PD-AAT-789 45941

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Control Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT	596-0094	ROCAP

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)

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 81	A. Total $ 2,809	From (month/yr.) Sept. 1981
B. Final Obligation Expected FY 83	B. U.S. $ 850	To (month/yr.) November 1985
C. Final Input Delivery FY 86		Date of Evaluation Review December 1985

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
1. Terminate project as of PACD Dec. 31, 1985.	N.A.	N.A.
2. ROCAP will not provide more support to CORECA until such time as IICA and CORECA have acted on the recommendations of the evaluation report and decided how to proceed in the future in a more effective manner.		
3. Because of ROCAP's continued interest in CORECA as a regional mechanism for analyzing common problems in agricultural development and recommending solutions, ROCAP will continue to attend the Council of Ministers of Agriculture meetings, as observer.		
4. ROCAP is especially interested in the ability of IICA and CORECA to effectively utilize the policy studies developed under the project as a basis for regional policy dialogue and policy modification. If this is done, ROCAP may consider a request from CORECA to develop policy studies on additional topics.		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Nancy J. Fong
Nancy J. Fong
Project Manager

John Eyre, DDIR
Richard A. Delaney
Richard Delaney, PO

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name Nadine Plaster, DIR/ROCAP

Date

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

PART II (PES) AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT PROJECT

SUMMARY

The final evaluation of the project was performed by a two-man team of agricultural policy specialists. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess what the project accomplished in terms of the project goal and purpose and make recommendations to insure the continued functioning of the Secretariat once ROCAP's financial support ends. The contractor followed the scope of work and performed the evaluation as scheduled. The mission finds the evaluation results to be useful and has begun to discuss the recommendations with IICA, the counterpart institution. In general, ROCAP is in agreement with the findings, as well as most of the conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The draft evaluation report which included the Executive Summary was discussed with the team and comments were sent to them for revisions and additions to the final report. The Executive Summary included in the final report is considered to be satisfactory.

A summary of the major findings, conclusions and recommendations is appended to the PES.

A lesson learned from the project is that to avoid serious ambiguities and misunderstandings with respect to project direction and management there should be only one agreement in which all parties are signatories and that all parties fully and clearly understand the purpose of the project and are in agreement on it.

Another lesson learned is that is very important to update the PP Logical Framework document during the project to reflect evolving or changing objectives/activities.

Also, the creation of a regional consultative mechanism, like CORECA, takes longer than 3 years to fully reach its potential.

0373b

Project No. 596-0094: Agricultural Secretariat

The final evaluation of the project was held during the period of November 3-30, 1985 by two private consultants.

Major findings of the evaluation are as follows:

1. The project has been a success as a regional forum for the Ministers of Agriculture.

2. No policy decisions affecting the countries or the region had originated in the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation (CORECA).

3. The response of the Technical Secretariat to the requirements of CORECA for policy analysis and advisory services has been inadequate.

4. The assistance provided to IICA by the AID-funded Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP) in preparing several recent policy-oriented studies has been very useful.

5. There are serious administrative obstacles to improve performance by the Technical Secretariat.

6. Only two of the seven signatory countries have met their financial quotas. Two countries have not made any cash contributions and three have made only partial payments in local currency.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

1. The Agricultural Secretariat project has not fully achieved its stated purpose of assisting the Agricultural Secretariat to become a permanent and effective body able to identify, analyse and recommend solutions to regional agricultural problems and constraints.

2. CORECA has been successful as a forum for the Ministers but not as a policy-making body.

3. The primary role of the Agricultural Secretariat should be twofold:

a) to provide a forum for the Ministers
b) to provide a Technical Coordinating Secretariat capable of giving policy analysis and advisory services.

4. The Technical Secretariat should continue to be located at IICA Headquarters in San José, and should be placed at a higher, more appropriate level within the IICA hierarchy.

5. Internal and external management and administrative procedures as practiced by the Technical Secretariat have not been conducive to achieving high levels of performance and need to be improved.

6. The Technical Secretariat has not performed as anticipated because it has "spread itself too thin", taking on activities that might better be handled by other IICA offices.

7. The total number of Reciprocal Technical Cooperation activities falls short of the desired total of 140 missions per year implicit in the Logical Framework of the project.

8. ROCAP should have suspended assistance to the Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Unit (RTCU) until IICA posted the IICA officer of the unit in San Jose rather than Guatemala.

9. Policy-oriented studies prepared by the Research & Analysis Unit (RAU) with APAP assistance are appropriate for use by the Technical Secretariat, the Technical Coordinating Committee and/or the Executive Committee to identify and analyze policy options for consideration by CORECA.

10. The Research & Analysis data management service is functioning and providing useful data to the participating countries. However, these data are not being used as input to policy studies.

Future of the Agricultural Secretariat

1. ROCAP should not provide additional assistance to the Agricultural Secretariat as currently structured upon termination of its present agreement with IICA.

4

2. Any further assistance that is provided by ROCAP to the Agricultural Secretariat should be carried out via a tripartite agreement to which all parties (ROCAP, IICA and other Member Countries) are signatory.

Proposed New Structure for the Technical Secretariat:

1. Because of its policy role and involvement with officials at the ministerial level, the Technical Secretariat should be removed from its present position within the IICA hierarchy and affixed to the Office of the Deputy Director General.

2. Technical functions currently being carried out by the Research & Analysis and the Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Units should be assigned to appropriate existing units within IICA.

3. Should the decision be made to adopt the proposed new structure, consideration should be given to arguments both for and against reincorporating the Technical Coordinating Committee and the Executive Committee as bureacratic layers between the Regional Council and the Technical Secretariat.

(Attachment to PES#_____

EVALUATION COST DATA

ROCAP _____ or Bureau/Officer _____

Form completed by Richard J. Delaney, Program 6/6/86
Typed Name Office Date

1. No. and Title of Project/Activity: 596-0094 Agricultural Secretariat
(or Title of Evaluation Report) _____

2. Date of Evaluation Report: Dec. 30, 1985
Date of PES (if different): May 30, 1986

3. Mission Staff Person Days involved in this Evaluation (estimated):
- Professional Staff NA Person Days
- Support Staff NA Person Days

4. AID/W Direct-Hire or IPA TDY support funded by Mission (or office) for this evaluation: NA

Name	Period of TDY (Person-Days)	Dollar Cost: (Travel, Per Diem, etc)	Source of Funds*

5. Contractor Support, if any, for this evaluation:**

Name of Contractor	Contract #	Dollar Amount of Contract	Source of Funds*
Checchi & Co.	PDC-0000-I-00-3082-00	$ 32,772.03	Project

*Indicate Project Budget, PD&S, Mission O.E. or Central/Regional Bureau funds

**IQC, RSSA, PASA, PSC, Purchase Order, Institutional Contract, Cooperative Agreement, etc.

XD-AAT-789-A 45942

FINAL EVALUATION OF THE

AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT PROJECT

No. 596-0094

Regional Office for Central American Programs
Agency for International Development
Guatemala City, Guatemala

Checchi and Company
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-3193

December 30, 1985

1

CHECCHI AND COMPANY
1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036-3193

TELEPHONE
202-452-9700

CABLE ADDRESS
"CHECCHI"
TELEX 440157

December 31, 1985

Ms. Nancy Fong
Rural Agricultural Development Office
AID/ROCAP
APO Miami 34024

Ref: Final Evaluation of Agricultural Secretariat
Project No. 596-0094

Dear Ms. Fong:

Enclosed are ten copies of our final report on the referenced project. We are pleased to have been of service to AID/ROCAP in carrying out this evaluation assignment, and hope you will keep us in mind for similar assignments in the future.

Best wishes for the New Year.

Sincerely,

Patricia McPhelim

Patricia McPhelim
Vice President/
IQC Projects Manager

ACRONYMS USED IN THIS DOCUMENT

APAP	-	Agricultural Policy Analysis Project
IDB	-	Interamerican Development Bank
CACM	-	Central American Common Market
CA/P	-	Central America and Panama
CEPI	-	Investment Center of IICA
CIDIA	-	Agricultural Information and Documentation Center of IICA
CIRSA	-	Ministers Inter-Regional Committee on Animal Health
CORECA	-	Regional Council of Agricultural Cooperation
EEC	-	European Economic Community
IICA	-	Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation
NAPU/USPA	-	National Agricultural Planning Unit
PROPLAN	-	Development Planning and Administration of Program IX at IICA
RAU	-	Research and Analysis Unit
RCAC CORECA	-	Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation
ROCAP	-	Regional Office for Central American Programs
RTCU	-	Regional Techical Cooperation Unit
SIECA	-	Secretariat of Central American Economic Integration
TCC	-	Technical Coordinating Committee
TS	-	Technical Secretariat
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development

Table of Contents

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i - vi
PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	1
PROJECT BACKGROUND	2
SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY	11
EVALUATION RESULTS	13
CONCLUSIONS	22
RECOMMENDATIONS	27

APPENDIX A	Statement of Work
APPENDIX B	People Interviewed and Organizations Visited
APPENDIX C	Documents Reviewed
APPENDIX D	Agreement of Regional Council of Minister of Agriculture; IICA/ROCAP Project Agreement and Amendment; and Annotated List of PILs and PADs
APPENDIX E	Country Quota Payments to Agricultural Secretariat
APPENDIX F	Survey Questionnaire of Ministry of Agriculture Interview
APPENDIX G	Technical Assistance Conducted by the Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Unit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose and Methodology

In November 1985, Checchi and Company provided a two-man team of agricultural policy specialists to carry out a final evaluation of the AID-funded Agricultural Secretariat Project (596-0094), as implemented by the Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation (IICA). The team reviewed all pertinent documents made available by AID's Regional Office for Central American Programs (ROCAP) and by the Agricultural Secretariat. Brief visits were made to six of the seven countries that signed the agreement creating the Agricultural Secretariat in order to interview government officials (including Ministers, Vice-Ministers, and Directors of Agricultural Sector Planning Units), the Directors of IICA's Country Offices, the Director of CATIE, and the Director of the Department of Agriculture of SIECA. Interviews were also carried out at IICA headquarters in San Jose, Costa Rica, with Agricultural Secretariat personnel and with IICA Directors and staff. The criteria used for evaluating the project were taken in large part from the Statement of Work for the evaluation study and from the Logical Framework as incorporated in the Project Paper.

Summary Project Description

The Agricultural Secretariat Project was designed to be carried out in two phases, the first extending from September 30, 1981 to September 30, 1983, the second from October 1, 1983 to March 31, 1985. Due to implementation delays, the planned completion date was extended twice at IICA's request, so that the project is now due to terminate on December 31, 1985.

The goal of the project is to promote regional efforts to increase agricultural production, intraregional trade and exports and to stimulate

rural development. The purpose of the project is to assist the Agricultural Secretariat to become a permanent and effective body able to identify, analyze, and recommend solutions to agricultural problems and constraints common to some or all of the Central American countries, Panama, and the Dominican Republic.

The Agricultural Secretariat was initially comprised of a Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation (RCAC), a policy-making body made up of the Ministers of Agriculture from each Member Country; a Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), an advisory group which includes the directors of each country's National Agricultural Planning Units (NAPU's); and a Technical Secretariat, coordinated by IICA personnel and charged with providing technical and administrative support to the RCAC. In the third year of the project, an Executive Committee of Vice-Ministers of Agriculture was officially constituted within the Agricultural Secretariat.

Project-funded activities were to focus on the TS and its two staff units:

(i) The Research and Analysis Unit (RAU), which undertakes or arranges for studies to provide the basis for policy recommendations to the RCAC and responds to requests for technical data available in the regional information systems at IICA. The project provided $350,000 to establish a Special Fund for financing the studies and an additional $150,000 for the management, analysis, and distribution of data including those data utilized in policy studies.

(ii) The Regional Technical Cooperation Unit (RTCU), which serves essentially as a clearing house by receiving requests from Member Countries for technical assistance and matching them with technical expertise available within the region. The project provided $150,000 in funds to help cover the experts' travel and per diem costs during the initial years of operation of this mechanism. Another $70,000 was budgeted to finance a limited amount of outside technical expertise not available from public sector institutions.

12

Major Findings

As a regional forum for the Ministers of Agriculture, the project has been a success. This was confirmed at all levels. It was also confirmed that the RTCU had provided a very useful and much appreciated service by furnishing Member Countries with needed technical expertise.

For various reasons, the RCAC has yet to become an effective policy-making body. While expressing hope that policy-related contributions would be forthcoming in the future, government officials interviewed could not identify any policy decisions affecting their respective countries or the region that had originated in the RCAC, as would have been a realistic goal for a project of this type. Nor were they able to cite examples of increased production, intra-and/or interregional trade, or rural development for which actions taken by the RCAC might be credited, although such goals might have been difficult to achieve during the lifetime of the project in any case.

The response of the TS to the requirements of the RCAC for policy analysis and advisory services has been inadequate. Although a number of high-quality studies have been prepared by the TS using resources from the Special Fund, until recently emphasis in these studies had been placed primarily on sector analysis and project preparation at the expense of formulation of policy options or recommendations for consideration by the RCAC.

The assistance provided to IICA by the AID-funded Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP) in preparing several recent policy-oriented studies has been very useful. Had this assistance been made available earlier, it might have been possible to present the completed studies to the RCAC for consideration and action during the lifetime of the project.

Interviews with IICA personnel, and the team's own observations, revealed serious administrative obstacles to improved performance by the TS, foremost among which is the inappropriate placement of the TS at a low level within IICA's administrative hierarchy.

13

Only two of the seven signatory countries have met their financial quotas. Two countries have not made any cash contributions while the remaining three have made only partial payments in local currency. Support by ROCAP to the Agricultural Secretariat beyond the life of the present project was to have been contingent upon full compliance with the quota payment provisions of the Project Agreement.

Conclusions and Recommendations

General:

(i) In spite of two extensions totaling nine months beyond the planned life of the project, the Agricultural Secretariat Project has not fully achieved its stated purpose of assisting the Agricultural Secretariat to become a permanent and effective body able to identify, analyze, and recommend solution to regional agricultural problems and constraints.

(ii) The RCAC has been successful as a forum for the Ministers but not as a policy-making body.

The Technical Secretariat:

(iii) The primary role of the Agricultural Secretariat should be two-fold: (a) to provide a forum for the Ministers wherein they can communicate and deliberate on matters of regional importance including policy decisions and (b) to provide a Technical (Coordinating) Secretariat capable of giving policy analysis and advisory services as well as logistic support to the RCAC. All other activities should be considered secondary and could best be carried out elsewhere within IICA.

(iv) In view of its need to draw upon other IICA resources, the TS should continue to be located at IICA Headquarters in San Jose. It should, however, be placed at a higher, more appropriate level within the IICA hierarchy.

14

(v) Internal and external management and administrative procedures as practiced by the TS have not been conducive to achieving high levels of performance and need to be improved.

(vi) A major reason why the TS has not performed as anticipated by ROCAP is that it has "spread itself too thin", taking on activities that might better be handled by other IICA offices rather than focusing on its policy analysis and advisory responsibilities.

The Reciprocal Technical Cooperative Unit:

(vii) Over the past three years, there have been impressive increases in the number of technical assistance missions arranged by the RTCU; however, the expected output of 50 missions for 1985 falls considerably short of the desired total of 140 missions per year implicit in the Logical Framework for the project.

(viii) A contributing factor to this shortfall has been the continued posting of the IICA officer in charge of the Unit in Guatemala rather than at TS offices in San Jose. This problem had been noted in previous evaluations of the Agricultural Secretariat, and ROCAP should have suspended assistance to RTCU activities until remedial action was taken by the IICA.

The Research and Analysis Unit

(ix) Recent policy-oriented studies prepared by the RAU with APAP assistance are appropriate for use by the TS, the TCC, and/or the Executive Committee to identify and analyze policy options for consideration by the RCAC. It is unfortunate that APAP services could not be made available earlier in the project's life.

(x) The RAU's data management service is functioning and providing useful data to the participating countries, albeit with technical assistance from Spanish Aid. However, as far as the team was able to determine, these data are not being used as input to policy studies.

15

Future of the Agricultural Secretariat:

(xi) Given the priorities expressed by ROCAP, the level of performance that can be expected from within the Agricultural Secretariat to satisfy these priorities, and the inability of some of the participating countries to meet their financial quotas, ROCAP should not provide additional assistance to the Agricultural Secretariat as currently structured upon termination of its present agreement with IICA. An alternative structure for the Secretariat designed to alleviate some of these concerns is proposed in paragraph (xiii) below.

(xii) In the interests of all concerned, any further assistance that is provided by ROCAP to the Agricultural Secretariat should be carried out via a tripartite agreement to which all parties (ROCAP, IICA, and the Member Countries) are signatory. The two agreements which currently govern the project have created serious ambiguities and misunderstandings with respect to project direction and management.

