

AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS PROJECT
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Contract No. DAN-4084-C-00-3087-00

Evaluation of the Latin American and
Caribbean Agricultural Planning
and Policy Analysis Project
(LACPLAN/PROPLAN)

Submitted to:

Dr. James Riordan
Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Subcontractor:

Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

Prepared by:

Dean F. Schreiner
Department of Agricultural Economics
Oklahoma State University
Ralph Hanson
Bureau of Science and Technology
Office of Agriculture
U.S. Agency for International Development

Revised
September 10, 1984

Best Available Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Antecedents.....	1
Scope of this Evaluation.....	4
TECHNICAL EVALUATION.....	4
IICA INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF AGRICULTURAL PLANNING AND POLICY ANALYSIS.....	9
Organization.....	10
Commitment.....	11
DEMAND FOR PROPLAN SERVICES.....	13
CAPABILITY OF IICA FOR PROVIDING AGRICULTURAL POLICY ANALYSIS SERVICES.....	14
RECOMMENDATIONS.....	16
For IICA.....	16
For S&T.....	17
For S&T Agricultural Policy Analysis Project.....	17
ANNEX I PROJECT EVALUATION AND SCOPE OF WORK.....	19
ANNEX II IICA CENTRAL UNIT PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTS.....	23
ANNEX III IICA COLOMBIA AND DOMINICAN REPUBLIC PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTS.....	31

Evaluation of the Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural
Planning and Policy Analysis Project
(LACPLAN/PROPLAN)

Introduction

Implementation of the Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning and Policy Analysis Project (LACPLAN) would have been facilitated by a definitional separation of agricultural sector planning from agricultural policy analysis. LACPLAN has concentrated on agricultural sector planning (allocative planning) -- ignored agricultural policy analysis (incentive planning). The ingredients originally viewed as making the Interamerican Institute for Agricultural Cooperation (IICA) an important institution supporting Latin America and Caribbean agricultural planning efforts are still there. They should now be used to support agricultural policy analysis efforts.

Antecedents

Reasons why the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) chose to support agricultural planning and policy analysis in Latin America and the Caribbean and why IICA was chosen to implement LACPLAN (who subsequently and more appropriately renamed the project PROPLAN) are contained in other documents¹. In summary, PROPLAN represented the direction the Agency was taking in the developing world to emphasize the importance of agricultural planning and

¹ A current and detailed description and prior evaluation of PROPLAN is contained in James T. Riordan, "Evaluation of Agricultural Sector Planning Activities in Latin America and the Caribbean", Abt Associates Inc., Cambridge, Massachusetts, especially pages 2-14 to 2-28.

policy analysis in achieving increased capacity for food production and increased participation of poor people in the benefits of development. IICA was chosen to implement a centrally funded agricultural planning and policy analysis project for this major geographical region because (1) it was committed philosophically to institutionalization of in-country sectoral planning units over the long term; (2) growth in its budgetary commitments to this area offered concrete evidence that philosophical commitment was matched by action; (3) Latin American and Caribbean countries not only appeared receptive to IICA as an effective agency of cooperation in development but also seemed to regard it, with good reason, as an indigenous Latin American institution; and (4) although IICA's program priorities had shifted dramatically toward agricultural sector planning and policy analysis in previous years, resource limitations and the need for greater manpower had prevented IICA from shifting as rapidly as needs arose.¹

USAID is able to fund agricultural planning projects through Missions or Central Bureaus. Centrally funded projects are justified for purposes of (1) developing methodologies for use on a broad scale; (2) providing technical assistance backstopping to country projects; (3) developing training materials and holding seminars and short courses on a broad scale; and (4) establishing a networking across countries of institutions and people engaged in planning and policy

¹ Ibid, p. 2-16.

analysis. These became the specific purposes of PROPLAN since IICA itself is a regional institution providing similar functions.

A brief history of the early beginnings of PROPLAN is useful to understand more fully the reporting that follows. PROPLAN, starting in 1977, was the first major activity funded under the Expanded Program of Economic Analysis for Agricultural and Rural Sector Planning. The Expanded Program came out of the Economics and Sector Planning Division of the Office of Agriculture of the Technical Assistance Bureau (currently, S&T/AGR/EPP) with William Merrill as Chief of the Division. Dean Schreiner was the first project manager of PROPLAN. Others involved in the design of PROPLAN included Fred Mann, a private consultant; Lee Fletcher of Iowa State University; and Mike Moran of IICA. This was one of the first projects to be negotiated under a Cooperative Agreement in the Agency and hence this provided a means for collaborative design of an activity that would be carried through to implementation. IICA was contracted to carry out the purposes of the project. Iowa State University and Michigan State University signed Cooperative Agreements to provide IICA technical assistance in implementing the project. IICA hired Dr. Jose Silos as the first PROPLAN project manager. After about one year Dr. Silos moved up to head the agricultural planning division within IICA that included PROPLAN as one major project. Dr. Lizardo de las Casas was hired to replace Dr. Silos as project manager and remained in that capacity for the duration of PROPLAN. USAID was not so fortunate with their project management. After Schreiner served for about one year, a succession of managers followed until the current and final manager, Ralph Hanson.

Scope of this Evaluation

The Project Evaluation Scope of Work is contained in Annex I. Country visits were made by one or both of the authors to Costa Rica, Colombia and the Dominican Republic. This evaluation is centered around five topics:

- 1) Technical evaluation of PROPLAN.
- 2) IICA institutionalization of agricultural planning and policy analysis.
- 3) Demand for services from IICA by the Latin America and Caribbean governments.
- 4) Capability within IICA for providing services in agricultural planning and policy analysis.
- 5) Recommendations to IICA, the Bureau of Science and Technology (S&T) and the current S&T Agricultural Policy Analysis Project.

