical framework, the project's purpose is, "1. To assess the capacity, constraints and needed improvements in agricultural planning and policy analysis in Latin America and the Caribbean. 2(a) To identify gaps in training and technical assistance programs in agricultural planning and policy analysis, (b) to design specific training activities to

improve agricultural planning capacities in IICA and their target countries, and (c) to obtain a long-term multiplicative affect of IICA activities in sector planning and policy analysis. 3. To assist in (a) undertaking specific sector planning and policy analysis activities in one or more countries and (b) designing mechanisms for institutionalization and implementation of planning and policy analysis processes in other IICA target countries. 4. To manage the Latin American and Caribbean agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis network."

Item 1 was achieved from the analysis of the data collected in the major survey of the planning institutions throughout the region during the first two years of the project. During this assessment data was collected from the 23 IICA target countries throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. Three seminars were held presenting the findings of this assessment, one in Kingston, Jamaica, one in San Jose, Costa Rica, and one in Lima, Peru.

Item 2a was completed as a product of the three regional seminars.

Item 2b was achieved through the design and implementation of training seminars, policy analysis course, and the large number of documents published as a result of this project.

Item 2c was achieved through the results of 2b. There has been a series of requests of IICA to follow up their training presentations with more in-country work on training and/or technical assistance.

Items 3a and 3b were completed with work in the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, Venezuela, and Panama.

Item 4 has been completed through a continuing series of training and planning seminars throughout the life of the project. A formal network

newsletter or organization was never established due to cost and time constraints although this was not a requirement, just one possible approach.

19. Goal/Subgoal

"To improve and build institutional capabilities for agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis in Latin American and Caribbean countries through the InterAmerican Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA). To facilitate implementation of agricultural and rural sector planning and policy analysis processes in the appropriate ministries and planning institutions of the IICA target countries."

The activities undertaken by IICA over the last six years through their PROPLAN office have clearly demonstrated IICA's capability to provide agricultural and rural sector planning for countries throughout the Latin American and Caribbean regions. IICA currently has a technical staff specializing in planning located in their central office in San Jose, Costa Rica and in the field offices of the Dominican Republic, Barbados, Colombia, and Uruguay. There is every reason to believe this staff will remain with IICA for the foreseeable future.

The agricultural and rural sector planning processes have been on-going in the government ministries throughout the Latin American and Caribbean region. IICA has been helped to move this process forward over the last several years.

In reference to the policy analysis area there is more doubt as to the capability of IICA. IICA has not really gotten involved in the policy analysis area and therefore there is no benchmark to measure their

capability. (See attached evaluation report by Ralph Hanson and Dean Schreiner.) During discussions held with IICA officials in Costa Rica, Colombia, and the Dominican Republic it became apparent that IICA is sensitive to the political concerns of getting involved in agricultural policy analysis and demonstrated some hesitation of going in that direction. (See attached evaluation report.) Technically it appears the capability exists but up to this point it has not been demonstrated.

20. Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries have been the planning personnel in the countries receiving technical assistance (Panama, Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Venezuela, and the Dominican Republic) and the individuals from throughout the region who participated in training activities sponsored by LACPLAN.

The indirect beneficiaries are the food producers and consumers who are directly affected by improved policies and planning in their respective countries.

21. Unplanned Effects

This project did not result in any unexpected results.

22. Lessons Learned

Development Strategy

Agricultural policy analysis is a very large and complex field. No one local, regional or international institution will have sufficient expertise or

resources to cover all areas. Part of the resources of an institution such as IICA, or a similar institution in other geographic regions, should be devoted to correct policy problem identification and then to looking for the best expertise to assist in problem analysis and resolution, knowing that the home institution will not always have the needed expertise.

Follow-on Activities with IICA

The evaluation paper identifies some potential follow-on activities and include:

1. Linkages with the S&T Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP):
 - Roster of technical experts
 - Networking of decisionmakers and policy technicians
 - Joint workshops through CORECA or other countries and programs
 - Joint technical assistance ventures
 - Joint project design and evaluation ventures
2. Fund specific policy studies in which IICA shows a comparative advantage.

Evaluation Methodology

This was a multi-country and multi-person evaluation effort. Appropriately so, the evaluation process permitted sufficient flexibility and ad-hocness to complete the job. A major objective of the evaluation was to gain information and insights from this project to be used in the S&T APAP. The evaluation succeeded in obtaining this objective.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

Significant Policy Implications

Comprehensive planning, particularly at the national level, lacks

credibility in most if not all countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. This should not limit or cloud the thinking toward the need for partial or fairly complete analyses of important agricultural and food policies in the region. Significant social gains may result from changes in policy that arise out of fairly short-term, partial analyses. LACPLAN/PROPLAN does not emphasize these partial analyses.

Significant Program Management Implications

Project managers should look for potentially (1) different ways of implementing a project, (2) differences in methodologies that can be used, or (3) differences in philosophies in viewing problems and solutions. Frequently, within the same project, different people will have different ideas about implementation, methodology or philosophy but the ideas become suppressed due to conditions such as dominant leadership. Project managers may suggest outside review panels or seminars to discuss advantages and disadvantages of the various alternatives. Project management, however, should be convinced a review is necessary before disrupting an apparent productive existing operation.

/ 11 /

ANNEX A

Individuals Contacted During Evaluation

<u>INDIVIDUALS</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
<u>IICA Officials</u>	
Ricardo Caceres	Costa Rica
P. Lizardo de las Casas	Costa Rica
Fernando Del Risco	Costa Rica
Hector Morales	Dominican Republic
Horacio Stagno	Dominican Republic
Jerry LaGra	Dominican Republic
Francisco Barea	Colombia & the Dominican Republic
Mario Blasco	Colombia
Alfonso Bejarano	Colombia
Gonzalo Estafanell	Barbados
<u>AID Officials</u>	
Dave Joslyn	ROCAP/San Jose
Rafael Rosario	USAID/San Jose
Roberto Castro	USAID/Santo Domingo
Tex Ford	USAID/Santo Domingo
<u>Host Country Officials</u>	
Mohelles Mejia - Ministry of Agriculture	Colombia
Armiro Orozco, ICA (Colombian Agr. Research & Extension Agency)	Colombia
Luis Romano, ICA	Colombia
Carlos Fonck - private consultant	Dominican Republic
Samuel Encarnacion - Office of National Statistics	Dominican Republic
Pablo Rodriguez - CEDOPEX	Dominican Republic
Agapito Perez Luna - private consultant	Dominican Republic
San Lois - SEA (Ministry of Agriculture)	Dominican Republic
Santiago Tejada - SEA	Dominican Republic
Francisco Perez Luna - SEA	Dominican Republic