Proposed New Structure for the Technical Secretariat

(xiii) Because of its policy role and involvement with officials at the ministerial level, the TS should be removed from its present position within the IICA hierarchy and affixed to the Office of the Deputy Director General. To the extent possible, technical functions currently being carried out by the RAU and the RTCU should be assigned to appropriate existing units within IICA. Project identification and preparation activities should be carried out by the Investment Center of IICA (CEPI). The RTCU should be attached to the Office of the Assistant Deputy Director General for Program Development which is in charge of all ten IICA programs. The data management and advisory service should be handled by IICA's Agricultural Information and Documentation Center (CIDIA).

(xiv) Should the decision be made to adopt this proposed new structure, consideration should be given to arguments both for and against reincorporating the TCC and the Executive Committee as bureaucratic layers between the RCAC and the TS.

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

The overall strategy of the Regional Office of Central American Programs (ROCAP) is to facilitate regional projects within the Central American area. The Agricultural Secretariat Project No. 596-0094 was designed to assist the development of the Agricultural Secretariat which had been called for and endorsed by the Regional Council of Ministers of Agriculture (RCAC). The project was to promote regional agricultural production, interregional trade, and rural development through the adoption of more appropriate agricultural policy as conceptualized and analyzed by the Technical Secretariat (TS) and implemented by the ministers of participating countries.

This evaluation report will focus on the degree to which the original goal of the Agricultural Secretariat Project was achieved. It will assess the project's conceptualization, implementation, and operational viability at the end of the four-year project term. This will allow the identification of factors which proved to be critical to the outcome of the project; a discussion of the lessons learned; and recommendations for actions needed once ROCAP's financial support to the project has been terminated.

17

PROJECT BACKGROUND

History

Since late 1978, the Central American region has been in a continuing state of political, social and economic upheaval. As a direct result of the political situation, the process of building a regional system of economic cooperation on the basis of the formal political arrangements and concessions embodied in the Central American Common Market (CACM) has come to a standstill. To a great degree, trade and commerce throughout the area have continued upon the basis on earlier treaties and agreements and using established institutions.

While the gains from economic integration have been substantial over the twenty-five years of the CACM's existence, they have accrued primarily to the industrial sector. As a proportion of total intraregional trade, agricultural trade declined from 52 percent in 1963, to 40 percent in 1969, 35 percent in 1972, and 25 percent in 1979. This situation contributed to a growing imbalance in well-being between the industrialized urban sectors of the Central American region, and the rural sectors characterized by low productivity and high rates of unemployment.

The expansion and diversification of agricultural production for regional as well as for world markets have been recognized as the means to achieve a more balanced development; lower consumer prices; increased supply security; redistribution of wealth toward the rural sector; and a general strengthening of the regional integration movement. Nevertheless, in spite of some well-intentioned regional trade policies, agricultural sector integration has not yet been achieved. Regional agricultural development has been impeded by short-run trade restrictions on basic food products, pressures to close national borders due to threatening plant pest problems, national policies of agricultural self-sufficiency in basic grains, and lack of sound data upon which new policies can evolve. Continuing tariffs on agricultural imports have created inefficiencies leading to increases in the region's production costs; and lack of good market data has hampered exploitation of the region's known export opportunities.

18

Agricultural development in the region continues to be hampered by institutional and physical constraints. Important institutional constraints include the lack of (1) an effective regional analytical group to develop practical policy alternatives for regional export opportunities; (2) uniform grading, inspection and certification standards; (3) an arbitration mechanism to resolve disputes; (4) reliable market forecasting and reporting systems; (5) adequate agricultural sanitation controls with trained personnel; (6) and effective production and promotion agencies. Among the physical constraints are (1) problems associated with backward technology on small farms; (2) poor transportation and communications; (3) low productivity; (4) inadequate research and extension services; and (5) lack of access to production credit.

For some years, the Ministers of Agriculture within the region had recognized the need for a regional mechanism to address common agricultural sector constraints. At a meeting of the Ministers Inter-Regional Committee on Animal Health (CIRSA) held in Mexico in November 1979, they expressed strong support for creating their own regional, analytical, and coordinating body. At a subsequent CIRSA meeting held in November 1980, the Ministers of Agriculture from the five Central American countries, Panama, and the Dominican Republic signed a resolution to create the Agricultural Secretariat which was to be located within the Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation (IICA) in San Jose, Costa Rica.

Under the terms of an agreement between IICA and the Ministers of Agriculture (IICA/Countries Agreement), five principal responsibilities were assigned to the Agricultural Secretariat:

1. To define major agricultural development problems and opportunities facing the region over the next 5-20 years;

2. To identify and analyze short- and long-term policy planning, program, and investment options;

19

3. To address intraregional trade-related issues (tariffs, import/-export restrictions, pricing and interest rate policies, and national self-sufficiency policies within the region) an to identify practical, politically acceptable mechanisms for promoting increased agricultural trade;

4. To establish a mechanism for facilitating the exchange of technical expertise and information within a regionally coordinated framework; and

5. To stimulate rural employment and increased small farm income through the coordination of efforts of national and regional institutions.

The Agricultural Secretariat was to have three major functions:

1. To foster cooperation and coordination among the Ministers of Agriculture representing the Central American countries, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. As a permanent regional organization, it was to facilitate discussion, review, and decision-making by the Ministers with respect to policies, plans, and programs which influence the growth and progress of regional agricultural production, trade and exports, and rural employment.

2. To initiate and coordinate region-wide research and analyses considered necessary to develop policy options and stimulate production, intraregional trade and rural development. It was acknowledged that some of these studies could evolve into pre-feasibility and/or feasibility studies for project funding and implementation.

3. To establish and operate a mechanism for the exchange of agricultural information and data, experts, and technical assistance among the participating countries.

20

The IICA/Countries Agreement (see Appendix D) provided for the establishment of the Regional Council of Agricultural Cooperation (RCAC/CORECA), which was to be supported by a Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) and its Technical Secretariat (TS). The RCAC was to be made up of the Ministers of Agriculture of each participating country, who were to meet at least once a year to discuss, review, and make decisions on matters brought before them by the TCC. The TCC, made up of the Directors of the Agricultural Sector Planning Offices of each country or their designated representatives, was to be responsible for coordinating the Ministers' activities and for implementing their decisions at the country level through the National Agricultural Planning Units (NAPU/USPA). [1/] Under the TCC was to be established as part of IICA a permanent body, the Technical Secretariat, consisting of two entities: a Research and Analysis Unit (RAU) responsible for carrying out the technical work needed to formulate recommendations for decision-making by the RCAC; and a Regional Technical Cooperation Unit (RTCU) charged with promoting and coordinating exchanges of information and technical services.

On September 30, 1981, a Project Grant Agreement (No. 596-0094) was signed between IICA and ROCAP on behalf of the Agency for International Development (AID). The purpose of the Agreement was to provide funding for a project supporting a regional effort in Central America, Panama, and the Dominican Republic to assist the Agricultural Secretariat to become a permanent institution capable of identifying, analyzing, and recommending solutions to agricultural problems and constraints common to parts or all of the project area.

The Agricultural Secretariat Project was designed to operate from September 30, 1981 to March 31, 1985, in two phases. The initial AID authorization provided only for Phase I, to September 30, 1983, at the conclusion of which a progress evaluation was conducted and the decision

---

1/ An Executive Committee of Vice-Ministers of Agriculture was constituted as part of the Agricultural Secretariat in 1984.

made to implement Phase II. Because project implementation was delayed (with respect to policy analysis and recommendations and the RTCU), the project termination date was extended from March 31, 1985 to September 30, 1985, and again to December 31, 1985, both times at IICA's request. The IICA/Countries Agreement was subsequently extended to 1987.

Previous Project Evaluations

The current is the third and final evaluation of the Agricultural Secretariat Project. The first was a joint exercise carried out by IICA and ROCAP in April 1983. The second was also a joint exercise carried out by IICA and the countries in May 1984, to evaluate the Agricultural Secretariat from the perspective of the IICA/Countries Agreement.

Problems, conclusions and recommendations contained in the previous evaluations which have a bearing on the current evaluation are summarized below.

IICA/ROCAP Evaluation

Problems

25.1 [1/] There were inconsistencies in the objectives stated in the ROCAP/IICA Agreement and the IICA/Countries Agreement. The ROCAP/IICA Agreement emphasized policy analysis whereas the ROCAP/Countries Agreement placed primary emphasis on the development and funding of regional projects.

27.4 There were problems relating to the payment of the country quotas to the Agricultural Secretariat.

1/ The numbers indicate the page and item number in the respective evaluation reports, i.e. 39.1 refers to page 39 item 1.

22

27.5. There were inconsistencies with respect to the lines of communication and authority which the TS used to carry out its responsibilities within IICA.

28.6 The RTCU had not been located in San Jose in accordance with earlier agreements.

29.1 The placement of the Agricultural Secretariat at a low administrative level in the IICA hierarchy greatly complicated the functioning of the TS. The lack of an approved relationship for the coordination of the Agricultural Secretariat with the national offices of IICA was responsible for conflicts and unsatisfactory working relationships between the TS and the technical and country offices of IICA.

Conclusions

34.1. The Agricultural Secretariat was recognized as an important body, particularly as a forum for the Ministers.

34.4. The organizations involved in working with the Agricultural Secretariat (e.g. ROCAP, IICA, etc.) did not have a clear understanding of the role of the TS.

35.7. The TS should develop a procedure for identifying and analyzing (but not developing) regional issues.

35.8. The credibility of the TS has been reduced by the use of inappropriate administrative procedures.

35.11. The location of the RTCU in Guatemala rather than with the rest of the TS in San Jose has caused significant problems.

36.17. The national offices of IICA had not been given a role in the activities of the TS in their respective countries.

36.18. The agreement between IICA and SIECA should significantly strengthen the analytical and technical capacity of the TS.

36.19. The goals of the IICA/Countries Agreement, while positive, unfortunately orient the efforts of the TS in a direction contrary to those defined by the IICA/ROCAP Agreement.

Recommendations

38.3. The new operating policies of IICA should be used to develop operational procedures necessary to reformulate the technical activities of the Agricultural Secretariat and to insure it adequate support from other IICA programs.

38.4. The TS should expand its functions to include identification and formulation of projects and regional agricultural policies for approval by the Ministers.

39.6. IICA should create a technical advisory body to service the TS.

39.7. The TS, in conjunction with the National Agricultural Planning Units (NAPU/USPA), should redefine, as precisely as possible, the mechanisms and procedures necessary for the efficient functioning of the RTCU.

40.9. As defined in the IICA/ROCAP agreement, the national offices of IICA should play an important role in the development and implementation of activities by the TS in their respective countries.

41.13. IICA should insist that the countries meet their financial obligations to the Agricultural Secretariat. It was suggested that payment be allowed in national currencies.

41.12. During the second phase of the development of the project, the TS should reorganize its efforts to achieve the goals set forth in the IICA/ROCAP Agreement.

24

IICA/Countries Evaluation

This report contained 21 conclusions and 20 recommendations. Those significant to this evaluation are presented below.

Conclusions

60.1. The forum for the Ministers had been successfully established.

60.2. Notwithstanding the Agricultural Secretariat's slow start, it had shown considerable progress.

60.3. The existing structure of the Agricultural Secretariat was well adapted to carry out policy analysis, studies, and projects to facilitate the decision-making process at the regional level.

60.5. After a long period of adjustment, including the setting up of operational procedures, the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC), consisting of heads of NAPU's, had demonstrated a high level of efficiency in carrying out its tasks.

60.6. Due to administrative problems the RTCU was not performing as efficiently as expected.

61.7. The RAU did not have the operational capacity and the expertise needed to carry out efficiently the broad range of studies with which it had been charged.

62.14. Although the Agricultural Secretariat had been able to establish informal ties with national and regional technical and financial organizations, benefits from such ties could not be expected until these ties were formalized.

25

62.15. Although the Agricultural Secretariat had identified investment and technical assistance projects, no clear concept had been developed for their implementation.

63.19. The countries should meet their financial obligations to the Agricultural Secretariat as an indicator of the importance given to the project by the Ministers, which does not go unnoticed by financial institutions capable of funding projects.

Recommendations

64.3. The present structure of the Agricultural Secretariat should be maintained.

65.8. Because of the essential support services provided by the IICA Programs and Centers, the TS should not be moved from IICA Headquarters.

65.9. To enable the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation (RCAC), consisting of the Ministers of Agriculture, to deal quickly and efficiently with specific regional matters, with a minimum of protocol and expenditures, the TS should investigate the feasibility of holding shorter and more frequent meetings.

26

SCOPE OF WORK AND METHODOLOGY

The Agricultural Secretariat Project Paper called for a final evaluation to take place during the last month of project activity. The Project Paper stipulated that the evaluation team should examine project accomplishments in light of the objectives established during the design period and make recommendations on changes or modifications which might be required to ensure the continued functioning of the Agricultural Secretariat. The results of the final evaluation were to be made available for review by the TCC and the RCAC during the last meeting of those groups scheduled under project auspices.

In accordance with the Statement of Work (see Appendix A), the evaluation team reviewed relevant project documentation including that which had been prepared by the TS. To assess participant country support for the Agricultural Secretariat and to determine the degree of country involvement in its activities, the Mission interviewed one Minister and three Vice-Ministers of Agriculture, and the NAPU Directors in six participating countries. [1/] Interviews were also conducted with the Director of the Department of Agriculture of the Secretariat of the Central American Economic Integration (SIECA) in Guatemala and the Director of the Tropical Agricultural Research and Training Center (CATIE) in Costa Rica. Since one of the evaluation criteria concerned the degree to which the TS was coordinating activities and participating with other national and regional programs, the team expanded the interview process in each country to include IICA country

---

[1/] Costa Rica, Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, and the Dominican Republic. The TS had cabled the IICA Country Directors requesting that they advise the Member Governments of the purpose and arrival date of the team and that they arrange for interviews with relevant officials including the Ministers and Vice-Ministers of Agriculture. For a variety of reasons, the team was able to meet with only one Minister and three Vice Ministers. However, this effort was suppiemented by interviews with knowledgeable officials including directors of NAPU's and others charged with Agricultural Secretariat liaison.

27

level personnel and others from relevant regional agencies. Upon completion of these country-level interviews, the team returned to IICA headquarters in San Jose, where interviews were carried out with Agricultural Secretariat and IICA personnel. Included in this latter group were IICA's outgoing Director General and his replacement, two Assistant Directors General, the Directors of Programs and Specialized Centers, and the Director of the Central (Area 1) Office which in addition to being responsible for the project area shares responsibility with Program IX (Agricultural Planning and Development) as the host entity for the Agricultural Secretariat. A complete interview list is provided in Appendix B.

To insure that information was collected in a systematic manner, the team developed and used a brief survey questionnaire (see Appendix F), taking care to protect the anonymity of the respondents.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Survey of Participating Agencies

Ministry of Agriculture Personnel

All Ministry of Agriculture personnel interviewed were familiar with the Agricultural Secretariat; however, the rapid turnover of personnel at the higher levels prompted some individuals to respond that they did not have sufficient experience to elaborate beyond generalities.

All ministry respondents were familiar with the various functions of the Agricultural Secretariat including the RCAC, TCC, RTCU, and the data bank program. None of the interviewees, including those at the ministerial level, could recall any policy change which had been made in their respective countries as a result of participation in the Agricultural Secretariat. However, as a forum for the discussion of policy and mutual problems, the Agricultural Secretariat was cited as a significant benefit for the region. Some officials stated that it was too early to attempt to evaluate the benefits which would occur in the region as a result of the Agricultural Secretariat's activities.

The most frequently cited of the Agricultural Secretariat's activities was the RTCU program. Everyone gave specific examples of technical exchange activities and felt the RTCU had produced positive results in their respective countries. In the opinion of all ministry personnel interviewed, the future of the Agricultural Secretariat with respect to the RTCU Program was promising. They cited this program as a low-cost method of obtaining technical expertise from individuals who were familiar with the region.

When questioned about the location of the Agricultural Secretariat, all respondents replied that, while it should remain within IICA, it should be placed higher up in the administrative structure to better fulfill its policy advisory role. They agreed that the movement of the TS to

a higher level in the IICA structure would probably require the relocation of the RTCU to another part of IICA.