Technical Evaluation

PROPLAN output has been well documented. What institution would not be pleased with the publication record shown by this five year project (Annex II).¹ A short list of the most important and relevant documents for this evaluation were identified by Ralph Hanson and these were reviewed. A good synthesis and summary of the important ideas and results of PROPLAN are contained in PROPLAN/AP Activity Report for 1983 and Final Report, Internal Document 120, San Jose, Costa Rica.

¹ The publication listing in Annex II is from IICA, PROPLAN/AP Activity Report for 1983 and Final Report, Internal Document 120, San Jose, Costa Rica. This listing represents publications only from the central office of IICA. Country offices have their own documents as reported later for Colombia and the Dominican Republic.

The need for distinguishing between agricultural sector planning and agricultural policy analysis, as stated in the introduction of this evaluation, is based on results of PROPLAN. Some may argue that this difference is only one of semantics, and certainly, agricultural planning does involve policy decisions. However, upon reviewing the 104 titles listed in Annex II, not one title makes reference to a specific commodity, resource or market policy.¹ Rather, most titles refer to planning methodologies and planning processes.

The emphasis to date of PROPLAN has been on planning process. This emphasis is reflected in published documents, technical assistance to countries, country programs (specifically, Colombia and the Dominican Republic) and training programs. The subject areas covered in the Course on Policy Analysis for Agricultural Public Decision-Making below verifies this emphasis:²

- 1) Planning and management for agricultural development and rural well-being.
- 2) Policy analysis as technical support for guiding and planning implementation process; Phases and activities of policy analysis in relation to the prospective and operating dimensions of the planning-implementation process.
- 3) Methods and models of analysis for decision-making.
- 4) Analysis for orientational decisions.
- 5) Analysis for operational decisions.

¹ Two titles in the Complementary Documents Series refer to general topics of prices, subsidies and market-interventions policies.

² PROPLAN/AP Activity Report of 1983 and Final Report, pp.3-4.

- 6) Project identification and prioritization.
- 7) Preparation of operational plans/programs.
- 8) Program and project management.
- 9) Monitoring and evaluation.
- 10) Sociodynamics in the planning-implementation process.
- 11) Final workshop: Analysis and suggestions of alternatives for strengthening planning systems and the performance of advisors.

AID documents have consistently pointed out the differences between allocative planning -- the design, preparation, and appraisal of projects employing large blocks of resources subject to public control, and incentive planning -- changing policies and institutions for facilitating and encouraging maximum performance by the sector consistent with social goals. This has been the argument the Agency has used to rationalize sector programming (and sector analysis) versus project programming (and project analysis.) Measuring results of changing policies and institutions requires a broader perspective than is allowed through project analysis. Thus, sector analysis should provide such a perspective.

It is apparent from IICA documents that they have accepted sector planning but have remained in the realm of allocative planning. Their added dimension is consistency among projects and institutions within the sector. This is consistent with their emphasis on (1) a single, integrated planning/implementation process; (2) a single directive or guidance system; (3) participation of the rural population in guiding the planning-implementation process; and

(4) interdisciplinary integration, stressing the group nature of task performance.¹

IICA has appropriately noted that this type of allocative planning is not limited to application at the national level and hence the Sectoral Planning Offices. It can be defined for a determined scope of action including a project, a program, an area, a region, a subsector, a sector or an institution.² In fact, an excellent application is provided in Colombia with their microregional analysis for DRI-PAN (an integrated rural development program).

Emphasis of agricultural sector allocative planning is on use of resources and how public agencies and institutions can be used to bring about the most efficient and desirable use of these resources. Major emphasis is placed on allocative control of these resources.³ This was certainly the case in the Colombia DRI-PAN program. This is why emphasis is placed on local participation of target groups and on involvement of all concerned public agencies and institutions in the planning process. With all parties involved, it is natural for distinctions between planning and implementation to become blurred, especially for resources already committed. In fact, IICA stresses the importance of planning and implementation becoming one process.⁴

¹ Ibid, p. 23.

² Ibid, p. 25.

³ It is interesting to note that the policy decision to commit these resources has usually already been made before allocative planning begins.

⁴ One of the fundamental postulates of PROPLAN is a "Redefinition of the processes of planning and implementation as a single, integrated planning/implementation process." (underline in original). Ibid, p. 23.

Since PROPLAN has by-in-large been restricted to agricultural sector allocative planning, it is natural that results (publications, training programs, technical assistance) emphasize planning methodologies, processes for interdisciplinary involvement, and methods for obtaining target group participation.¹ Other than IICA's methodological results, little from PROPLAN is transferable from one country to another or from one institution to another. This is recognized by IICA in their emphasis placed on "learning by doing."² PROPLAN provided excellent on-the-job training for the Colombian DRI-PAN program and the regional projects of the Secretaria de Estado de Agricultura of the Dominican Republic.

PROPLAN has made exceptional contributions to agricultural sector allocative planning in Latin America and the Caribbean. It has not had an impact on analysis of country commodity, resource and market policies for achieving increased capacity for food production and increased participation of poor people in the benefits of development. In our opinion, IICA should move in this direction through PROPLAN or some modified version of PROPLAN.

Comprehensive planning, particularly at the national level, lacks considerable credibility in most if not all countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. No single institution or agency has

¹ In addition to the titles of documents listed in Annex II, note the titles of documents from Project PROPLAN - Colombia and the Dominican Republic given in Annex III.

² Ibid, p. 16.

control over all policies affecting agricultural production and food utilization. Yet, PROPLAN in its early development of methodologies and its emphasis on a single integrated planning/implementation process assumes the model of a single control unit and comprehensiveness. This reason may explain why PROPLAN has had considerable success at the microregional/project level where considerable control can be delegated to a single unit but has had little evidence of application at the national level.