Questions relating to the future of the policy aspects of the Agricultural Secretariat focused on two issues: (1) the policy forum and (2) the development of regional projects. The service provided by the forum was viewed with satisfaction at all levels. Since its inception, the RCAC has had five Ordinary Meetings and one Extraordinary Session. However, none of the ministry officials interviewed were able to point to any policy decision affecting either their country or the region that had originated in the RCAC. Nor were they able to cite any examples of increased production, intra- and/or inter-regional trade, or rural development that could be credited to such decisions. Nevertheless, the hope was expressed that substantive contributions would be produced by the RCAC in the future.

Opinions were mixed with respect to the potential of the Agricultural Secretariat for success with the funding and implementation of regional projects. It was pointed out that the countries are so similar in terms of their agricultural production that they tend to compete with one another for export markets while they may be reluctant to rely on one another as a source of basic grains and other staple foods.

The subject of country quota payments to the Agricultural Secretariat is a sensitive one. Although no suggestions were made on how to enforce these payments, there was total agreement that no country should be excluded from participation in the Agricultural Secretariat for nonpayment. Although these quotas are payable in local currencies and are recognized by all concerned as but token contributions, some countries have not made any payments, while others are in arrears and still others have complied in full (see Appendix E).

IICA Country Personnel

All IICA Country Directors were familiar with the various programs of the TS but their enthusiasm and support for the programs were quite

30

varied. While there was near unanimous support for the concept of the RCAC, the Directors differed in their views on conditions for participation. Reservations were also expressed about the ability of the TS, as currently structured, to provide policy analysis and advice to the RCAC. None of the IICA country personnel were aware of any policy changes at the national or regional level which had originated within the Agricultural Secretariat.

The RTCU and its technical exchange activities received favorable evaluations from almost everyone, although there was some criticism of the coordination of RTCU programs. To a large degree, these problems were attributed to the location of the RTCU coordinator in Guatemala rather than in San Jose.

Among the country office personnel who favored the continuation of the Agricultural Secretariat, there was agreement that it should remain within IICA. However, opinions were mixed about where it should be placed in IICA's administrative structure.

It was apparent from the interviews that the TS had been operating independently within the countries and had failed to keep the IICA Country Directors informed on a continuing basis of its activities, creating significant misunderstandings and ill will. This problem was also cited in the April 1983 ROCAP/IICA evaluation report.

There was support for separating RTCU from the TS and placing it elsewhere within IICA. This administrative change was viewed as particularly appropriate if the TS were to be elevated to a higher level, within the administrative hierarchy of IICA.

While the potential of the Agricultural Secretariat to contribute to regional development and integration was acknowledged, there was skepticism about whether this potential could be achieved unless administrative changes were made in the TS and the number of its activities was reduced.

The country quota issue was discussed with each IICA Country Director. There was support for the idea that the quota represented a token payment which could be paid if it were included in the budgets of the ministries. Although the participation of all countries was viewed as important, no solutions were suggested for dealing with the problem of nonpayment.

IICA Central Office Personnel

Interviews with high level personnel at IICA Headquarters in San Jose revealed that there had not been much coordination between the TS and other sections of IICA, and that few joint activities had taken place. For example, the Investment Center of IICA (CEPI) prepares projects for funding by the IDB, the World Bank, and the donor groups; however, there was little evidence that the TS had utilized the experience and expertise of this specialized center in the preparation of projects it had proposed for funding. Likewise, Program IX and its PROPLAN are specifically involved with the planning and administration of development activities. Even though the TS as a project is administratively assigned to Program IX, no substantial evidence was found to demonstrate that it had utilized the expertise available through this Program.

One of the tasks of the TS is to participate in the development of a regional data base. Although it may be inferred from the Project Paper (page 4) that the TS manages the data bank, in reality this function has remained, as it should, with IICA's Agricultural Information and Documentation Center (CIDIA). The utilization by the TS of CIDIA's resources and personnel has been considerably more extensive than in the case of other IICA units. The data bank of wholesale market prices and quantities is functioning and country personnel have been instructed in its use. However, as yet these data have not been used as inputs to policy studies.

Findings of Evaluation Team

Pursuant to its instructions, the team evaluated the project within the context of "end-of-project" conditions and "outputs which were to be

accomplished" as contained in both the Project Paper and Statement of Work. The project was also evaluated against its Logical Framework.

It should be noted that the performance of the project as measured against its Logical Framework is more favorable that when evaluated by the criteria in the Statement of Work and Project Paper. This is due in large part to the greater emphasis placed on policy objectives in these latter documents.

The findings of the team are presented below:

1. Organization and Management. The regulations governing the Agricultural Secretariat have been duly approved by all participating countries and the overall Agricultural Secretariat framework has been established. The Coordinating Secretary and the Coordinators of the RAU and RTCU have been hired (i.e., seconded from elsewhere in IICA) and one NAPU staff member in each country has been assigned to technical staff activities. The RCAC has met at least two times per year; and the TCC has met three times per year. To date there have been five Ordinary Meetings and one Extraordinary Meeting of the RCAC; the TCC has met eleven times; and the Executive Committee has met three times.

   Management and administrative problems hamper the efficiency of the TS in its relationships with other offices of IICA both at Headquarters and in the field. Several times during its tour of the region, the evaluation team was told by the Country Directors that the TS would communicate directly with government officials (including Ministers of Agriculture) before briefing them (the Country Directors). Not only did this embarrass the Country Directors (especially when asked by the Minister to explain the meaning of a communique from the TS), but it put the Agricultural Secretariat in a bad light as well as lowered its efficiency.

33

Hopefully, this situation will be remedied, at least in part, now that a manual on operating procedures has been prepared for the RTCU which includes norms for the creation and operation of the COTER Fund and the management of the human resources data bank. The team did not have an opportunity to review this new procedures manual.

2. Policy Recommendations. The team was unable to identify any policy recommendations that had been made by the RCAC. In every country visited, Ministry of Agriculture personnel at all levels (including Ministers and Vice-Ministers) were asked to enumerate policies which had originated in the RCAC, but were unable to do so. Consequently, policies that could provide the basis for implementing reforms, amending agricultural trade barriers, financing projects, and providing technical personnel were not identified by the evaluation team.

3. Coordination with other Regional Institutions. The team interviewed the Director of SIECA's Agricultural Department in Guatemala and the Director of CATIE in Turrialba, Costa Rica in order to ascertain the extent of cooperation existing between their organizations and the Agricultural Secretariat. The SIECA representative stated that at the meetings of the Ministers to which observers are invited and permitted to make presentations, he is seldom recognized by the Chair when he wishes to make an intervention and that in all other aspects the Secretariat tends to overlook SIECA. The Director of CATIE stated that he seldom receives invitations to attend any sessions of the Secretariat. Thus, it appears that the hopes for coordinated efforts by these regional organizations embodied in the Project Paper have not been realized at the highest levels, although at lower levels there has been at least one instance of a cooperative initiative by the RTCU in providing financial assistance with the evaluation of a CATIE training program.

4. Financial Support. Only two of the seven countries, Panama and Honduras, have met their financial quotas, while two others, El Salvador and the Dominican Republic, have not made any cash contribution. Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica have made partial payments with domestic currency.

5. RTCU Operations. The operations of the TS are hampered because the staff member appointed to be in charge of the RTCU is posted in Guatemala and consequently is unable to adequately carry out his duties. Coordination assistance is being provided to the RTCU under a fixed term technical assistance project financed by the Spanish government. The regional information system is functioning with a technician provided by Spanish aid.

   The number of technical assistance missions carried out by the RTCU has increased from 11 missions in 1983 to 18 missions in 1984 to an estimated 50 missions in 1985. While the rate of increase is impressive, the 1985 total is still well below the "minimum of 20 requests/year/country for technical cooperation ... (to be) fulfilled" as stated in the Logical Framework for the project. In all cases the assistance has been provided to public agencies. Inasmuch as some countries have not met their financial quotas, ROCAP has had to assume more than its contractual share of the costs of the missions carried out.

6. Studies and Special Reports. According to the TS, eight documents were prepared during 1981-1982, 28 during 1983, 36 in 1984, and 10 as of the end of March 1985. They range in length from 2 to over 150 pages, although the majority seem to have less than 20 pages. While a large proportion of these documents are concerned with administrative or housekeeping matters, some substantive studies and project identification documents have also been produced and prepared for submission to financial institutions. In all, 22 project profiles have been developed, eight of which have been presented to AID, the World Bank, or the IDB.

35

A number of studies are currently being prepared for presentation at the forthcoming meeting of the TCC. Included are background documents, consisting primarily of sector studies, for six of the seven original members of the Agricultural Secretariat. The team was able to review the draft of one of these studies (Estudios de Politicas Agricolas Globales -- Republica Dominica, 133 pp.), which was to serve as a prototype for the rest. Although the document is well prepared, it is best described as a sector study rather than as an "Overall Study of Agricultural Policy" as the title would suggest. [1/]

A summary of the regional aspects of the six sector studies currently in preparation is included in "Estudio de Politicas Agricolas: Aspectos Regionales." As with the individual country studies, this is a regional assessment of problems and issues but does not provide policy options for consideration by the TS and by the TCC for subsequent transmittal to the RCAC. It concludes with an annotated list of problems requiring action and/or additional research.

Five other studies, some still in draft form, were made available to the evaluation team. These were: "Food Security: An Annotated Bibliography," (28 pp.); "Food Security Issues and Policy Options in the CORECA Region," (207 pp.); "Food Security Issues and Options in Central America: A Review and Synthesis of Literature," (112 pp.); "Marco Conceptual y Methodological Para los Estudios de Politicas Agricolas," (39 pp.); and "Estudio Sobre Politicas de Exportacion de Productos Agricolas No Tradicionales," (150 pp.). Another four documents are forthcoming but could not be made available in time.

1/ If the policy studies and country sector studies had been prepared prior to the project profiles, they could have served as useful inputs to the project selection and conceptualization process.

The team's assessment of the quality of the studies initiated by the Agricultural Secretariat and financed with ROCAP resources is as follows:

a. The six sector studies are well-prepared and informative; however, as mentioned above, they are not agricultural policy studies, and it is doubtful that they will serve the immediate needs of the Agricultural Secretariat. [1/] Although policy studies can be built on the information provided in the sector studies and the regional summary, this same information could have been obtained from studies already in existence.

b. The quality of the remaining documents ranges from good to excellent. The team was especially impressed with the documents relating to food security which had been prepared in such a way that the TS, as well as the TCC and/or the Executive Committee, could readily identify policy options with their respective consequences, for presentation to the RCAC.

   The study relating to the promotion of non-traditional exports provides a useful background information on the regional situation; however, its recommendations focus more on projects, training, and research than on policies for consideration.

1/ The limitations of the studies for policy purposes may reflect the TS' strategy, as described to the evaluation team, of developing policy studies in two phases, the first consisting of collection and analysis of baseline data, the second of identifying from the data policy-related problems and options for addressing them. Although this strategy might have been useful over a longer timespan, it did not produce the needed policy information during the lifetime of the project agreement.

CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions

Based on the information presented in the previous sections of this report, as well as on experience and insights gained during the course of its work, the team arrived at the following conclusions concerning the Agricultural Secretariat Project and the future of the Agricultural Secretariat including participation by ROCAP:

1. The Agricultural Secretariat is operational but has not lived up to ROCAP's expectations because, for a variety of reasons, it has not functioned adequately as a policy body. However, the level of activities with respect to (a) the RTCU, (b) the information exchange system, and (c) policy-related studies has risen appreciably during the latter portion of the period covered by the ROCAP/IICA Agreement, and recent policy-oriented studies, such as those relating to food security, have been well done and could serve as very useful bases for policy analysis and advice.

2. The RCAC has proven to be successful as a forum for the Ministers, but not as a policy-making body.

3. A major reason why the Agricultural Secretariat has not performed as anticipated by ROCAP is that it has spread itself too thin, in effect giving the impression of being a mini-IICA. The primary role of the Agricultural Secretariat should be two-fold: (a) to make available a forum for the ministers wherein they can communicate and deliberate on matters of regional importance including policy decisions, and (b) to provide a Technical (Coordinating) Secretariat capable of providing a policy analysis and advisory service as well as logistic support to the Ministers. All other activities should be considered secondary and might best be carried out elsewhere within IICA.

4. The team was favorably impressed with the dedication and performance of the RAU and its Director. If these energies had been oriented toward policy analysis early in the life of the project, the contribution of the Secretariat to the process of regional integration would have been considerably enhanced.

5. Given its need to draw upon other IICA resources, the Agricultural Secretariat should continue to be posted at IICA Headquarters in San Jose, Costa Rica. However, the Agricultural Secretariat is improperly situated within IICA and should be moved to a higher and more appropriate level of the institution's hierarchy.

6. Internal and external management and administrative procedures carried out by the TS are not conducive to achieving high levels of performance and need to be improved. The two prior evaluations of the Secretariat called attention to these same issues.

7. IICA needed assistance to carry out project activities, especially in the area of policy studies, due to lack of expertise. ROCAP was unable to contribute significantly to the technical aspects of the project because it did not have ready access to the necessary technical personnel. The intervention, at ROCAP's request, of the AID-funded Agricultural Policy Analysis Project (APAP) which provided assistance to IICA with project preparation, served a very useful purpose. If this type of assistance has been made available earlier and the policy studies had been completed and presented to the Ministers within the life of the project, policy actions might have taken place under project auspices.

8. ROCAP should have suspended funding for all RTCU activities when IICA proved to be unresponsive to the requirement that the supervisor of this unit be located in the office of the Technical Secretariat in San Jose.

9. Given the priorities expressed by ROCAP, the level of performance that can be expected from within the Agricultural Secretariat to meet these priorities, and the inability of some of the participating countries to meet their financial quotas, ROCAP should not provide additional assistance to the Secretariat as currently structured upon the termination of its present agreement with IICA.

10. Any further assistance provided by ROCAP to the Agricultural Secretariat should be carried out via a tripartite agreement in which all parties are signatories. The two agreement relationship currently governing the project has created serious ambiguities and misunderstandings with respect to project direction and management.

Verifiable Indicators

Table 1 contains a Project Evaluation matrix based on three sets of evaluation criteria drawn respectively from (I) the Logical Framework of the Project Paper, (II) the end-of-project conditions as set forth in the team's Statement of Work, and (III) the projects outputs also identified in the Statement of Work. The existence of several sets of evaluation criteria reflects important inconsistencies in the project paper. While major emphasis was given to the policy analysis and advisory function of the project, only one of the 12 indicators in the Logical Framework related to the policy. This compares with five out of ten end-of-project conditions that are policy-related, representing a considerable difference in the relative weighting of policy issues in the total evaluation process.

The assumptions provided in the Logical Framework also posed problems with respect to the evaluation of project outputs. They are stated so vaguely that even with full compliance the corresponding verifiable indicators may not be forthcoming.

40

Table 1. Project Evaluation Matrix Based Upon Alternate Criteria

	LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHMENT		
	Satisfactory	Partial Fulfillment	Unsatisfactory
I. OUTPUTS AND VERIFIABLE INDICATORS FROM PROJECT PAPER LOGICAL FRAMEWORK			
A. Agricultural Secretariat Established And Functioning			
1. Coordinating Secretary and Regional Coordinator Hired.....	X		
2. 1 NAPU staff member in each country assigned to technical staff.....	X		
3. RCAC meeting twice a year.....	X		
4. TCC meeting three times a year.....	X		
5. RCAC making policy decisions based on staff recommendations.....			X
B. Regional Information System Functioning			
1. Data available from national sources input in regional system.....	X		
2. New data input from project-financed and national level studies.....	X		
C. RTCU Functioning			
1. IICA local staff assisting in identifying experts.....	X		
2. Bio-data system expanded to include experts from all CAC countries.....	X		
3. Minimum of 20 requests/year/country for technical cooperation are fulfilled.....			X
D. Special Fund Established			
1. 5 studies carried out or contracted by technical staff (as amended in 1985 workplan).....	X		
2. 9-10 projects designed based on results from studies and presented to international, regional, and/or national institutions for funding.....		X	

	LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHMENT		
	Satisfactory	Partial Fulfillment	Unsatisfactory
II. END-OF-PROJECT "CONDITIONS" FROM STATEMENT OF WORK			
A. Regulations governing Agricultural Secretariat approved by participating countries.....	X		
B. Policy related activities by countries:			
1. Adopt policy recommendations.....			X
2. Action taken to support recommendations			X
3. Reforms made as necessary.....			X
4. Projects financed.....			X
5. Personnel provided.....			X
C. Technical Secretariat coordinating activities with regional institutions.....			X
D. Members make required financial contributions to Agricultural Secretariat.....		X	
E. Use of RTCU By:			
1. Public Sector.....	X		
2. Private Sector.....			X

	LEVEL OF ACCOMPLISHMENT		
	Satisfactory	Partial Fulfillment	Unsatisfactory
III. END-OF-PROJECT "OUTPUTS" FROM "STATEMENT OF WORK"			
A. Agricultural Secretariat			
1. Established and operational.....	X		
2. Research and analysis unit functioning with qualified staff.....	X		
3. Reciprocal cooperation unit functioning with qualified staff.....		X	
B. Regional information system functioning at IICA.....	X-		
C. Technical expertise exchange (RTCU) functioning.....		X	
D. Special Fund Established Fund.....		X	
E. Studies being conducted to provide a basis for policy and program [illegible]			

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Agricultural Secretariat

During the course of its investigation, the team became convinced that the workload and activities of the TS far exceeded what originally had been intended. Furthermore, there seemed to be a consensus that the inappropriate positioning of the TS within the bureaucratic structure of IICA had reduced its efficiency both within IICA and in terms of its day-to-day activities with RCAC. This was confirmed from interviews carried out in the member countries (including government officials and IICA Country Directors) as well as at IICA Headquarters.