The vast majority of the Latin American and Caribbean countries operate with essentially free market economies. This does not mean these countries' economies are free of government interventions. On the contrary, most of the economies have extensive government interventions and most of these market interventions have not been extensively analyzed for their distribution of economic costs and benefits.¹ Incentive planning utilizes policies for influencing the large number of dispersed market decisions found in most free market economies to bring about desirable economic and equity goals. PROPLAN has not moved in this direction.

IICA Institutionalization of Agricultural Planning and Policy Analysis

To address the question of whether IICA has institutionalized the capability of agricultural planning and policy analysis one must

¹ See Luther Tweeten, "Introduction to Agricultural Policy Analysis: The Distribution of Economic Costs and Benefits from Market Intervention" for methods of analysis (mimeo, background material for Agricultural Policy Analysis Project, Department of Agricultural Economics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater).

address the issues of: (1) is IICA organizationally conducive to carrying out agricultural planning and policy analysis as originally visualized for PROPLAN; (2) has IICA committed sufficient resources, intellectual thinking and administrative prowess in carrying out the functions of PROPLAN; and (3) is there evidence that IICA has provided services expected of PROPLAN and is PROPLAN capable of providing services in the future. The last issue is addressed in succeeding sections of this evaluation report. The first two issues are addressed in this section.

Organization

IICA is organized similar to many international agencies and with a great deal of similarity to State Cooperative Extension Services. A central unit is located in San Jose, Costa Rica and offices are located in each of 23 countries. Sources of funding for IICA are described in the LACPLAN Project Paper but it is important to remember that each country participates to a degree in direct funding and in providing counterpart services. Each country has a stake in IICA and hence IICA is considered a Latin American and Caribbean institution.

Country offices must prepare and submit plans of work for approval by host country officials. These plans of work are prepared in conjunction with host country institutions and with the IICA central unit. IICA is organized along functional or program lines. PROPLAN falls within Program Nine which is essentially agricultural planning and management.

The organizational structure of IICA was a major selling point within AID for the LACPLAN project itself. The central unit provided a means for holding workshops, establishing networking, providing technical assistance to country programs and, in general, increasing the capacity for countries to do agricultural planning and policy analysis. Country offices provided the linkage to host country institutions and a means to gain acceptability of PROPLAN.

Organizationally, IICA is just as strong today for carrying out the functions of PROPLAN as was described in the original LACPLAN Project Paper.

One area of concern is that of gaining country approval to carry out objective analyses of politically sensitive agricultural policies. However, the IICA Program Directors of Colombia and the Dominican Republic assured us that this would be no problem as long as a host institution was involved in the analysis. These authors are unaware of sufficient evidence to prove or disprove whether IICA is able to carry out objective analyses of politically sensitive policies.

Commitment

An institutional analysis of resources by Program area within IICA has not been made for the current budgeting periods for this evaluation. A budget analysis of IICA was made for the LACPLAN Project Paper and the opinions expressed at that time were ones of a high level of commitment to agricultural planning in terms of priorities but that it would take time to build sufficient manpower and financial support.

There is seldom sufficient resources to do everything that one would like to do in terms of workshops, development of materials and providing country programs with consultancies. But, as documented earlier, PROPLAN has an enviable record in number of documents and activities completed. The output of PROPLAN has been outstanding and one gets the feeling that PROPLAN is highly respected within IICA and is well supported.

One does not get a feeling, however, that IICA has provided the PROPLAN manager with a great deal of intellectual thinking about what is agricultural planning and policy analysis or what should it be. Nor does it appear that, administratively, PROPLAN has been challenged or assisted by administrators in striking out in new areas of endeavor or with new methods or procedures. Why has IICA administration not asked penetrating questions about specific country price policy, investment strategy or budget allocation?

It appears that PROPLAN, although respected, has operated very much in isolation from the rest of the agency. This may be because PROPLAN has its own manager and, to a certain extent, its own budget from outside sources. IICA administration should take a more active role in providing intellectual input and in assisting PROPLAN to become more daring in the types of planning and policy analysis activities it undertakes. It is not apparent that PROPLAN has received much outside input since the Cooperative Agreements with Iowa State and Michigan State have terminated. An annual conference or seminar would be useful which focused not on things that PROPLAN had accomplished but, rather, on new policy problem issues and new methods of analysis. This would be stimulating to PROPLAN personnel and provide new perspectives to the work to be done.

Demand for PROPLAN Services

USAID frequently becomes obsessed with wanting to know what has been the demand for services: How many requests have come in from IICA Country Program Directors requesting PROPLAN services? How many countries have requested workshops or requested training for X number of host country technicians?

Although this is one way to measure demand for services, at times, it can be a very superficial accounting of a country's need for analysis of policies for agricultural development. It does not take long for someone who has travelled and worked in IICA's 23 countries to recognize an enormous need for objective analysis of agricultural and economic policies. One might contrast these methods of measuring the demand for PROPLAN services as the direct demand approach versus a derived demand approach. The direct demand for services measures (1) the number of requests IICA received for PROPLAN services, (2) how many of these requests was PROPLAN able to respond to, and (3) what was the product of the response. If requested, IICA could provide this information.

The derived demand approach recognizes that there are a rather unlimited number of policy problems the 23 IICA countries are facing. IICA, therefore, must prioritize in some fashion what policy problems and for what countries PROPLAN should meet this derived demand and in what time frame and using what methods. Measurements can then be taken on what products have been turned out and in what magnitudes.

It is not apparent that IICA has done an assessment of the policy problems facing their 23 countries. For purposes of long-term planning it may be useful for IICA to carry out such an assessment. However, there are many policy problems that IICA could begin to address in the short run even though perhaps such problems have not been categorized in any priority scale among all countries. CORECA has identified high priority policy problems for their countries of Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republic. High priority policy problems for Peru were identified in a recent Policy Seminar. These and other recent events are sources IICA could use in the short run to identify priority problems for analysis.