There was widespread conviction in the countries as well as at IICA Headquarters that the primary function of the Agricultural Secretariat was to provide: (1) a forum for the Ministers of Agriculture of the member countries, and (2) a Technical Secretariat which in addition to providing logistic support and coordination would serve as a policy research and advisory body to RCAC. The inclusion of RTCU, project identification and preparation, and data management responsibilities had tended to dilute the concentration of energies and efforts needed by the TS in carrying out its major responsibility of servicing the requirements of the Council of Ministers for policy research and advice.

Relocation of the TS Within IICA

Given that the major responsibility of the Agricultural Secretariat is political in nature, its present bureaucratic location within IICA's Central Area Office (Area 1) is inappropriate. The Technical Secretary needs to be able to communicate freely with the Ministers of Agriculture and others within the participating countries, yet IICA regulations stipulate that only the Director General and Directors of the National Offices (in their capacity as representatives of the Director General) can communicate directly with the Ministers. Under the existing structure, the Technical Secretary must report to the Director of the Area 1 Office who reports to the Assistant Deputy Director General for Operations, who

in turn reports to the Deputy Director General and he to the Director General. Additional confusion arises because the TS is also a component of Program IX; hence, in theory, the Technical Secretary should report to the Director of that Program, who in turn reports to the Assistant Deputy Director for Program Development, and he to the Deputy Director General and onto the Director General.

It is recommended that the Technical Secretariat be removed from its present position within the IICA hierarchy and attached directly (as an appendage) to the Office of the Deputy Director General. This would allow the Technical Secretary to carry out his responsibilities more efficiently and facilitate more effective coordination and collaboration with the IICA Programs and Special Centers (CIDIA, CEPI, etc.) by the TS.

It should be recognized that the Ministers of Agriculture who make up the RCAC are also Members of the Governing Council of IICA and as such are entitled to have their sub-regional council appropriately situated close to the Office of the Deputy or Director General. The recommended arrangement would also facilitate closer links between the Director General and eight of the twenty-nine Ministers on IICA's Governing Council.

Reassignment of Technical Functions

The TS presently carries out duties that are strictly political (i.e. working with and servicing the RCAC) as well as others that are technical in nature (i.e. those associated with RTCU, project identification and preparation, etc.). If the suggestion that the TS be appended to the Office of the Deputy Director General were to be adopted, it would no longer be appropriate for the TS to handle these technical functions.

After interviewing the Directors of IICA Programs and Specialized Centers, the evaluation team concluded that there were indeed appropriate and well designed units within IICA capable of handling most of the technical activities presently assigned to the TS.

44

Project Identification and Preparation

Responsibility of identifying and preparing projects should be turned over to IICA's own Investment Center (CEPI). This specialized center is part of the Office of the Assistant Director General for Operations and *inter alia* was created for the purpose of identifying and preparing projects and obtaining funding for their execution either from quota or other sources such as the Inter-American Development Bank, World Bank, the European Economic Community, and others.

During its first three years of existence, CEPI has identified and prepared US $172 million of projects which already have been funded and an additional US $753 million which are undergoing consideration for funding. CEPI also finances the post of the Chief of the Technical Secretariat's RAU which is filled by an individual seconded from CEPI.

Clearly, the resources of this specialized center are adequate to serve the needs of the Agricultural Secretariat. Once the RCAC had reached agreement on possible projects, such information would be transmitted to the Directorate of CEPI for inclusion in its work plan including project preparation, securing funding, and eventual implementation.

Reciprocal Technical Coordinating Units (RTCU)

Although this form of Technical Cooperation among Developing Countries (TCDC) has been a popular program of the TS, it represents a purely technical function which should not remain an integral component of the Agricultural Secretariat. However, the types of technical cooperation that can be carried out by the RTCU are so diverse that they are not within the competence of any single IICA Program. Consequently, the team recommends that RTCU be attached to the Office of the Assistant Deputy Director General for Program Development which is in charge of all ten IICA programs.

Under this recommended arrangement, and with the approval of the Assistant Deputy Director General, the officer-in-charge of the RTCU could

45

request cooperation from the appropriate IICA program, technicians could continue to be recruited from the existing or an expanded roster of technical resources, and their per diem and travel costs could be met by subventions executed by the TS out of the Special Fund already created for the purpose and managed by the Technical Secretariat.

Data Management and Analysis. This activity has been carried out in close cooperation with the IICA's Inter-American Agricultural Documentation and Information Center (CIDIA). Specific data generated within national systems is being transferred to systems managed by CIDIA where it is processed and/or collected with other data and transmitted back to the participating countries as well as to the Agricultural Secretariat.

The team was assured by the Director of CIDIA that if the resources presently being provided to the Agricultural Secretariat to fund this service were instead channeled to CIDIA, the quantity of output would not deteriorate and that the countries and the Secretariat would be equally, if not better off, than under the present situation.

Proposed New Structure of the Technical Secretariat

If the changes proposed above were to be carried out, the Agricultural Secretariat would be stripped of its technical responsibilities other than those associated with its policy analysis functions, and would consists of the Council of Ministers and a streamlined Technical Secretariat that would provide logistic and administrative support in addition to a Policy Advisory and Analysis Service.

The teams remains neutral concerning the advisability of reincorporating the Technical Coordinating Committee (Directors of the NAPU's) and/or the Executive Committee (Vice-Ministers). It does wish to suggest, however, that there are valid arguments both for and against inserting a bureaucratic structure between the Council of Ministers and the Technical Secretariat.

46

APPENDICES

Appendix A

STATEMENT OF WORK

I. Scope of Work

The contractor should carry out a final evaluation of the Agricultural Secretariat Project, 596-0094, being implemented by the Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura (IICA). The evaluation report shoudl assess what the project accomplished in terms of the project purpose and goal established in the project paper and make recommendations to insure the continued functioning of the Secretariat once ROCAP's financial support ends.

The goal of the project is to promote regional efforts to increase agricultural production, intra-regional trade and exports, and to stimulate rural development, particularly rural employment and improved living standards.

The purpose of the project is to assist the Regional Agricultural Agricultural Secretariat to become a permanent and effective body able to identify, analyze and recommend solutions to agricultural problems common to some or all of the Central American countries, Panama or the Dominican Republic.

The project paper end-of-project conditions which should be assessed to assist in determining whether the project purpose was accomplished are as follows:

1) Regulations governing the Agricultural Secretariat are approved by participating countries.

2) Participating countries, adopt policy recommendations made by the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation (RCAC) and undertake necessary actions to support these decisions, including implementing reforms amending ag trade barriers, financing projects and providing technical personnel.

3) Regional institutions (SIECA, CATIE, etc.) coordinate efforts with the Secretariat.

4) Participating countries agree to continue providing annual contributions to the Secretariat of $30,000 per country.

5) Public and private sectors are utilizing the Regional Technical Cooperation Unit (RTCU) as a major mechanism to respond to regional technical assistance requirements.

Outputs which were to be accomplished in order to achieve the project purpose are listed below:

1) The overall Agricultural Secretariat framework established and operational, with the important technical functions of the Research and Analysis and Recriprocal Technical Cooperation Units being carried out by a qualified staff;

2) The regional information system functioning at IICA with sufficient data to support the technical requirements of the Secretariat and appropriate staff provided to assure effective operation;

3) The technical expertise and information exchange mechanism established and functioning; and

4) The special fund established and studies being conducted that provide a basis for policy and program recommendations.

The evaluation report should also:

Assess the effectiveness of the organizational and administrative structures established by IICA for implementing the project.

Examine the products and studies which project resources have financed.

Provide recommendations on needed actions for the continued functioning of the Secretariat once ROCAPs financial assistance terminates.

II. Methodology

The evaluation team should: (a) review project documents, including the original project paper, quarterly status reports, prior evaluations, documents prepared for the Ministers of Agriculture and Technical/Executive Committee meetings, Minutes of the Council of Ministers and Technical/Executive Committee meetings and other reports, in order to measure compliance with project purpose and outputs.

(b) Interview the Central America/Panama and Dominican Republic Ministers of Agriculture and Directors of the National Agricultural

Planning Units (USPAs) to assess the extent of their support to the Agricultural Secretariat and the extent of the USPAs involvement in the technical activities of the Secretariat.

III. Consultants Qualifications and Timing

Two consultants with experience in agricultural policy analyses are required. Knowledge of, and work experience in, Central America are essential. S-3, R-3 Spanish language proficience is required. The evaluation will require approximately 48 work days including brief 2-3 day visits each to Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama and the Dominican Republic. The balance of the time will be spent in Costa Rica at the ROCAP/San Jose office. The consultants should plan to arrive in Costa Rica on or about November 7, 1985.

IV. Reports

A draft final report will be prepared in English and submitted to ROCAP for review and comment prior to departing the region. Ten copies of the final report are to be submitted to ROCAP within two weeks of receiving comments on the draft report from ROCAP.

Appendix B

PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AND ORGANIZATIONS VISITED

SEICA

Manuel Martinez y Martinez - Director Department of Agriculture

IICA

Panama

Ing. Guillermo Guerra E. - Country Director
Lic. Clara Solís B. - Chief Rural Youth Programs

Dominican Republic

Ing. Héctor Morales J. - Country Director

Honduras

Ing. Alberto Franco - Country Director

El Salvador

Dr. Raúl Soikes - Country Director

Guatemala

Ing. Carlos Luis Arias - Specialist Agricultural Communications

Costa Rica

Sr. Miguel A. Araujo Cruz - Coordinating Secretary, Agricultural Secretariat
Sr. Juan A. Aguirre - Director Specialized Center, Project Development
Dr. Lizardo de las Casas - Director, Program IX - Development Planning and Administration (PROPLAN)
Dr. Carlos Enrique Fernández - Director, Central Area
Dr. Mario Kaminsky - Director, Agricultural Information and Documentation Center (CIDIA)
Dr. Francisco Morillo - Director General
Sr. Raúl Pineda - Communications Specialist
Dr. Martín Piñeiro - Director General Designate
Dr. Jorge Soria - Assistant Deputy Director General for Program Development

Ing. José Alberto Torres - Assistant Deputy Director General, Operations
Sr. Víctor Tunarosa Murcia - Project Formulation, Evaluation Specialist, Agricultural Secretariat
Sr. Rodolfo Martínez Ferraté, Founding Coodinating Secretary, Agricultural Secretariat.

Ministry of Agriculture

Panama

Ing. Carlos Palacios - Subdirector of Sector Planning
Julio Sánchez - Chief of the Legal Department
Virginia de Velásquez - Chief of Technical Cooperation

Dominican Republic

Ing. Fausto Grisanty - Coordinator for Agricultural Secretariat
Ing. Santiago Tejada E. - Coordinator of Ag. Studies
Lic. José M. Vizcino - Asst. Director of Ag. Planning

Honduras

Ing. Raf Flores Ponce - Chief of Ag. Sector Planning
Lic. Regino Quezada - Vice-Minister of Natural Res.

El Salvador

Ing. Gregorio Valladares -Vice-Minister of Agriculture

Guatemala

Ing. Juan Humberto Mancur Donis - Minister of Agriculture
DVS Roberto Muñoz Solares - Vice-Minister of Agriculture

USAID/ROCAP

Michael Deal - Project Development Officer, ROCAP, Guatemala
John Eyre, Deputy Director, ROCAP, Guatemala
Nancy Fong - Project Office, Agricultural Secretariat Project, ROCAP, Guatemala
David W. Joslyn - Regional Agriculture Development Officer, ROCAP, San José
Michael Lofstrom - Assistant Project Development Officer, ROCAP, Guatemala

Appendix C

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

ABT ASSOCIATES INC. Agricultural Policy Analysis Project. AID Mission.

IICA. Annual Report. Volume I. San José, Costa Rica. 1984. 290 p.

_____. Base Interamericana Integrada de Datos Agropecuarios y Socioeconómicos. Manual del Usuario. IICA/CIDIA. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 104 p.

_____. Bibliografía Anotada sobre Políicas de Seguridad Alimentaria. Doc. COTEPA/CORECA 04-IV-85. San José, Costa Rica.

_____. CEPI: Objetivos, Actividades y Logros 1983-1985. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 15 p.

_____. CIDIA. Desarrollo de un Sistema de Información para Análisis del Sector Agropecuario de los países del CORECA. Segunda Fase. Comisión de Estudio y Acción, CEA. San José, Costa Rica. Febrero 1985. 15 p.

_____. Cronograma Revisado de Trabajo de la Fase I del Estudio de Políticas Agrícolas. 1985.

_____. El Abastecimiento de Productos Perecederos a las Areas Urbanas. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 20 p.

_____. Estudio de Políticas Agrícolas Aspectos Regionales. Doc. CE/CORECA 10-IV-85. San José, Costa Rica.

_____. Estudio de Políticas Agrícolas de los Países Miembros del CORECA. Guía para la Recolección de Información por parte de los Consultores Nacionales. 1985. 12 p.

_____. Estudio de Políticas Agrícolas en Seguridad Alimentaria. Doc. COTEPA/CORECA 04-IV-85. San José, Costa Rica. 133 p.

_____. Estudio de Políticas Agrícolas Globales - República Dominicana. 1985. Doc. COTEPA/CORECA 03-III-85. San José, Costa Rica. 133 p.

_____. Estudio sobre Políticas de Exportación de Productos Agrícolas No Tradicionales. Doc. COTEPA/CORECA 05-III-85. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 150 p.

IICA. Evaluación del Acuerdo de Cooperación Técnica entre los Ministros de Agricultura de Centroamérica, Panamá y República Dominicana y el IICA para el Funcionamiento del CORECA. Informe de la Comisión Evaluadora. Doc. CORECA/Evaluación No.4. Serie de Publicaciones Misceláneas No.521. Mayo 1984. 67 p. Anexos.

_____. Evaluación Proyecto de la Secretaría y Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola de Centro América, Panamá y República Dominicana. Informe de la Comisión Evaluadora. San José, Costa Rica. Abril 30 de 1983. 42 p. y Anexo.

_____. Gastos Totales Efectuados por el IICA en el Proyecto CORECA a Setiembre 1985. SECRETARIA AGRICOLA.

_____. Información de Precios y Mercados. San José, Costa Rica. 1985.

_____. Informe de Acciones del Programa IX durante 1984. DPIX 3. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 18 p.

_____. Informe de la Sexta Reunión del Comité Técnico y Tercera Reunión del Consejo de Ministros de Agricultura. IICA/AID/ROCAP San Salvador, El Salvador. Febrero 1983. 108 p.

_____. Informe de la Séptima Reunión del Comité Técnico. Tela Honduras. Abril 13 a 16 de 1983.

_____. Informe de Progreso del Sistema de Información del CORECA. II Reunión del Comité de Estudio y Acción en Información. 5 p.

_____. Informe del Grupo de Consulta para el Desarrollo de un Programa Operativo del Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola de Centroamerica, Panamá y República Dominicana (CORECA). 1982.

_____. Informe de la Cuarta Reunión del Consejo de Ministros de Agricultura y Octava Reunión del Comité Técnico. ISSN 0253-4746. Tegucigalpa, Honduras. 1983. 157 p.

_____. Informe de la Quinta Reunión del Consejo de Ministros de Agricultura (Serie de Ponencias, Resultados y Recomendaciones Eventos Técnicos). No.355.ISSN-0253-4746. 1985. 105 p.

_____. Manual de Procedimientos del Programa de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca, COTER. Doc. CE/CORECA 03-III-85. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 32 p.

IICA. Manual de Procedimientos del Programa de Estudios Especiales, Preses. Doc. CE/CORECA 04-III-85. Tercera Reunión del Comité Ejecutivo. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 25 p.

_____. Marco Conceptual y Metodológico para los Estudios de Políticas Agrícolas. Doc. COTEPA/CORECA 09-III-85. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 39 p.