Capability of IICA for Providing Agricultural Policy Analysis Services

Capability of providing agricultural policy analysis services must be measured in terms of (1) having an appropriate organizational framework to put results into the hands of decision makers and into the appropriate institutions; (2) having sufficient resources to form a core group of technicians to prepare and implement a plan of work consistent with objectives of IICA for PROPLAN and Program Nine; and (3) having a basis for drawing upon a pool of knowledge and results about important policy issues for the 23 countries. The first area on organizational framework was covered earlier. IICA does have the mechanisms for getting results into the hands of appropriate country institutions and decision makers.

The second area is difficult to assess until one is familiar enough with the overall objectives of IICA. PROPLAN has had

sufficient resources to carry out their objective of improving the agricultural planning process as defined earlier. To take on the additional objective of agricultural policy analysis the amount of resources is inadequate especially at the central unit level. There should be one person in charge of nothing else but providing leadership in organizing the policy analysis area, providing analytical structure, and disseminating results. This should be an experienced person with substantial training in the mechanics of policy analysis work. This additional person is critical in providing direction for this additional objective of Program Nine. Beyond this person, expansion of resources in this area should proceed slowly until IICA gains experience in assessing the needs and providing services. By keeping a relatively low profile and few resources in the beginning, there will be less temptation to promise more than can be delivered until IICA has gained experience in the policy analysis areas.

It will be impossible for IICA to maintain a staff with knowledge and ability to work in all areas of agricultural policy covering all 23 countries. However, IICA can begin to build a basis for drawing upon a pool of resource people, gathering materials and studies related to specific policy areas, and forming a network of people and institutions working in agricultural policy analysis. A first linkage could be with the S&T Agricultural Policy Analysis Project.

In summary, IICA has the organizational capability of delivering agricultural policy analysis results. Because of the need to expand PROPLAN in the direction of policy analysis versus agricultural planning, IICA needs to expand resources and leadership in this direction. Leadership should develop mechanisms for accessing the international pool of resources knowledgeable about specific agricultural policies.

Recommendations

Recommendations are based on this and earlier evaluations of the LACPLAN/PROPLAN and on personal observations from following the development of this project. Recommendations are divided between those for IICA, those for S&T, and those for the S&T Agricultural Policy Analysis Project. Recommendations are not necessarily presented in order of priority for implementation.

For IICA

1. Separate the functions of agricultural planning (allocative planning) and policy analysis (incentive planning) in Program Nine activities. Reasons for this separation are stated in the technical evaluation section.
2. Maintain the project identification of PROPLAN. This project designation has acceptance, has a good record and is something to build on.
3. Involve IICA administration more in providing intellectual thinking and innovative management of PROPLAN. This will help to integrate PROPLAN into other IICA program areas and provide for a cross fertilization of ideas.

4. Add a person immediately to assume leadership in strictly the agricultural policy area within Program Nine. As the demand for policy analysis expands, additional resources should be added to this area.
5. Develop a mechanism for accessing the international pool of resources in specific areas of agricultural policy.
6. Hold an annual conference or seminar on frontier issues of Latin American and Caribbean policy problems. The focus should be on issues, results and methodologies.
7. In the long term PROPLAN should do an assessment of policy problem issues in the 23 countries, prioritize the results and formulate a long-term plan of work. This assessment can build on the ideas and mechanisms used in the initial survey conducted by PROPLAN.
8. Formally test the hypothesis that IICA can carry out objective analyses of politically sensitive agricultural policies within a country setting.
9. Distinguish more clearly types of publications coming out of PROPLAN and reserve one or more categories for formal review processes before publication. This should not be implemented in a manner to discourage publication but, rather, in a manner to allow for review comments and incorporation of these comments for improving the document.

For S&T

1. Choose some specific policy areas of high importance to USAID/LAC and request IICA to submit proposals for potential funding. Proposals should emphasize problem identification, proposed methodologies and procedures to be used, and expected results from analysis.
2. Involve PROPLAN technicians in AID agricultural policy project design and evaluation. Encourage AID Missions to involve IICA personnel in agricultural policy projects funded by the Agency such as the project in the Dominican Republic.

For S&T Agricultural Policy Analysis Project

1. Upon request, assist IICA in establishing a mechanism for accessing the international pool of resources in agricultural policy.

2. Invite the PROPLAN manager to prepare a seminar and paper on experiences of PROPLAN in developing and implementing training programs and providing country technical assistance in agricultural planning.
3. Sponsor joint workshops and conferences on agricultural policy analysis as currently proposed for CORECA.

Project Evaluation Scope of Work

- A. Project Title : Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning Network (LACPLAN)
- B. Project Number : 931-0236.07
- C. Cooperating Institutions : InterAmerican Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA); Iowa State University; Michigan State University
- D. Project Management : Lizardo de las Casas, IICA
Ralph R. Hanson, AID/S&T/AGR

E. Summary: The Latin American and Caribbean Agricultural Planning Network (LACPLAN) 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 America and Caribbean countries principally by use of the InterAmerican Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA). This purpose has been undertaken through the development of the following four separate but interrelated project components:

- (1) training materials;
- (2) seminars and workshops;
- (3) technical cooperation; and
- (4) networking activities.

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 (M.S.U.) and Iowa State University (I.S.U.) 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. M.S.U. and I.S.U. completed their involvement in this project in 1981 and after receiving a one year unfunded extension IICA completed its activities at the end of FY 83.

F. Rationale for Team Evaluation: This project has been on-going for over six years and has developed experience in an area where S&T/AGR is starting a new project, agricultural policy analysis. It is hoped that S&T/AGR and its contractor can use the experiences of LACPLAN to further the development and expertise of the Agricultural Policy Analysis project. Therefore, one member of the evaluation team will be from the core staff of the Agricultural Policy Analysis project and the other member of the evaluation team will be the AID project manager for LACPLAN. Thus, this combination will provide the historical significance of the project, the AID/W perspective, and provide the opportunity for a member of the core staff from the Agricultural Policy Analysis project to become totally familiar with the lessons learned from LACPLAN.