_____. Matriz de Relaciones entre Objetivos de Desarrollo y Políticas e Instrumentos a Nivel de País.

_____. Primera Reunión del Comité Técnico de Coordinación de los Estudios de Políticas Agrícolas del CORECA. Acta. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 10 p.

_____. Primera Reunión del Comité Técnico de Coordinación de los Estudios de Políticas Agrícolas de CORECA. Lista de Participantes. San José, Costa Rica. 1985.

_____. Proyecto: Mecanización de un Sistema de Información de Precios y Mercados de Productos Agropecuarios en Costa Rica. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 74 p.

_____. Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities. 1985.

_____. Reglamento del CORECA. Doc. CE/CORECA 02-III-85. Tercera Reunión del Comité Ejecutivo. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 31 p.

_____. Series Estadísticas de Precios Recibidos y Pagados por el Productor Agropecuario: Elaboración de la Relación de Paridad. Panamá, Panamá. 1985.

_____. Sistema Gerencial de Información Agropecuaria. Ante-Proyecto de Estructura del Banco de Datos. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 29 p.

_____. Términos de Referencia para el Consultor en Análisis Macroeconómico dentro de los Estudios de Análisis de Política del Coreca. 2 p.

_____. Un Programa de Apoyo a las Exportaciones de Productos Agropecuarios en Costa Rica. San José, Costa Rica. 1985. 27 p.

_____. What is CEPI? San José, Costa Rica. 1983. 23 p.

LEHMAN B , Fletcher, et al. Food Security Issues and Policy Options in the CORECA Region. 1985. 207 p.

MOYA, J y SALAZAR, M. Propuesta del Plan de Trabajo para el Proyecto de Estudios de Política Agraria por el CORECA. 2 p.

OSPA-DICI-601. Carta. San Salvador, El Salvador. 1985. 2 p.

VANG, David. Food Security. An Annotated Bibliography. Department of Economics. Iowa State University. Ames, Iowa. 29 p.

WOLFF, Nancy. Food Security Issues and Options in Central America: A Review and Synthesis of Literature. Iowa State University. Ames, Iowa. 1985. 112 p.

Appendix D

AGREEMENT OF REGIONAL COUNCIL OF MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE; IICA/ROCAP PROJECT AGREEMENT AND AMENDMENT; AND ANNOTATED LIST OF PILs AND PADs

CERTIFICO: que la presente copia es fiel al original registrado y custodiado por la División de Asuntos Jurídicos y Registro de Convenios del Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura.

San José, 3 de setiembre de 1981.

Hernán L. Fuenzalida
Jefe, División de Asuntos Jurídicos
y Registro de Convenios

ACUERDO DE COOPERACION TECNICA ENTRE LOS MINISTERIOS DE AGRICULTURA DE COSTA RICA, EL SALVADOR, GUATEMALA, HONDURAS, NICARAGUA, PANAMA Y LA SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA DE LA REPUBLICA DOMINICANA Y EL INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE COOPERACION PARA LA AGRICULTURA - OEA

Los Ministerios de Agricultura de Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panamá y la Secretaría de Agricultura de la República Dominicana, representados por los Ministros y el Secretario de Estado o sus representantes, Dr. Hernán Fonseca Zamora, por Costa Rica, Ing. Joaquín A. Guevara M., por El Salvador, Dr. Francisco Bobadilla, por Guatemala, Dr. Rodrigo Castillo, por Honduras, Ing. Ricardo Coronel por Nicaragua, Lic. Espino Domínguez, por Panamá, Ing. Samuel Encarnación por República Dominicana, en adelante denominados "los Ministros de Agricultura" y el Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para la Agricultura, representado por su Director General, Dr. José Emilio G. Araujo, en adelante denominado "el IICA",

C O N S I D E R A N D O

Que el IICA es el organismo especializado del sistema interamericano para la cooperación técnica en el campo de la agricultura y el desarrollo rural;

Que en Diciembre de 1980, en la Ciudad de México, con ocasión de la reunión del Consejo de la Organización Internacional Regional de Sanidad Agropecuaria, los Ministros de Agricultura de los países de Centro América y Panamá acordaron la creación del Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola (CORECA) y de su Secretaría de Coordinación que estaría a cargo del IICA.

Que los Gobiernos de Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panamá y República Dominicana signatarios de la Convención sobre el IICA ratificados el 8 de diciembre de 1980, pueden suscribir convenios con éste para facilitar y fortalecer el desarrollo de las actividades que se lleven a cabo en sus respectivos países.

A C U E R D A N

PRIMERA: PROPOSITO

Establecer el Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola (CORECA) y sus órganos: el Comité Técnico Asesor y la Secretaría de Coordinación. El CORECA persigue el propiciar un proceso conjunto de toma de decisiones que dé lugar a resoluciones de interés común en relación con los problemas de desarrollo agrícola y rural a través de la cooperación técnica recíproca, así como la identificación y preparación de estudios y proyectos.

SEGUNDA: DEL CONSEJO REGIONAL DE COOPERACION AGRICOLA (CORECA)

Estará integrado por los Ministros de Agricultura de Centroamérica, Panamá y el Secretario de Agricultura de la República Dominicana. Sesionará una vez al año como mínimo y tendrá las siguientes atribuciones principales:

1. Servir como foro permanente de consulta para la coordinación y orientación de las políticas, planes y programas de desarrollo y bienestar social, en el sector agropecuario de Centroamérica, Panamá y la República Dominicana.

2. Identificar y evaluar los factores que limitan el desarrollo del sector agropecuario en los países de Centroamérica, Panamá y República Dominicana, a fin de señalar las formas de cooperación y apoyo recípro

co que puedan establecerse entre los países para la superación de los referidos obstáculos.

3. Conocer y aprobar los informes, estudios y documentos presentados por el Comité Técnico.

4. Aprobar el Reglamento del Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola y del Comité Técnico.

TERCERA: DEL COMITE TECNICO

Estará integrado por los Directores de las Oficinas de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria de los países miembros o por un funcionario designado por el mismo. Formará parte además, de este Comité Técnico el Secretario de Coordinación. Este Comité se reunirá por lo menos una vez al año en sesión ordinaria. Las atribuciones y demás características de este órgano se sujetarán al Reglamento aprobado por los Ministros de Agricultura. El seguimiento de las acciones a nivel de cada país se hará a través de las Unidades de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria (UPSA's).

Tendrá las siguientes atribuciones principales:

1. Coordinar y dar seguimiento a los acuerdos tomados por el Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola.

2. Revisar los documentos que se presentarán a las reuniones del Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola.

3. Someter al Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola los informes y documentos pertinentes para su aprobación.

62

4. Estimular y promover la coordinación de esfuerzos en la ejecución de programas y proyectos de los países signatorios del Convenio, en particular los relacionados con el fortalecimiento de los recursos humanos y tecnológicos.

5. Definir el programa anual de cooperación regional agrícola con base en las necesidades de los países miembros.

CUARTA: DE LA SECRETARIA TECNICA DE COORDINACION

Será establecida como parte del IICA. La sede estará ubicada en San José, Costa Rica. Estará encabezada por un Secretario de Coordinación que será seleccionado por el IICA con el acuerdo del Comité Técnico y deberá ser nacional de uno de los países signatario del Acuerdo. Contará también con el personal de apoyo necesario y para sus operaciones a nivel nacional, utilizará un funcionario del IICA como enlace con cada país. El Secretario de Coordinación en calidad de Secretario Ejecutivo, dirigirá las unidades operativas. Será también responsable del manejo de los fondos con que operará dicha unidad y coordinará las reuniones del CORECA y del Comité Técnico.

1. La Secretaría Técnica tendrá las siguientes atribuciones:

   a. Promover y gestionar conjuntamente con las Unidades de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria, la asistencia técnica y/o financiera para la realización de estudios, la formulación y ejecución de proyectos regionales en el campo agropecuario.

   b. Administrar los recursos financieros del Programa del Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola.

   c. Apoyar a las Unidades de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria y a los Equipos de trabajo que se integren en la ejecución de los Acuerdos tomados por el Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola.

63

La Secretaría de Coordinación tendrá inicialmente dos componentes de organización: La Unidad de Análisis e Investigación y la Unidad de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca.

a. Unidad de Análisis e Investigación

Esta Unidad será responsable del trabajo técnico conducente a la formulación de recomendaciones para decisiones sobre políticas del CORECA. Una función básica será la de recolectar y poner en conocimiento del Comité Técnico los estudios, programas y proyectos agrícolas que tengan una significación regional para la integración e implementación de las resoluciones de seguimiento hechas por el CORECA o su Comité Técnico.

Asímismo, tendrá la responsabilidad de proveer el apoyo analítico y técnico necesario para la formulación de políticas de parte del CORECA en asuntos de importancia de los países signatarios.

El personal de la unidad consistirá de un Coordinador a nivel central. En los países, un técnico especialmente designado por las UPSA's coordinará las acciones con dicha unidad a través de los funcionarios de enlace de las oficinas nacionales del IICA. Estará encargada igualmente de recibir requerimientos de información, cotejar con los datos disponibles en el Centro Interamericano de Documentación, Información y Comunicación Agrícola (CIDIA) y suministrar la información a los requirentes.

La Secretaría de Coordinación a través de esta unidad manejará el Fondo Especial previsto para la contratación de estudios a ser realizados.

b. Unidad de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca

Esta unidad tendrá una función básica de promover y coordinar el intercambio de información y de servicios técnicos entre los países participantes y la administración del proyecto de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca (COTER). Estará encabezada por un Coordinador de igual categoría que el Coordinador de la Unidad de Análisis e Investigación. En la misma forma, para su trabajo utilizará a los enlaces de las UPSA's y a los funcionarios del IICA que servirán de enlace a nivel nacional.

Los países que provean los expertos para proyectos de asistencia técnica a corto plazo dentro de la región, continuarán pagando los salarios correspondientes. Los países que reciban al experto pagarán el costo de los viajes y viáticos. Sin embargo, para ayudar en la iniciación de este mecanismo de intercambio, el proyecto administrará un Fondo Especial para cubrir los costos de viaje y viáticos, de ser posible con seguro de riesgos.

QUINTA: CONTRIBUCION INSTITUCIONES DONANTES

Se autoriza al IICA para que tome las acciones pertinentes ante la Agencia Internacional para el Desarrollo (AID) del Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de América, por intermedio de su Oficina Regional para Centroamérica (ROCAP) y otros donantes para que de acuerdo al proyecto de presupuesto discutido y aprobado se puedan obtener los aportes para un plazo de tres años, en apoyo a la Secretaría Técnica del CORECA. Estos recursos serán canalizados y administrados por el IICA. Se suscribirá un acuerdo normativo sobre el particular entre el IICA y los organismos donantes. De esto se informará a los países en su oportunidad.

SEXTA: CONTRIBUCION DEL IICA

El objetivo general que persigue el IICA es el de cooperar en el fortalecimiento y operación del Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola y su Comité Técnico, a través de su Secretaría de Coordinación.

La contribución del IICA al Acuerdo será en especie, principalmente de tres técnicos, y algún apoyo financiero para servicios de computación. El Secretario de Coordinación será un alto funcionario del personal del IICA, nacional de algún país del área del Acuerdo. Los Coordinadores de las Unidades de Análisis e Investigación y de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca serán nombrados entre el personal del IICA. Además, los funcionarios del IICA de las oficinas nacionales de los países del área del proyecto, dedicarán 20% de su tiempo a la función de enlace con las Unidades de Planificación Sectorial Agropecuaria (UPSA's).

Se contratarán los servicios de una Secretaria Bilingue para la Secretaría de Coordinación y se darán las facilidades físicas de oficinas y equipo en la Sede Central del IICA.

El personal técnico requerido por el Sistema de Información será provisto por el IICA, así como cualquier otro personal profesional del IICA que se requiera sobre una base de consultoría a tiempo parcial para reforzar las actividades de la Secretaría de Coordinación

SETIMA: CONTRIBUCION DE LOS MINISTERIOS DE AGRICULTURA

Cada Ministerio se compromete a hacer una contribución de US$60.000 durante la vigencia del Acuerdo, el primer año US$10.000; el segundo US$20.000 y el tercero US$30.000.

66

El Ministerio de Desarrollo Agrop[illegible] efectiva su con-
[illegible]ción el tercer año de vigen[illegible]

El Ministerio de Agricultura de El Salvador en el presente año compromete su contribución hasta tanto no reciba la confirmación de su Gobierno, pero se compromete a hacer las gestiones necesarias para obtenerla.

En casos justificados, las contribuciones de los Ministerios podrá hacerse efectiva de manera distinta a la señalada, a juicio del Consejo.

OCTAVA: RESULTADOS ESPERADOS

[illegible] de tres años, la [illegible] a con el apoyo [illegible]rio del Comité Técnico del CORECA y el reconocimiento de su utilidad por parte de los Ministros de Agricultura.

[illegible] uientes:

[illegible] de la Secretaría Técnica de Coordinación firme-[illegible] establecida y las funciones de análisis, investigación, documenta[illegible] cooperación técnica recíproca [illegible] a satisfacción del Comité [illegible] de los Ministros de Agricu[illegible]

[illegible] Fondo Especial para estudios, [illegible] especial dentro del [illegible] manejo eficiente y eficaz [illegible]

c El mecanismo de intercambio del proyecto de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca para el Desarrollo Rural en América Central, Panamá y República Dominicana (COTER), establecido y funcionando a satisfacción.

Best Available Document

d. Un sistema regional de información funcionando en el IICA con documentación y datos suficientes para asegurar el apoyo de los requerimientos de la Secretaría Técnica de Coordinación.

NOVENA: CONTINUACION DEL ACUERDO

Antes de finalizar el plazo de este Acuerdo que será de tres años, se realizará una evaluación de los logros alcanzados y del impacto obtenido en los países respectivos del área por parte de un Consultor Independiente preferentemente. Como resultado de esta evaluación y de acuerdo a las recomendaciones respectivas, los Ministros de Agricultura podrán asumir las obligaciones inherentes a la institucionalización de la Secretaría Técnica, o decidir la continuación de la misma dentro del IICA.

DECIMA: OTRAS ADHESIONES

En caso de que otros países soliciten su ingreso al Consejo Regional de Cooperación Agrícola y sean aceptados de conformidad con lo que establece el reglamento respectivo, se podrá ampliar el presente instrumento, mediante un Acuerdo de Adhesión suscrito entre el IICA y el Ministro o Secretario de Agricultura del país que se integra.

UNDECIMA: CONSULTAS

Las partes firmantes aceptan que las instituciones que brinden ayuda financiera pueden consultar individual o colectivamente con los signatarios sobre el progreso y desarrollo de este Acuerdo.

En fe de lo cual, los Ministros de Agricultura o sus representantes debidamente autorizados, de Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panamá y República Dominicana y el Director General del IICA, suscriben el presente Acuerdo en ocho originales de igual tenor, que será efectivo desde el día 11 de agosto de 1981.

Los Ministros y Viceministros de Agricultura de Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panamá y República Dominicana, reunidos en el Hotel Bauen de la ciudad de Buenos Aires, el día 10 de agosto de 1981, dentro del contexto del Consejo Regional Agrícola Centroamericano, con el objeto de discutir diferentes aspectos de interés común.

CONSIDERANDO:

Que las Unidades Sectoriales de Planificación Agrícola de nuestros países, que constituyen el Comité Técnico, han tenido tres reuniones bajo el patrocinio del IICA y han estudiado y recomendado que se aprueben algunos instrumentos para institucionalizar este Consejo, lo cual consta en las tres ayuda memorias de las cuales nos damos por enterados;

Que conocidas las negociaciones realizadas entre el IICA y ROCAP-AID para obtener recursos en apoyo de este Consejo.

RESUELVEN:

1. Aprobar el reglamento de CORECA y el reglamento del Comité Técnico que se anexan a esta resolución.

2. Aprobar y firmar el Acuerdo Multinacional entre los Ministerios de Agricultura de los países de Centroamérica, Panamá, República Dominicana y el IICA para la creación del CORECA.

3. Autorizar al IICA para que suscriba los convenios necesarios con ROCAP-AID y los países a fin de poner en ejecución el proyecto del CORECA en los cuales IICA actuará como Secretaría General.

RECOMIENDAN:

1. Al IICA la continuación del apoyo a este esfuerzo y la búsqueda de recursos externos para este proyecto.

2. La realización de una próxima reunión de Ministros Miembros del CORECA, en el que se invite a los Ministros de Agricultura de México, Estados Unidos de América y Venezuela para discutir e identificar posibilidades de apoyo recíproco.

Firmado en la ciudad de Buenos Aires el día 11 de agosto de 1981.

Hernán Fonseca Z. Rodrigo Castillo Francisco Bobadilla Porfirio Domínguez

Juan Ernesto Quezada Joaquín A. Guevara M.

10

AID Project No. 596-0094
596-0094-G-00-1066-00

CONVENIO DE PROYECTO DE DONACION
PROJECT GRANT AGREEMENT

ENTRE
BETWEEN

EL INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE COOPERACION AGRICOLA
THE INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION

Y
AND

LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PARA EL
FOR THE

PROYECTO DE LA SECRETARIA AGRICOLA
AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT PROJECT

DE FECHA 30 DE SEPTIEMBRE DE 1981
DATED SEPTEMBER 30, 1981

UNITED STATES
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR CENTRAL AMERICAN PROGRAMS
GUATEMALA CITY, GUATEMALA C.A.

Proyecto AID No. 596-0094
596-0094-G-00-1066-00

Convenio de Proyecto de Donación

del 30 de septiembre de 1981

entre el Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación Agrícola (IICA)

y

Los Estados Unidos de América actuando a través de la Oficina Regional para Programas Centroamericanos (ROCAP) a nombre de la Agencia para el Desarrollo Internacional (A.I.D.)

ARTICULO 1: El Convenio

El propósito de este Convenio es expresar el entendimiento de las partes arriba indicadas ("Partes") con respecto a la ejecución por el IICA ("Donatario") del Proyecto descrito más adelante y con respecto al financiamiento de dicho Proyecto por las Partes.

ARTICULO 2: El Proyecto

SECCION 2.1. Definición del Proyecto. El Proyecto, que se describe más detalladamente en el Anexo 1, consistirá en un esfuerzo regional en Centroamérica, Panamá y la República Dominicana para establecer una Secretaría Agrícola como una institución

AID Project No. 596-0094
596-0094-G-00-1066-00

Project Grant Agreement

dated September 30, 1981

between the Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation (IICA)

and

The United States of America acting through the Regional Office for Central American Programs (ROCAP) on behalf of the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.)

ARTICLE 1: The Agreement

The purpose of this Agreement is to set forth the understandings of the part named above ("Parties") with respect to the undertaking by IICA ("Grantee") of t Project described below, and with respec to financing of the Project by the Parti

ARTICLE 2: The Project

SECTION 2.1. Definition of the Project. The Project, which is further described in Annex 1, will consist of su porting a regional effort in Central America, Panama and the Dominican Republ .to establish the Agricultural Secretaria

permanente que pueda identificar, analizar y recomendar soluciones a los problemas y obstáculos agrícolas comunes a parte o a toda el área del Proyecto. El Anexo 1, adjunto, amplía la anterior definición del Proyecto. Dentro de los límites de la anterior descripción al Proyecto, los elementos de la descripción detallada indicada en el Anexo 1 pueden ser modificados por medio de acuerdo escrito entre los representantes autorizados de las Partes indicadas en la Sección 8.2, sin hacer una enmienda formal a este Convenio.

SECCION 2.2. Naturaleza Segmentaria del Proyecto.

(a) La contribución de A.I.D. al Proyecto se proporcionará en segmentos. El segmento inicial se proporcionará de acuerdo con la Sección 3.1 de este Convenio. Los segmentos subsiguientes estarán sujetos a la disponibilidad de fondos de la A.I.D. para este propósito, y al mutuo acuerdo de las Partes para proceder, al momento de agregar otro incremento subsiguiente.

(b) Dentro del límite de la Fecha de Finalización de Asistencia al Proyecto en general, estipulada en este Convenio, la A.I.D., basada en consultas con el Donatario, puede por medio de Cartas de Ejecución del Proyecto, especificar períodos apropiados para la utilización de los fondos donados por A.I.D. bajo un incremento individual de asistencia.

ARTICULO 3: Financiamiento

SECCION 3.1. La Donación. Para asistir al Donatario en el financiamiento de los costos de ejecución del Proyecto, la A.I.D. de conformidad con la Ley de Asistencia Externa de 1961 y sus enmiendas, acuerda donar al Donatario bajo los

as a permanent institution to identify, analyze and recommend solutions to agricultural problems and constraints common to parts or all of the project area. Annex 1, attached, amplifies the above definition of the Project. Within the limit of the above definition of the Project, elements of the amplified description stated in Annex 1 may be changed by writt agreement of the authorized representatives of the Parties named in Section 8.2 without formal amendment of this Agreement.

SECTION 2.2. Incremental Nature of the Project.

(a) A.I.D.'s contribution to the Project will be provided in increments, the initial one being made available in accordance with Section 3.1 of this Agreement. Subsequent increments will be subject to availability of funds to A.I.D. for this purpose and to the mutual agreement of the Parties at the time of a subsequent increment, to proceed.

(b) Within the overall Project Assistance Completion Date stated in this Agreement, A.I.D. based upon consultation with the Grantee, may specify in Project Implementation Letters appropriate time periods for the utilization of funds granted by A.I.D. under an individual increment of assistance.

ARTICLE 3: Financing

SECTION 3.1. The Grant. To assist the Grantee to meet the costs of carrying out the Project, A.I.D., pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended agrees to grant the Grantee under the term of this Agreement an amount not to exceed

términos de este Convenio, una cantidad que no exceda Cien Mil Dólares Estadounidenses (EU$100,000) ("Donación"). La donación puede ser utilizada para financiar costos en moneda extranjera, como se define en la Sección 6.1, y costos en moneda local, como se define en la Sección 6.2, de bienes y servicios necesarios para el Proyecto.

One Hundred Thousand United States ("U.S. Dollars ($100,000) ("Grant"). The Grant may be used to finance foreign exchange costs, as defined in Section 6.1 and loca currency costs, as defined in Section 6.2 of goods and services required for the Project..

SECCION 3.2. Recursos del Donatario para el Proyecto

(a) El Donatario acuerda proporcionar o ver que sean proporcionados aquellos fondos estimados en el presupuesto en el Anexo 1 los cuales, además de los de la Donación, sean requeridos para llevar a cabo el Proyecto en forma efectiva y oportuna.

(b) Los recursos iniciales proporcionados por el Donatario o que el Donatario haya asegurado que se proporcionen para el Proyecto no serán menores del equivalente a doscientostreinta y un mil dólares ($231,000), incluyendo los costos sufragados "en especie" durante los primeros 15 meses del Proyecto.

SECTION 3.2. Grantee Resources for the Project

(a) The Grantee agrees to provide o cause to be provided for the Project thos funds estimated in the budget in Annex 1 which, in addition to the Grant, are required to carry out the Project effective and in a timely manner.

(b) The initial resources provided or caused to be provided by the Grantee f the Project will be not less than the equ alent of two hundred thirty one thousand dollars ($231,000), including costs borne on an "in-kind" basis, during the initial fifteen months of the Project

SECCION 3.3. Fecha de Finalización de la Asistencia al Proyecto

(a) La "Fecha de Finalización de la Asistencia al Proyecto" (FFAP), que es el 30 de septiembre de 1983, o cualquier otra fecha que las Partes pudieran convenir por escrito, corresponde a la fecha en la cual las Partes estiman que todos los servicios financiados bajo la Donación han sido proporcionados para el Proyecto, según se contempla en este Convenio.

(b) A menos que lo acordara por escrito, la A.I.D. no emitirá ni aprobará documentación alguna que autorice

SECTION 3.3. Project Assistance Completion Date

(a) The "Project Assistance Completion Date" (PACD), which is September 30, 1983, or such other date as the Parties may agree to in writing, is the date by which the Parties estimate that all services financed under the Grant will have been furnished for the Project as contemplated in this Agreement.

(b) Except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing, A.I.D. will not issue o approve documentation which would authori:

desembolsos de la Donación para servicios prestados o bienes proporcionados para el Proyecto después de la FFAP, según se contempla en este Convenio.

(c) Las solicitudes de desembolso, acompañadas por los documentos de respaldo necesarios estipulados en las Cartas de Ejecución del Proyecto, deberán ser recibidas por la A.I.D. o cualquier banco descrito en la Sección 7.1, en un período que no exceda de nueve (9) meses después de la FFAP, o de cualquier otro período que la A.I.D. acuerde por escrito. Después de dicho período, la A.I.D., previa notificación por escrito al Donatario, puede, en cualquier oportunidad u oportunidades, reducir la suma de la Donación en su totalidad o en la parte por la cual no haya recibido solicitudes de desembolso acompañadas de los documentos de respaldo estipulados en las Cartas de Ejecución del Proyecto, antes del vencimiento de dicho período.

ARTICULO 4: Condiciones Previas al Desembolso

SECCION 4.1. Primer Desembolso. Previo al primer desembolso bajo la Donación, o a la emisión de documentos por la A.I.D. conforme a los cuales se hará tal desembolso, el Donatario proporcionará a la A.I.D., salvo acuerdo contrario por escrito de las Partes, en forma y contenido satisfactorios a la A.I.D.:

(a) Una opinión de abogado aceptable a A.I.D. de que este Convenio ha sido debidamente autorizado y/o ratificado por, y ejecutado a nombre de, el Donatario, y que el mismo constituye una obligación válida y legal del Donatario de acuerdo con todos sus términos;

disbursement of the Grant for services performed subsequent to the PACD or for goods furnished for the Project, as contemplated in this Agreement.

(c) Requests for disbursement, accompanied by necessary supporting documentation prescribed in Project Implementation Letters, are to be received by A.I.D. or any bank described in Section 7.1 no later than nine (9) months following the PACD, or such period as A.I.D. agrees to in writing. After such period, A.I.D., giving notice in writing to the Grantee, may at any time or times reduce the amount of the Grant by all or any part thereof for which requests for disbursement, accompanied by necessary supporting documentation described in Project Implementation Letters, were not received before the expiration of said period.

ARTICLE 4: Conditions Precedent to Disbursement

SECTION 4.1. First Disbursement. Prior to the first disbursement under the Grant, or to the issuance by A.I.D. of documentation pursuant to which disbursement will be made, the Grantee will, except as the Parties may otherwise agree in writing, furnish to A.I.D., in form and substance satisfactory to A.I.D.:

(a) An opinion of counsel acceptable to A.I.D. that this Agreement has been duly authorized and/or ratified by, and executed on behalf of, the Grantee, and that it constitutes a valid and legally binding obligation of the Grantee in accordance with all of its terms;

(b) Declaración del nombre de la persona que ocupe o actúe en función del Donatario especificado en la Sección 8.2, y de cualesquiera representantes adicionales, junto con una muestra de la firma de cada persona especificada en tal declaración;

(c) Un acuerdo detallado firmado por los siete ministros de agricultura e IICA, delineando las responsabilidades y contribuciones de las Partes al Convenio, incluyendo una cláusula señalando que las Partes al Convenio reconocen el derecho de instituciones que suministren financiamiento para las actividades de la Secretaría Agrícola para consultar con las Partes, ya sea individual o colectivamente, sobre el progreso de la Secretaría Agrícola, y una cláusula estableciendo los procedimientos para la Secretaría Técnica y el Comité Técnico de Coordinación.

SECCION 4.2. Condiciones Previas al Desembolso para Actividades del Proyecto en Países Participantes. Previo al primer desembolso bajo la Donación, o a la emisión de documentos por la A.I.D. conforme a los cuales se hará tal desembolso para financiar actividades del Proyecto en un país participante, el Donatario proporcionará, en forma y contenido satisfactorios a A.I.D.:

(a) Un plan de trabajo detallado estableciendo planes nacionales de ejecución con especificación de tiempo, incluyendo presupuestos, para el primer año del Proyecto.

SECCION 4.3. Notificación. Tan pronto la A.I.D. determine que las Condicones Previas especificadas en las Secciones 4.1 y 4.2 han sido cumplidas, le notificará al Donatario.

(b) A statement of the name of the person holding or acting in the office of the Grantee specified in Section 8.2, and of any additional representatives, togeth with a specimen signature of each person specified in such statement;

(c) A detailed agreement signed by all seven agriculture ministers and IICA delineating the Parties' responsibilities and contributions to the Project, including a clause stating that the Parties to the Agreement recognize the right of inst tutions providing financing for the activ ties of the Agricultural Secretariat to consult with the parties, individually or collectively, on the progress of the Agri cultural Secretariat, and a clause establishing the procedures for the Technical Secretariat and the Technical Coordinating Committee.

SECTION 4.2. Conditions Precedent t Disbursement for Project Activities in Participating Countries. Prior to disbursement under the Grant, or to issuance by A.I.D. of documentation to whic disbursement will be made to finance Project activities in a participating country, the Grantee shall furnish in form and substance satisfactory to A.I.D.

(a) A detailed work plan setting forth time phased national implementation plans, including budgets, for the first year of the Project.

SECTION 4.3. Notification. When A.I.D. has determined that the conditions precedent specified in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 have been met it will promptly notify the Grantee.

SECCION 4.4. Fecha Límite para las Condiciones Previas.

(a) Si todas las condiciones especificadas en la Sección 4.1 no han sido cumplidas dentro de los 90 días subsiguientes a la fecha de este Convenio, o cualquier otra fecha que la A.I.D. acuerde por escrito, la A.I.D. puede dar por terminado este Convenio, a su discreción, por medio de notificación escrita al Donatario.

(b) Si todas las condiciones especificadas en la Sección 4.2 no han sido cumplidas dentro de los ciento veinte (120) días después de la fecha de este Convenio, o cualquier otra fecha posterior que la A.I.D. acuerde por escrito, la A.I.D. puede cancelar el saldo no desembolsado del Convenio hasta donde no haya sido irrevocablemente comprometido a terceras partes, y puede dar por terminado este Convenio por medio de notificación escrita al Donatario.

ARTICULO 5: Estipulaciones Especiales

SECCION 5.1. Evaluaciones del Proyecto. Las Partes convienen en establecer un programa de evaluación como parte del Proyecto. A menos que las partes convengan lo contrario por escrito, el programa incluirá:

(a) Evaluación del progreso hacia la obtención de los objetivos del Proyecto;

(b) identificación y evaluación de áreas problemáticas o limitaciones que inhiben tal obtención;

SECTION 4.4. Terminal Dates for Conditions Precedent.

(a) If all of the conditions specified in Section 4.1 have not been met within 90 days from the date of this Agr ment, or such other date as A.I.D. may agree in writing, A.I.D. at its option, may terminate this Agreement by written notice to the Grantee.

(b) If all of the conditions speci in Section 4.2 have not been met within hundred and twenty (120) days from the d of this Agreement, or such later date as A.I.D. may agree to in writing, A.I.D., its option, may cancel the undisbursed balance of the Grant to the extent not irrevocably committed to third parties, and may terminate this Agreement by writ notice to the Grantee.

ARTICLE 5: Special Covenants

SECTION 5.1. Project Evaluations. The Parties agree to establish an evaluation program as part of the Project. Except as the Parties otherwise agree in writing, the program will include:

(a) evaluation of progress towards attainment of the objectives of the Project;

(b) identification and evaluation of problem areas or constraints which inhibit such attainment;

(c) evaluación de la forma en que se puede utilizar dicha información para superar tales problemas; y

(d) evaluación, al grado que sea posible, del impacto del Proyecto en el desarrollo global.

SECCION 5.2. Estudios. Salvo que la A.I.D. disponga lo contrario por escrito, el Donatario conviene que, antes de llevar a cabo estudios a ser financiados con fondos de A.I.D., se proporcionará en forma y contenido satisfactorios a A.I.D. una descripción y presupuesto para dichos estudios. Además, el Donatario conviene en usar los fondos del Proyecto para estudios que tendrán un impacto a nivel regional y que estarán de acuerdo con criterios regionales (p. ej., intercambio y cooperación regional, comercio regional, etc.). Para los propósitos de este Proyecto, Regional querrá decir la participación de un mínimo de cuatro de los siete países participantes o tres de los países del MCCA.

SECCION 5.3. Informes. El Donatario conviene en presentar un informe consolidado de las actividades y progreso del Proyecto en un formato aceptable a A.I.D., tanto trimestral como anualmente.

SECCION 5.4. Recursos del Donatario para el Proyecto. Salvo que la A.I.D. acuerde lo contrario por escrito, el Donatario conviene proporcionar los bienes y servicios para el Proyecto durante el período de octubre de 1981 a septiembre de 1983 según se convenga entre el Donatario y la A.I.D., en una suma no menor al equivalente de cuatrocientos sesenta y dos mil dólares ($462,000).

SECCION 5.5. Capacidad de Datos/Información. El Donatario conviene proporcionar a A.I.D. la documentación que indica que se retendrán los técnicos de PIADIC como una parte integral del personal de IICA para la ejecución del sistema regional de información.