G. Specific Functions to be Performed by the Evaluation Team: To gain familiarity with project goals, purposes, objectives, assumptions, inputs and outputs, the evaluation team members will review the documents pertinent to project development: project paper, contract documents, cooperative agreements, management reviews, annual plans of work, project evaluations, 1980 audit report, and a series of IICA documents published under this project.

Prior to initiating their evaluation activities, the team will hold a brief coordination meeting in Washington to make an initial review of the project documentation and to be briefed by S&T/AGR. During the evaluation the team will meet with IICA officials in Costa Rica, Colombia, and the Dominican Republic as well as with government officials in each of these countries. The team will assess the successes and failures of the four major activities of this project: technical cooperation, networking, training materials, and the seminars and workshops. In the final evaluation report the team will write a section on lessons learned and provide recommendations for use in the Agricultural Policy Analysis project. The final written report will be submitted to AID/S&T/AGR/EPP no later than sixty days following the initial coordination meeting.

H. Problems and Issues to be Addressed: Has IICA institutionalized the capability of planning and policy analysis? Has there been (and is there now) a demand for services from IICA by the Latin American governments? Has the networking component been institutionalized? Is IICA capable of providing services to USAIDs and AID/W in the area of agricultural planning and policy analysis? See annex for illustrative list of measures of performance.

I. Recommendations to be Made: As part of their evaluation work, the team will produce a set of recommendations on how the S&T agricultural policy analysis project can best use the lessons learned from the LACPLAN project, on what techniques or approaches might best be used in holding agricultural policy analysis workshops and seminars, and in what manner, if any, the agricultural policy analysis project might use the resources at IICA.

J. List of Documents to be Reviewed:

1. Project paper
2. Project contract with IICA
3. Project cooperative agreements with Iowa State University and Michigan State University.
4. Annual Work Plans (1978 - 1983)
5. Management Reviews
6. Project Evaluations
7. AID Audit Report (1980)
8. "Marco Conceptual del Proceso de Planificacion Agrario en America Latin y El Caribe"
9. "Analisis del Funcionamiento de las Unidades de Planificacion Sectorial en el Proceso de Planificacion Agraria en America Latin y El Caribe"
10. "Una Vision Global del Proceso de Analisis de Politicas para la Conduccion del Desarrollo Agricola y Rural"
11. "Identificacion de Proyectos en el Proceso de Planificacion - Ejecucion de Politicas para el Desarrollo Agropecuario y Rural"
12. "A Guide to Information and Policy Analysis for Agricultural Decision making in Latin America and in the Caribbean"

K. Composition of Evaluation Team: The evaluation team will be composed of a member of the core staff from the Agricultural Policy Analysis project, Dr. Roger Norton - Agricultural Economist, and the AID LACPLAN project manager, Ralph Hanson - Agricultural Economist.

L. Dates and Places of Evaluation: A brief coordination meeting will take place in Washington the last week of January, 1984. Field assessments will occur in San Jose, Costa Rica (February 5-8), Bogota, Colombia (February 9-11), and Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic (February 13-16).

ANNEX

Illustrative list of measures of performance to questions raised in section H.

1. IICA capability in agricultural planning and policy analysis.
 - Staff experience
 - number of years of experience in the field
 - staff training - number of BAs, MAs, and PhDs on staff
 - staff size
 - division budget commitment
2. Demand for services
 - documented requests for services such as cables of requests for services, letters of requests, visits by interested participants
 - participation in courses

GUIDANCE IN GENERAL

Basic Documents Series

- DP-1 Marco conceptual del proceso de planificación agraria en América Latina y el Caribe: una visión integral de los procesos de análisis de políticas y de toma de decisiones en el sector agrario.
- DP-21 Un enfoque sobre la conducción del proceso de planificación-ejecución de las políticas para el desarrollo agrícola y bienestar rural.
- DP-25 Una visión global del proceso de análisis de políticas para la conducción del desarrollo agrícola y rural.
- DP-30 Los componentes centrales de la conducción del desarrollo agrícola y rural en el nivel regional.
- DP-32 Lineamientos generales para el análisis de la función de seguimiento y evaluación.
- DIP-26 Algunas reflexiones sobre la conducción del proceso de planificación-ejecución de la política de desarrollo agropecuario y rural y la acción del IICA a través de PROPLAN.
- DIP-32 Problemática de la planificación e implementación de la política de desarrollo agropecuario y rural.
- DIP-59 Diagnóstico Microregional.
- DIP-78 La comunicación educativa en la cooperación técnica de los Proyectos PROPLAN.
- DIP-89 Contribución a la explicitación de algunos aspectos del marco conceptual del enfoque de los proyectos PROPLAN.
- DIP-94 El enfoque grupal y la articulación de roles en la conducción del proceso de planificación-ejecución.
- DIP-95 Metodología para la preparación del Resumen Operativo Gerencial (R.O.G.). (1)
- DIP-99 Consideraciones sobre la coordinación como cualidad inherente del proceso de desarrollo. (1)

(1) Document prepared by other PROPLAN projects.

Applied Research Documents Series

- DP-2 Análisis del funcionamiento de las unidades de planificación sectorial en el proceso de planificación agraria en América Latina y el Caribe: su participación en el proceso de análisis de política y de toma de decisiones en el sector agrario.
- DP-4 El sistema de planificación agraria en Bolivia.
- DP-5 La etapa de formulación del proceso de planificación agrícola en Venezuela.
- DP-6 La etapa de instrumentación de la ejecución del proceso de planificación agrícola en Honduras.
- DP-7 La etapa de control del proceso de planificación agraria en el Perú.
- DP-11 La etapa de instrumentación de la ejecución del proceso de planificación agraria en Perú.
- DP-31 Notas sobre la problemática de la conducción del desarrollo agrícola y rural.
- DIP-43 Metodología para la exploración y selección de zonas. SEAPLAN/IICA. (1)
- DIP-44 Marco de referencia para el diseño de la metodología de evaluación del plan de desarrollo agrícola 79/82 (Guatemala) PROPLAN/AP.
- DIP-92 La coordinación institucional en el Proyecto ARDI/AROA. (1)
- DIP-93 Experiencias de la aplicación de una concepción de programación dinámica para la coordinación institucional en el Proyecto ARDI/AROA. (1)

Complementary Documents Series

- DP-8 Seminario regional sobre planificación agrícola y análisis de políticas en América Latina y el Caribe: Zona Norte.
- DP-9 Seminario regional sobre planificación agraria y análisis de políticas en América Latina y el Caribe: Zona Andina y Zona Sur.
- DP-10 Regional seminar on agricultural planning and policy analysis in Latin America and the Caribbean: Antillean Zone.
- P-17 Planificación y administración para el desarrollo rural: El enfoque de PROPLAN/A y sus experiencias en Colombia. (1)

1) Documents prepared by other PROPLAN Projects.

- DP-18 Fortalecimiento institucional en planificación y administración para el desarrollo rural: Memoria del Seminario IICA-PROPLAN/USDA-DPMC. (1)
- DP-19 Necesidad de un enfoque integrado sobre la conducción del desarrollo agrícola y rural: posiciones convergentes.
- DP-34 Planificación y administración para el desarrollo rural: la capacitación como elemento esencial de la cooperación técnica (ponencia presentada por IICA-PROPLAN en el II Seminario de Intercambio). (1)
- DP-38 Memoria del segundo seminario de intercambio: Planificación y Administración para el Desarrollo Rural. (1)
- DP-39 Memoria del curso sobre asesoramiento para la toma de decisiones en el sector público agropecuario.
- DP-40 Seminario-taller sobre el papel del planificador en la conducción del desarrollo agropecuario y rural-regional. (1)
- DIP-24 Memoria del Seminario PROPLAN, San José. 1980.
- DIP-25 Memoria del Seminario PROPLAN, Paipa, Colombia. 1980.
- DIP-39 Proposta de pautas metodológicas para a analise de desenvolvimento agrícola latinoamericano.
- DIP-85 A guidance system improvement effort: PROPLAN/A cooperation with Colombian DRI Program. (1)
- DIP-91 Memoria del Seminario-taller sobre fortalecimiento de la coordinación institucional en el Proyecto ARDI/AROA. (1)
- Un nuevo enfoque analítico del problema de coordinación en el sector público agrícola. Mayo Vega. (2)
 - Planes versus planificación en la experiencia latinoamericana. Carlos A. Mattos. (3)
 - La planificación social observada por un economista. Armando Di Fillippo. (3)
 - Planeación normativa y planeación situacional. Carlos Matus (3)
 - La planeación económica observada por un sociólogo. Joseph Hodara (3)
 - La técnica de los grupos operativos en la formación del personal docente universitario. Cayetano A. De Lella Allevato. (3)

(1) Documents prepared by other PROPLAN Projects.

(2) Contribution of other IICA projects.

(3) Material used by PROPLAN, not specifically prepared for the project.

Educational Material and Exercises

- Ejercicio sobre problemática de la coordinación. (1)
- DIP-105 Ejercicio sobre articulación de roles.
- DIP-107 La conducción del desarrollo agropecuario y rural (Resumen para exposición).
- DIP-112 Actualización de objetivos y metas (validación), (resumen para exposición). (2)
- DIP-113 Seguimiento y evaluación (resumen para exposición).

INFORMATION AND POLICY ANALYSIS PROCESS

Basic Documents Series

- DP-25 Una visión global del proceso de análisis de políticas para la conducción del desarrollo agrícola y rural.
- DP-33 Manual para la preparación del marco orientador del desarrollo rural en el nivel microregional.
- DP-35 El proceso de análisis de políticas para las decisiones de orientación: el marco orientador.
- DP-37 El proceso de análisis de políticas para las decisiones operativas.
- DIP-41 Orientación para la preparación de un documento sobre el proceso de análisis de políticas dentro del marco del proceso de planificación agropecuaria.
- DIP-49 Lineamientos metodológicos básicos para analizar sistemas de información orientados al seguimiento y evaluación de acciones específicas del sector público agropecuario. (2)
- DIP-65 Marco doctrinario. (Algunas notas para la preparación de un documento que explicita la posición doctrinaria del Gobierno).
- DIP-73 Base cuantitativa para el análisis de políticas.
- DIP-77 Categorías centrales e hipótesis principales para el proceso de análisis de políticas.
- DIP-90 Documento sobre el Sistema Nacional Integrado de Previsión y Acción Económica y Social para la Unidad 3: "Modelos y métodos de análisis para las decisiones".