(c) assessment of how such information may be used to help overcome such problems; and

(d) evaluation to the degree feasib of the overall development impact of the Project.

SECTION 5.2. Studies. Except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing, the Grantee covenants that, prior to undertaking studies to be financed with A.I.D. funds, it shall furnish in form and substance satisfactory to A.I.D. a description and budget for such studies. In addition, the Grantee covenants to use Project funds for studies which will have a regional level impact and which will conform with regional criteria (e.g., regional interchange and cooperation, regional trade, etc.). Regional, for purposes of this Project, will mean the involvement of a minimum of four of the seven participating countries or three of the CACM countries.

SECTION 5.3. Reports. The Grantee agrees to submit a consolidated report o Project activities and progress, in a format acceptable to A.I.D., both quart and annually.

SECTION 5.4 Grantee Resources for the Project. Except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing the Grantee covena to provide such goods and services for t Project during the period October 1981 through September 1983 as may be agreed upon between the Grantee and A.I.D., in amount not less than four hundred sixty-thousand dollars ($462,000) equivalent.

SECTION 5.5. Data/Information Capability. The Grantee agrees to furnish A.I.D. with documentation which indicate that they will maintain PIADIC technicia as an integral part of IICA staff for th implementation of the regional informati system.

78

ARTICULO 6: Fuente de Suministro

SECCION 6.1. Costos en Moneda Extranjera. Los desembolsos efectuados de conformidad con la Sección 7.1. serán utilizados exclusivamente para financiar los costos de bienes requeridos para el Proyecto cuya fuente y origen sean los Estados Unidos (Código 000 del Código Geográfico de la A.I.D.) y de servicios requeridos para el Proyecto cuya fuente y origen sean los Estados Unidos o países incluidos en el Código 941 del Código Geográfico de la A.I.D. que esté en vigor cuando sean firmados los contratos para tales servicios ("Costos en Moneda Extranjera") exceptuando países miembros del Mercado Común Centroamericano, Panamá y la República Dominicana, a menos que la A.I.D. convenga lo contrario por escrito, y exceptuando lo estipulado en el Anexo de Disposiciones Generales, Sección C.1(b) con respecto a seguro marítimo.

Costos de transporte marítimo serán financiados bajo la Donación únicamente en naves de bandera norteamericana, excepto si la A.I.D. conviene lo contrario por escrito. Si la A.I.D. determina que no hay naves disponibles de bandera norteamericana generalmente disponibles para transporte marítimo, o que los Estados Unidos no tiene acceso a servicio bajo bandera norteamericana, la A.I.D. convendrá, por medio de Cartas de Ejecución, en financiar costos de transporte marítimo bajo el Convenio, en naves de bandera de cualquier país incluido en el Código Geográfico 941 de la A.I.D. o de países participantes.

SECCION 6.2. Costos en Moneda Local. Los desembolsos efectuados de conformidad con la Sección 7.2. serán utilizados exclusivamente para financiar los costos de bienes y servicios requeridos para el Proyecto

ARTICLE 6: Procurement Source

SECTION 6.1. Foreign Exchange Costs. Disbursements pursuant to Section 7.1. will be used exclusively to finance the costs of goods required for the Project having their source and origin in the United States (Code 000 of the A.I.D. Geographic Code Book) and of services required for the project having their source and origin in the United States or in countries included in Code 941 of the A.I.D. Geographic Code Book as in effect at the time contracts are entered into for such services ("Foreign Exchange Costs") except for member countries of the Central American Common Market, Panama and the Dominican Republic, except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing, and except as provided in the Grant Standard Provisions Annex, Section C.1.(b) with respect to Marine Insurance.

Ocean transportation costs will be financed under the Grant only on vessels under flag registry of the United States, except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing. If A.I.D. determines either that there are no vessels under flag registry of the United States generally available for ocean transportation, or that the United States has no access to U.S. flag service, A.I.D. in a Project Implementation Letter may agree to finance under the Grant Ocean transportation costs on vessels under flag registry of any country included in A.I.D. Geographic Code Book 941 or the participating countries.

SECTION 6.2. Local Currency Costs. Disbursements pursuant to Section 7.2. will be used exclusively to finance the costs of goods and services required for the Project having their source and, except as

cuya fuente y, a menos que la A.I.D. convenga lo contrario por escrito, cuyo origen sean Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panamá y la República Dominicana ("Costos en Moneda Local"). Hasta donde lo permita este Convenio, los "Costos en Moneda Local" pueden también incluír el suministro de recursos en moneda local necesarios para el Proyecto.

ARTICULO 7: Desembolsos

SECCION 7.1. Desembolsos para Costos en Moneda Extranjera

(a) Después de haber cumplido con las condiciones previas, el Donatario puede obtener desembolso de fondos bajo la Donación para los costos de bienes y servicios en moneda extranjera requeridos para el Proyecto de conformidad con los términos de este Convenio, utilizando cualquiera de los siguientes métodos por mutuo acuerdo:

(1) Presentar a la A.I.D., con los documentos de respaldo necesarios, según lo estipulado en las Cartas de Ejecución del Proyecto: (A) Solicitudes de desembolso para tales bienes y servicios; o (b) solicitudes a la A.I.D. para que adquiera dichos bienes o servicios para el Proyecto en representación del Donatario; o

(2) Solicitar a la A.I.D. que emita Cartas de Compromiso por cantidades específicas (A) a uno o mas bancos estadounidenses, satisfactorios a la A.I.D., comprometiendo a la A.I.D. a reembolsar a dicho banco o bancos por los pagos efectuados por ellos a contratistas o proveedores, bajo Cartas de Crédito u otros documentos, por tales bienes o servicios; o (B) directamente a uno o mas contratistas o proveedores, comprometiendo a la A.I.D. a pagar a tales contratistas o proveedores por tales bienes o servicios.

A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing, their origin in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, Panama and the Dominican Republic ("Local Currency Costs"). To the extent provided for under this Agreement "Local Currency Costs" may also include the provisions of local currency resources required for the Project.

ARTICLE 7: Disbursements

SECTION 7.1. Disbursements for Foreign Exchange Costs

(a) After satisfaction of Conditions Precedent, the Grantee may obtain disbursement of funds under the Grant for the Foreign Exchange Costs of goods or services required for the Project in accordance with the terms of this Agreement by such of the following methods as may be mutually agreed upon:

(1) By submitting to A.I.D. with necessary supporting documentation as prescribed in Project Implementation Letters, (A) requests for reimbursement for such goods and services, or (B) requests for A.I.D. to procure commodities or services in the grantee's behalf for the Project; or

(2) By requesting A.I.D. to issue Letters of Commitment for specified amounts (A) to one or more U.S. Banks, satisfactory to A.I.D., committing A.I.D. to reimburse such bank or banks for payments made by them to contractors or suppliers, under Letters of Credit or otherwise, for such goods or services, or (B) directly to one or more contractors or suppliers, committing A.I.D. to pay such contractors or suppliers for such goods or services.

90

(b) Los gastos por servicios bancarios incurridos por el Donatario en relación con las Cartas de Compromiso y Cartas de Crédito serán financiados bajo el Convenio, salvo que el Donatario indique lo contrario a la A.I.D. También podrán ser financiados bajo la Donación cualesquiera otros cargos acordados por las Partes.

SECCION 7.2. Desembolsos para Costos en Moneda Local

(a) Después de haber cumplido con las condiciones previas, el Donatario puede obtener desembolsos de fondos bajo la Donación para Costos en Moneda Local requeridos para el Proyecto de acuerdo con los términos de este Convenio, presentando a la A.I.D. solicitudes de financiamiento para tales costos, con la documentación de respaldo necesaria según se estipula en las Cartas de Ejecución del Proyecto.

(b) La Moneda Local necesaria para tales desembolsos puede obtenerse de las siguientes maneras:

(1) Adquiriéndola la A.I.D. por compra con dólares estadounidenses o moneda local ya en posesión del Gobierno de los Estados Unidos; o

(2) Solicitándole la A.I.D. al Donatario que proporcione la Moneda Local para dichos costos, y reembolsando posteriormente una cantidad en dólares estadounidenses igual a la suma de moneda local proporcionada por el Donatario.

El equivalente en dólares estadounidenses de la moneda local proporcionada bajo este Convenio será, en el caso de la subsección (b)(1) antes mencionada, la cantidad en dólares estadounidenses requerida por la A.I.D. para obtener la moneda local, y en el caso de la subsección (b)(2) antes

(b) Banking charges incurred by the Grantee in connection with Letters of Commitment and Letters of Credit will be financed under the Grant unless the Grantee instructs A.I.D. to the contrary. Such other charges as the Parties agree to may also be financed under the Grant.

SECTION 7.2. Disbursements for Local Currency Costs

(a) After satisfaction of conditions precedent, the Grantee may obtain disbursements of funds under the Grant for Local Currency Costs required for the Project in accordance with the terms of this Agreement, by submitting to A.I.D., with the necessary supporting documentation as prescribed in Project Implementation Letters, requests to finance such costs.

(b) The Local Currency needed for such disbursements may be obtained:

(1) By acquisition by A.I.D. with U.S. Dollars by purchase or from local currency already owned by the U.S. Government; or

(2) By A.I.D. requesting the Grantee to make available the local currency for such costs, and thereafter reimbursing an amount of U.S. Dollars equal to the amount of local currency made available by the Grantee.

The U.S. Dollar equivalent of the local currency made available hereunder will be, in the case of subsection (b)(1) above, the amount of U.S. dollars required by A.I.D. to obtain the local currency, and in the case of subsection (b)(2) above, an amount calculated at the rate of exchange

mencionada, una cantidad calculada al tipo de cambio que esté en vigor a la fecha de certificación para pago por la A.I.D.

SECCION 7.3. Otras Formas de Desembolso. También pueden efectuarse desembolsos bajo la Donación por otros medios que las Partes convengan por escrito.

SECCION 7.4. Tipo de Cambio. Salvo estipulación mas específica en la Sección 7.2., si los fondos proporcionados bajo el Convenio son ingresados a los países participantes por medio de la A.I.D. o cualquier agencia pública o privada con el propósito de llevar a cabo las obligaciones de la A.I.D. bajo este Convenio, el Donatario efectuará los trámites necesarios para que dichos fondos puedan ser cambiados a la moneda de los países participantes al mas alto tipo de cambio legal en los países participantes a la fecha en que se efectúe dicho cambio.

ARTICULO 8: Misceláneo

SECCION 8.1. Comunicaciones. Todo aviso. solicitud, documento u otra comunicación presentada por una de las Partes a la otra bajo este Convenio se hará por escrito o por telegrama o cable y será considerada como debidamente entregada o enviada cuando la misma sea remitida a dicha Parte a las siguientes direcciones:

Al Donatario:

Dirección Postal: IICA
Apartado Postal 55
2200 Coronado
San José, Costa Rica

Dirección Cablegráfica: IICA
San José, Costa Rica

as of the date of certification for payment by A.I.D.

SECTION 7.3. Other Forms of Disbursement. Disbursements of the Grant may also be made through such other means as the Parties may agree to in writing.

SECTION 7.4. Rate of Exchange. Except as may be more specifically provided under Section 7.2., if funds provided under the Grant are introduced into the participating countries by A.I.D. or any public or private agency for purposes of carrying out obligations of A.I.D. hereunder, the Grantee will make such arrangements as may be necessary so that such funds may be converted into currency of the participating countries at the highest rate of exchange which, at the time the conversion is made, is not unlawful in the participating countries.

ARTICLE 8: Miscellaneous

SECTION 8.1. Communications. Any notice, request, document, or other communication submitted by either Party to the other under this Agreement will be in writing or by telegram or cable, and will be deemed duly given or sent when delivered to such Party at the following addresses:

To the Grantee:

Mail Address: IICA
Apartado Postal 55
2200 Coronado
San Jose, Costa Rica

Alternate Address for Cables: IICA
San Jose, Costa Rica

AV

A la A.I.D.:

Dirección Postal: ROCAP
8a. Calle 7-86, Z.9
Guatemala, Guatemala

Dirección Cablegráfica: ROCAP
AmEmbassy Guatemala

Todas las comunicaciones se harán en inglés o en español. Las direcciones arriba mencionadas podrán ser substituidas por otras por medio de notificación escrita.

SECCION 8.2. Representantes. Para todos los fines pertinentes a este Convenio, el Donatario estará representado por la persona en el cargo o encargada del Despacho de Director General de IICA, y la A.I.D. estará representada por la persona en el cargo o encargada del Despacho de Director de ROCAP, quienes a su vez, por medio de notificación escrita, pueden designar representantes adicionales para todos los efectos, salvo el de ejercer el poder estipulado en la Sección 2.1. de modificar los elementos de la descripción ampliada en el Anexo 1. Los nombres de los representantes del Donatario con muestras de sus firmas serán proporcionados a la A.I.D. quienes pueden aceptar cualquier instrumento firmado por dichos representantes en la ejecución de este Convenio como debidamente autorizados, a menos que reciban notificación de la revocación de tal autoridad.

SECCION 8.3. Anexo de Disposiciones Generales. Se adjunta un "Anexo de Disposiciones Generales para Proyectos de Donación" (Anexo 2), el cual forma parte de este Convenio.

SECCION 8.4. Idioma del Convenio. Este Convenio está preparado y firmado en inglés y español. En caso de diferencias o

To A.I.D.:

Mail Address: ROCAP
8a.Calle 7-86, Zona 9
Guatemala, Guatemala

Alternate Address for Cables: ROCAP
AmEmbassy Guatemala

All such communications will be in English or Spanish. Addresses may be substituted for the above upon written notification.

SECTION 8.2. Representatives. For all purposes relevant to this Agreement, the Grantee will be represented by the individual holding or acting in the office of Director General of IICA, and A.I.D. will be represented by the individual holding or acting in the office of Director, ROCAP, each of whom, by written notice, may designate additional representatives for all purposes other than exercising the power under Section 2.1. to revise elements of the amplified description in Annex 1. The names of the representatives of the Grantee with specimen signatures, will be provided to A.I.D. which may accept as duly authorized any instrument signed by such representatives in implementation of this Agreement, until receipt of written notice or revocation of their authority.

SECTION 8.3. Standard Provisions Annex. A "Project Grant Standard Provisions Annex" (Annex 2) is attached to and forms part of this Agreement.

SECTION 8.4. Language of the Agreement. This Agreement is prepared and signed in both English and Spanish. In the event of

discrepancias entre las dos versiones, prevalecerá la versión en inglés.

SECCION 8.5. Contingencias. En caso de aumentos en los costos previstos para las diferentes actividades del Proyecto, el Donatario podrá, sin la aprobación previa de A.I.D., usar un máximo del 10 por ciento de la contribución de A.I.D. al Fondo Especial para Estudios para cubrir estos aumentos. La A.I.D. deberá aprobar todos los cargos que excedan este porcentaje.

EN TESTIMONIO DE LO CUAL, IICA y los Estados Unidos de América, actuando por medio de sus respectivos representantes debidamente autorizados, celebran este Convenio y lo firman y ejecutan el día y fecha indicados al principio del mismo.

ambiguity or conflict between the two versions, the English language version will prevail.

SECTION 8.5. Contingencies. In the case of increases in expected costs for different project activities, the Grantee may, without prior A.I.D. approval, use a maximum of 10 percent of t A.I.D. contribution to the Special Fund for Studies budget item to cover these increases. A.I.D. must approve any charges in excess of this percentage.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, IICA and the United States of America, each acting through its duly authorized representative, have caused this Agreement to be signed in their names and delivered as of the day and year first above written.

INSTITUTO INTERAMERICANO DE COOPERACION PARA LA AGRICULTURA
INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR AGRICULTURAL COOPERATION

POR:
BY: _____
José Emilio Araujo, Director General
representado por Rodolfo Martínez Ferraté, Director General Adjunto para la Coordinación Externa

José Emilio Araujo, Director General
represented by Rodolfo Martínez Ferraté, Assistant Director General for Foreign Coordination

ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMERICA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

POR:
BY: _____
John R. Eyre, Director en Funciones, ROCAP
Acting Director, ROCAP

ANEXO I

DESCRIPCION DEL PROYECTO

I. Introducción

Las ganancias obtenidas de la integración económica han sido substanciales durante los veinte años de existencia del Mercado Común Centroamericano. Sin embargo, la mayoría de estas ganancias han beneficiado al sector industrial, y los beneficios de la integración a la agricultura han sido marginales y han contribuido a un creciente desequilibrio entre el bienestar del sector urbano y el rural. Se ha hecho evidente que se necesita mayor énfasis en la expansión y diversificación de la producción agrícola de la región para reducir este desequilibrio por medio de mayor eficiencia, precios más bajos al consumidor, mayor seguridad en los suministros, y un fortalecimiento general del movimiento de integración.