Applied Research Documents Series

- DP-3 El proceso de análisis de políticas en el sector agropecuario de Costa Rica.
- Marco orientador de desarrollo agropecuario de Panamá. (1)
 - Marco orientador del desarrollo agropecuario de República Dominicana. (1)

Complementary Documents Series

- DP-12 Workshop on agricultural planning and policy analysis.
- DP-23 Annotated bibliography and utilization of system simulation models for agricultural policy analysis.
- DP-13 On the choice of optimal agricultural policies.
- DP-20 A guide to information and policy analysis for agricultural decision making in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- DP-22 Manuals for policy analysis: on the use of general equilibrium models in agricultural policy analysis.
- DP-41 Manuals for policy analysis prices and market-interventions policies.
- Improving information on agriculture and rural life. James Bonnen. (1)
- Precios de sustentación versus subsidios a los insumos para la anti-suficiencia alimentaria en los países en desarrollo. Randolph Barker y Yujiro Hayami. (1)

Educational Material and Exercises Series

- DIP-101 Ejercicio sobre análisis de políticas para decisiones de orientación: políticas específicas.
- DIP-102 Ejercicio sobre análisis de políticas para decisiones operativas: medidas de política.
- DIP-108 El proceso de análisis de políticas para las decisiones de orientación. (Resumen para exposición).
- DIP-109 El proceso de análisis de políticas para las decisiones operativas (Resumen para exposición).

(1) Material used by PROPLAN, not specifically prepared for the project.

OPERATIONAL PLANNING**Basic Documents Series**

- DP-16 El proceso de planificación operativa.
- DP-29 La dimensión operativa del proceso de planificación-ejecución.
- DIP-7 Marco de referencia para estudios de caso sobre proceso de planificación operativa.
- DIP-36 Proceso de planificación-ejecución operativa de nivel microregional.
- DIP-51 Proceso de planificación operativa en el nivel regional.

Applied Research Documents Series

- DP-14 El proceso de planificación operativa agraria en Perú.
- DP-15 El proceso de planificación operativa agropecuaria en Chile.

Complementary Documents Series

- DIP-86 Informe del seminario-taller sobre planificación operativa y proyectos del PFI del Ministerio de Desarrollo Agropecuario de Panamá.

Educational Material and Exercises Series

- DIP-110 Preparación e instrumentación de planes y programas operativos. (Resumen para exposición).

PROJECTS

Basic Documents Series

- DP-27 Identificación de proyectos en el proceso de planificación-ejecución de políticas para el desarrollo agropecuario y rural.
- DP-28 Guía para el estudio y diseño del sistema sectorial de proyectos.
- DP-36 El manejo de programas y proyectos en el contexto de la conducción del desarrollo agrícola y rural.
- DIP-17 Los proyectos de inversión en el contexto del proceso de planificación-ejecución.
- DIP-27 Guía de contenido para la preparación del marco conceptual del sistema sectorial de proyectos.
- DIP-61 Consideraciones metodológicas sobre evaluación.
- DIP-82 Priorización de Proyectos.

Applied Research Documents Series

- DP-24 Consideraciones sobre Evaluación de Impacto de un proyecto de desarrollo rural: el caso del PPA-II de República Dominicana.
- DP-28 Guía para el estudio y diseño del sistema sectorial de proyectos.
- DIP-8 Informe de asesoría a la Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura de República Dominicana para la Evaluación de Realizaciones del PPA-II.
- DIP-23 Informe de asesoría a la Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura de República Dominicana para la Evaluación de Impacto --primera parte-- del Programa de Préstamo al Pequeño Agricultor (PPA-II).
- DIP-47 Informe de asesoría a la Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura de República Dominicana para la Evaluación de Impacto --segunda parte-- del PPA-II. República Dominicana.
- DIP-80 Seguimiento de ejecución y evaluación de efectos/impactos del ARDI/AROA.

Complementary Documents Series

- La coordinación y vinculación con el medio en el manejo de proyectos y programas. Mayo Vega. (1)
- Elementos metodológicos para la selección de proyectos prioritarios de las entidades adscritas al Ministerio de Agricultura. Colombia Marco Reyes. (1)

Educational Material and Exercises Series

- DIP-95 Metodología para la preparación del Resumen Operativo Gerencial.(2)
- DIP-97 Guía para la elaboración del Plan de Implementación. (2)
- DIP-98 Ejercicio de aplicación de la Guía para Elaboración de Planes de Implementación. (2)
- DIP-104 Ejercicio sobre Evaluación de Impacto.
- DIP-111 Manejo de Programas y Proyectos (Resumen para exposición).

(1) Contribution of other IICA projects.

(2) Documents prepared by other PROPLAN Projects.

PROYECTO PROPLAN/A - COLOMBIA

DOCUMENTOS GENERADOS AL 30 DE NOVIEMBRE DE 1983

<u>DOCUMENTOS</u>	<u>ESTADO</u>
1. ORGANIZACION TECNICO-ADMINISTRATIVA Y FUNCIONES DTT PAMPLONA	PUBLICADO
2. RESUMEN OPERATIVO GERENCIAL Y PROGRAMACION DTT PAMPLONA.	PUBLICADO
3. SISTEMA DE INFORMACION Y SEGUIMIENTO DDT PAMPLONA	PUBLICADO
4. ORGANIZACION TECNICO-ADMINISTRATIVA Y FUNCIONES DTT SUR HUILA.	TERMINADO
5. RESUMEN OPERATIVO GERENCIAL Y PROGRAMACION. DTT SUR HUILA.	TERMINADO
6. SISTEMA DE INFORMACION Y SEGUIMIENTO DTT. SUR HUILA.	TERMINADO
7. INFORME DE EVALUACION DEL SISTEMA DE MANEJO DE PROYECTOS DEL DTT PAMPLONA.	PUBLICADO
8. DIAGNOSTICO PARA LAS AREAS DRI DEL CESAR.	PUBLICADO
9. PLAN DE PRODUCCION DE LECHE Y SUS DERIVADOS PARA EL DISTRITO MALAGA.	PUBLICADO

DOCUMENTOSESTADO

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 10. SISTEMA DE INFORMACION Y SEGUIMIENTO PARA EL PROYECTO DE NUTRICION Y VIVIENDA DEL DISTRITO MALAGA. | PUBLICADO |
| 11. PROYECTO NUTRICION Y VIVIENDA DEL DISTRITO MALAGA. | PUBLICADO |
| 12. DIAGNOSTICO MICRO-REGIONAL DEL DISTRITO DRI PAMPLONA. (2 VOLUMENES). | PUBLICADO |
| 13. ESTUDIO DE MERCADO DE LA LECHE Y DERIVADOS EN MALAGA. | TERMINADO |
| 14. PROGRAMACION 1981-85 PARA EL DISTRITO DRI PAMPLONA. | PUBLICADO |
| 15. PROGRAMACION OPERATIVA 1981 PARA EL DISTRITO DRI PAMPLONA | PUBLICADO |
| 16. MARCO ORIENTADOR PARA EL DISTRITO DRI PAMPLONA. | PUBLICADO |
| 17. MODELO DE COORDINACION INTERINSTITUCIONAL. | TERMINADO |
| 18. METODOLOGIA PARA LA SELECCION DE MUNICIPIOS EN NORTE DE SANTANDER. | TERMINADO |
| 19. METODOLOGIA DE DIAGNOSTICO MICRO-REGIONAL. (4 FASCICULOS). | TERMINADO |

DOCUMENTOSESTADO

- | | |
|--|------------------------------------|
| 20. METODOLOGIA PARA LA PREPARACION DEL MARCO ORIENTADOR EN DISTRITOS DRI. | TERMINADO |
| 21. METODOLOGIA PARA LA ELABORACION DE PLANES DE PRODUCCION Y COMERCIALIZACION EN DISTRITOS DRI. | TERMINADO |
| 22. METODOLOGIA PARA REALIZAR EL ESTUDIO SOBRE PARTICIPACION DE LOS BENEFICIARIOS DRI. | TERMINADO |
| 23. RESULTADOS DEL ESTUDIO SOBRE PARTICIPACION DE LOS BENEFICIARIOS DRI. | TERMINADO |
| 24. ANALISIS DE OBJETIVOS E INDICADORES DRI-PAN. | TERMINADO
EN PROCESO |
| 25. METODOLOGIA DE PROGRAMACION ANUAL DRI-PAN. | TERMINADO |
| 26. EJERCICIO DIDACTICO "PROYECTO DE TECNOLOGIA APROPIADA PARA PEQUEÑOS PRODUCTORES". | TERMINADO |
| 27. EJERCICIO DIDACTICO "PROYECTO DE PRODUCCION DE LECHE CON PEQUEÑOS GANADEROS". | TERMINADO |
| 28. METODOLOGIA PARA LA PREPARACION DEL ROG. | EN PROCESO |

DOCUMENTOSESTADO

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 29. ANALISIS Y AGREGACION GENERAL POR DEPARTAMENTO Y PAIS DE LOS PLANES DE DESARROLLO DISTRITAL. | TERMINADO |
| 30. MARCO ORIENTADOR DEPARTAMENTAL DE SANTANDER. | TERMINADO |
| 31. MARCO ORIENTADOR DEPARTAMENTAL DE NORTE DE SANTANDER. | TERMINADO |
| 32. MARCO ORIENTADOR DEL PROYECTO ALTO HUALLAGA (PERU). | TERMINADO |
| 33. PROPUESTA DE ORGANIZACION TECNICO-ADMINISTRATIVA PARA LA OFICINA IICA-COLOMBIA. | TERMINADO |
| 34. OPINION DE FUNCIONARIOS DEL SECTOR AGROPECUARIO COLOMBIANO, SOBRE LAS ACCIONES DEL IICA EN COLOMBIA. | TERMINADO |

OPSA - IICA

References for 1983

Jose Vallejo Gomez	Mario Blasco Lamenca	Mariano Olazabal Balcazar
Jefe de la Oficina de	Director Oficina IICA	Coordinador Proyecto
Planeamiento	en Colombia	IICA - OPSA
del Sector Agropecuario		

1. Elementos de Analysis Para El Desarrollo Agroindustrial Colombiano. Authors: Isidro Planella Villagra, Silvia Nelly Oechoa de Pazmino and Jose Maria Huertas. Serie Publicaciones Miscelaneas (PM) No. 422.
2. Diagnostico de Suelos. Authors: Guillermo Mantilla Suarez and Pablo Leyva Franco. PM-No. 429.
3. Bibliografia Sobre Fauna, Flora y Parques Nacionales. Authors: Pablo Leyva Franco and Luis Felipe Reyes Pereira. PM-No. 430.
4. Diagnostico de los Recursos Hidricos. Authors: Guillermo Mantilla Suarez, Pablo Leyva Franco and Octavio Espinosa. PM-No. 432.
5. Bibliografia de los Recursos Hidricos en Colombia. Authors: Pablo Leyva Franco, Guillermo Mantilla Suarez and Luis Felipe Reyes Pereira. PM-No. 432A.
6. Elementos Metodologicos Para La Seleccion de Proyectos Prioritarios de Las Entidades Adscritas Al Ministerio de Agricultura. Author: Marco Fidel Reyes Carmona. PM-No. 437.
7. Politica de Credito Agropecuario 1970-1981. Author: Raquel Bustamante de Henao. PM-No. 439.
8. Guia Para Estudio y Diseno del Sistema Sectorial de Proyectos. (PROPLAN/AP). Author: Jaime Paredes. PM-No. 408.
9. Analisis del Proceso de Formulacion de Planes Indicativos Por Producto E Insumos. Author: Ramiro Orozco Lopez. PM-No. 426.
10. Consideraciones Economicas y Financiera Sobre la Viabilidad del Seguro Agrocrediticio en Colombia. Authors: Antonio Hernandez Ganarra and Gustavo Jimenez Perdomo. PM-NO. 431.
11. Actualizacion y Sistematizacion del Diagnostico y la Politica Agropecuaria 1979-1982. Authors: Raquel Bustamante de Henao and Marco Fidel Reyes Carmona. PM-No. 436.