Existe en Centroamérica un cierto número de obstáculos al crecimiento de la producción agrícola y durante algún tiempo se ha reconocido la necesidad de establecer un mecanismo que estudie la forma de salvar los obstáculos que son comunes a toda la región. Después de varios años de discutir los problemas comunes, los Ministerios de Agricultura del Mercado Común Centroamericano y Panamá firmaron un acuerdo para la creación de una Secretaría Agrícola que: a) definiera los principales problemas y oportunidades de desarrollo que enfrentará la región durante los próximos 5-20 años; b) identificara y analizara políticas de planificación y opciones de programación e inversión, especificando cuales son de corto y largo plazo; c) tratara los asuntos relacionados con el comercio intrarregional tales como tarifas, restricciones a la importación/exportación, políticas de precios y tasas de interés y políticas de autosuficiencia nacional dentro de la región, e identificara mecanismos prácticos y políticamente aceptables para promover el aumento del comercio agrícola; d) estableciera un mecanismo para facilitar el intercambio de peritaje técnico

ANNEX I

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

I. Introduction

Gains from economic integration have been substantial over the twenty years of the Central American Common Market's existence. Most of these gains, however, have accrued to the industrial sector, while the benefits of integration to agriculture have been marginal and have contributed a growing imbalance in well being between the urban and rural sectors. It has become apparent that increased emphasis is needed on the expansion and diversification of agricultural production in the region to reduce this imbalance through greater efficiencies, lower consumer prices, increased supply security, and a generally strengthened integration movement.

In Central America there are a number of constraints to increased agricultural production, and the need for a mechanism to address constraints which are common throughout the region has been recognized for some time. After several years of discussing common problems, the Ministers of Agriculture of the Central American Common Market and Panama signed an agreement to create an Agricultural Secretariat that would: a) define major agricultural development problems and opportunities that the region will face over the next 5-20 years; b) identify and analyze policy planning, program and investment options, distinguishing between those which are short and long-term in scope; c) address intraregional trade-related issues such as tariffs, import/export restrictions, pricing and interest rate policies and national self-sufficiency policies within the region and to identify practical, politically acceptable mechanisms for promoting increased agricultural trade; d) establish a mechanism for facilitating the exchange of technical expertise and information within a regionally coordinated framework; and e) coordinate the efforts of national and regional agricultural institutions to

e información dentro de un marco de trabajo coordinado regionalmente; y e) coordinara los esfuerzos de las instituciones nacionales y regionales para estimular la creación de empleos rurales y el incremento de los ingresos del pequeño agricultor.

Este proyecto se ha desarrollado para ayudar a la Secretaría Agrícola en la consecución de esos objetivos.

II. Objetivo y Propósito

El objetivo de este Proyecto es promover esfuerzos regionales para aumentar la producción agrícola, el comercio y exportación intrarregionales, y estimular el desarrollo rural, particularmente empleos rurales y mejores condiciones de vida. El propósito del proyecto es ayudar a la recién creada Secretaría Agrícola a convertirse en una institución permanente y efectiva capaz de identificar, analizar y recomendar soluciones a los obstáculos y problemas agrícolas comunes a algunos o a todos los países de Centroamérica, Panamá y la República Dominicana.

III. Resumen del Proyecto

El Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación Agrícola (IICA) será el Donatario y tendrá responsabilidad Global por la ejecución del proyecto. Para ayudar al logro del propósito antes mencionado, se proporcionarán fondos de donación de AID por un total de $400,000 durante los dos años de vigencia del proyecto. Estos fondos servirán para financiar el costo de estudios, viajes y viáticos de expertos técnicos, administración de datos y servicios de computación, asistencia técnica y una cantidad limitada de equipo. Los fondos de contraparte proporcionados por IICA y los países participantes -- por un total de $887,000 en efectivo y en especie durante la vigencia del proyecto -- financiarán personal administrativo local, expertos técnicos, estudios, viajes y viáticos, asistencia técnica y otros suministros.

stimulate rural employment and increasec small farmer income.

This project has been developed tc assist the Agricultural Secretariat achieve these objectives.

II. Goal and Purpose

The goal of this Project is to promote regional efforts to increase ag cultural production, intraregional trad and exports and to stimulate rural deve ment, particularly rural employment and improved living standards. The purpose of the project is to assist the newly created Agricultural Secretariat to bec a permanent and effective body able to identify, analyze and recommend solutio to agricultural problems and constraint common to some or all of the Central American countries, Panama and the Domi ican Republic.

III. Project Summary

The Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation (IICA) will be the Grantee and will have overall respo sibility for project implementation. T assist in the achievement of the above purpose, AID grant funds totalling $400 will be made available over the two-yea life of the project. These funds will finance the cost of studies, travel and per diem of technical experts, data man ment and computer services, technical assistance, and a limited amount of equ ment. Counterpart funds provided by II and the participating countries -- tota $887,000 in cash and kind contributio over the life of the project -- will fi nance local administrative personnel, t nical experts, studies, travel and per diem, technical assistance and other supplies.

86

La Secretaría Agrícola estará compuesta en la siguiente forma: el Consejo Regional para Cooperación Agrícola (CRCA), una entidad encargada de formular políticas integrada por los Ministros de Agricultura de cada país; el Comité Técnico de Coordinación (CTC), un grupo asesor que incluye a los directores de las Unidades Nacionales de Planificación Agrícola (USPA) de cada país; y la Secretaría Técnica (TS), integrada por el personal técnico, la cual será dirigida por el personal de IICA y contará con la ayuda del personal USPA en cada país.

Las actividades del proyecto se enfocarán en la Secretaría Técnica y sus dos unidades de personal, las cuales estarán a cargo del trabajo técnico y administrativo de la Secretaría Agrícola.

A. Componentes del Proyecto

El proyecto constará de tres componentes: (1) un Fondo Especial para financiar estucios, (2) un Fondo Especial para financiar el intercambio de expertos técnicos, y (3) administración de datos, análisis y producción.

1. Fondo Especial para Estudios

La Unidad de Investigación y Análisis será establecida dentro de la Secretaría Técnica y tendrá responsabilidad total por los estudios llevados a cabo para producir datos y otra información que serán la base para recomendar acciones de programación y política al Consejo Regional para Cooperación Agrícola (CRCA) de la Secretaría Agrícola. Un total de $171,000 en recursos del Proyecto serán proporcionados al Fondo, $150,000 provenientes de la Donación y $21,000 de los países cooperantes. La Unidad de Investigación y Análisis llevará a cabo algunos estudios por su cuenta, pero se espera que contratarán personas o grupos ajenos a la entidad para la mayoría de los estudios.

Within the Agricultural Secretariat, there will be a policy making body -- the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation (RCAC) -- comprised of the Ministers of Agriculture from each country; and an advisory group -- the Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) -- which will include the directors of the National Agricultural Planning Units (NAPUs) of each country; and the technical staff -- the Technical Secretariat (TS) -- which will be directed by IICA personnel and rely on NAPU personnel in each country for support.

Project activities will focus on the Technical Secretariat and its two staff units which will be responsible for the technical and administrative work of the Agricultural Secretariat.

A. Project Components

The Project will have three components: (1) a Special Fund for financing studies, (2) a Special Fund for financing the exchange of technical experts, and (3) data management, analysis and output.

1. Special Fund for Studies

The Research and Analysis Unit will be established within the Technical Secretariat and will have overall responsibility for studies undertaken to produce data and other information which will be the basis for recommending program and policy options to the Regional Council for Agricultural Cooperation (RCAC) of the Agricultural Secretariat. A total of $171,000 of Project resources will be provided to the Fund, $150,000 from the Grant and $21,000 from the cooperating countries. The Research and Analysis Unit will carry out some studies on its own, but it is expected that they will contract with outside individuals or groups for most of the studies.

2. Fondo Especial para el Intercambio de Expertos Técnicos

Una segunda unidad de personal -- la Unidad de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca -- también se establecerá dentro de la Secretaría Técnica con la responsabilidad de promover y coordinar el intercambio de servicios técnicos entre los países participantes. Los países que proporcionen los servicios de los expertos continuarán pagando los costos de salarios y beneficios de los mismos. El Fondo Especial de $168,000 compuesto por $77,000 de fondos del Proyecto y $91,000 de fondos de contraparte, será utilizado para cubrir los costos de viaje y viáticos de los expertos. Los países que reciban asistencia técnica utilizarán su contribución al Fondo para este propósito. Para reducir al máximo la desigualdad en la distribución de beneficios derivados del mecanismo de intercambio, los países recipiendarios tendrán que pagar directamente los costos de viajes y viáticos cuando su cuota del Fondo ya se haya agotado.

Se espera que surgirán algunos casos donde no habrá servicios de expertos disponibles en la región para trabajar en algún asunto técnico. Para tal eventualidad el Proyecto incluye $31,000 (complementados por $14,000 en contribución de contraparte) para proporcionar asistencia técnica externa especial. La Unidad de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca tendrá la responsabilidad de determinar si se necesita asistencia técnica externa y de hacer los arreglos necesarios para obtener los servicios requeridos.

B. Administración del Proyecto

IICA tendrá la responsabilidad global por la ejecución del Proyecto. Al iniciarse las actividades IICA nombrará un Secretario Coordinador quien estará a cargo de la Secretaría Técnica, supervisará

2. Special Fund for Exchange o Technical Experts

A second staff unit -- the Reciprocal Technical Cooperative Unit -- will also be established within the Technical Secretariat with responsibility for promoting and coordinating the exchange o technical services among the participatin countries. Countries providing the exper will continue to pay their salary costs a benefits. The Special Fund of $168,000 comprised of $77,000 in Project and $91,0 in counterpart funds, will be used to cove the travel and per diem costs of the experts. Countries receiving technical assistance will draw upon their contribution to the Fund for this purpose. To minimize unequitable distribution of benefits from the exchange mechanism, receiving countries will be required to pay travel and per diem costs directly should their quota in the Fund be exhausted.

It is expected that some cases will arise where no expertise will be available in the region to work on a technical matter. For this reason, the Project includes $31,000 (supplemented by $14,000 in counterpart contribution) t provide special external technical assist ance. The Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Unit will be responsible for determining when outside assistance is require and for making the necessary arrangements to secure the needed services.

B. Project Administration

IICA will have overall implementation responsibility for the project. At the outset, IICA will name a Coordinat Secretary who will be in charge of the Technical Secretariat, supervise and guid

y guiará las actividades de la Unidades de Investigación y Análisis y Cooperación Técnica Recíproca, servirá como enlace entre la Secretaría Técnica y el Comité Técnico de Coordinación, actuará como secretario del CTC y será responsable de la administración logística del Proyecto. Además, el personal de campo de IICA proporcionará apoyo a nivel nacional. En cada país, un miembro de la oficina de IICA será asignado para servir como enlace entre las USPAs y la Secretaría Técnica.

Los Directores de las UNPUs, quienes integran el Comité Técnico de Cooperación, analizarán, evaluarán y harán recomendaciones al CRCA. Además, las USPAs proporcionarán un enlace con la oficina de IICA en el país y cooperarán proporcionando insumos técnicos cuando se les solicite.

Las USPAs proporcionarán el personal técnico para apoyar el trabajo de la Secretaría Agrícola. Proporcionarán insumos técnicos cuando estén disponibles, pero primordialmente coordinarán los estudios y actividades a nivel nacional emprendidos por la Secretaría Técnica.

El Proyecto será monitorado por el Oficial de Desarrollo Agrícola Regional, con la asistencia del Oficial Asistente de Desarrollo Agrícola Regional, con sede en Costa Rica, y el Especialista Agrícola de ROCAP.

Todos los fondos se canalizarán por medio de IICA, quien contratará a los expertos financiados por el Proyecto. IICA preparará planes anuales de ejecución con sus correspondientes presupuestos por actividad y los presentará a ROCAP antes de firmar enmiendas anuales al Convenio de Proyecto. El IICA presentará, en forma aceptable a ROCAP, informes trimestrales y anuales, dentro de los treinta días subsiguientes a la terminación de cada trimestre.

the activities of the Research and Analysis and Reciprocal Technical Cooper tion Units, serve as a liaison between t Technical Secretariat and the Technical Coordinating Committee, act as secretary for the TCC and have responsibility for the logistical management of the Project In addition, support will be provided at the national level by IICA field staff. In each country, a member of the IICA office will be assigned to serve as liai between the NAPUs and the Technical Secretariat.

The Directors of the NAPUs, who constitute the Technical Coordinating Committee, will analyze, evaluate and make recommendations to the RCAC. In addition, the NAPUs will provide a liais with the IICA country office and coopera in providing technical inputs when requested.

The NAPUs will provide the technic staff to support the work of the Agricultural Secretariat. They will provide technical inputs when available but wil primarily coordinate national level stuc and activities undertaken by the Technic Secretariat.

The Project will be monitored by t ROCAP Regional ADO assisted by the Assis ant Regional ADO based in Costa Rica anc the Agricultural Specialist of ROCAP.

All funding will be directed throu IICA who will contract for the project funded experts. Annual implementation plans and corresponding activity budgets will be prepared by IICA and submitted t ROCAP prior to execution of annual amenc ments to the Project Agreement. Quarter and annual reports, in a format acceptat to ROCAP, will be submitted by IICA with thirty days following completion of each quarter.

IV. Evaluación del Proyecto

Antes de la finalización de este proyecto de dos años, IICA y la A.I.D. llevarán a cabo una evaluación detallada para determinar hasta que punto está progresando el proyecto. Específicamente, la evaluación examinará el grado de asistencia por parte de los Ministros de Agricultura para la Secretaría Agrícola, el grado de involucración de USPA en las actividades técnicas de la Secretaría, y hasta que grado la Secretaría ha establecido relaciones de trabajo con otras instituciones regionales. Los resultados de esta evaluación serán usados para negociar una extensión al proyecto diseñada para permitir el logro de los objetivos previstos y la continuación de actividades por un total de cuarenta y dos meses y por una cantidad de $850,000 por parte de la A.I.D. y $983,000 por parte de IICA de acuerdo con el diseño original del proyecto.

IV. Project Evaluation

Prior to the completion of this two-year project IICA and A.I.D. will conduct a detailed evaluation to determine the extent to which the project is progressing. Specifically, the evaluation will examine the extent of support for the Agricultural Secretaria on the part of the Ministers of Agriculture, the extent of NAPU involvement in the technical activities of the Secretariat, and the degree to which th Secretariat has established working relations with other regional institutions. The results of this evaluation will be used to negotiate an extension of the project designed to permit the achievement of planned objectives and the continuance of activities for a total of forty-two months and at a fund ing level of $850,000 from A.I.D. and $983,000 from IICA in accordance with the original project design.

PROJECT SUMMARY BUDGET
AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT PROJECT
(October 1, 1981-September 30, 1983)

BUDGET LINE ITEMS	Source of Funds ($ 000)			
	AID	IICA	CAC	TOTAL
A. Coordinating Secretary	--	29	--	29
B. Research and Analysis Unit				
Director (IICA)	--	94	--	94
National Liaison (IICA)	--	66	--	66
Secretary	--	11	--	11
Special Fund (Studies and Reports)	150	--	21*	171
Data Management, Analysis & Output	46	14	--	60
National Counterparts (7)	--	--	59	59
Equipment and Computer Services	11	2	--	13
Travel & Per Diem (Ag.Secretariat)	21	5	--	26
Equipment	3	3	--	6
Other Costs	2	2	--	4
Sub-Total (A+B)	233	226	80	539
C. Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Unit				
Director, IICA	--	94	--	94
National Liaison (IICA)	--	66	--	66
Secretary	--	11	--	11
Salary Support (National Technicians in country costs)	--	--	183	183
Special Fund (Travel & Per Diem of experts)	77	--	91*	168
Other Technical Assistance	31	--	14	45
Equipment and Computer Services	15	5	--	20
Miscellaneous Supplies	--	--	19	19
IICA - Staff San Jose	--	18	--	18
Sub-Total	123	194	307	624
D. Project Evaluation	8	--	--	8
E. Total (A - D)	364	420	387	1,171
F. Contingency (10%)	--	42	38*	80
G. Overhead Costs (10%)**	36	--	--	36
H. GRAND TOTAL (A - G)	400	462	425	1.287

* Cash Contribution

** Overhead costs are limited to the amount shown unless AID otherwise agrees in writing. In no case will AID approve overhead costs in excess of 15% of the total AID Grant amount before overhead.

PRESUPUESTO RESUMIDO
PROYECTO DE LA SECRETARIA AGRICOLA
(Del 1 de octubre de 1981 al 30 de septiembre de 1983)

RUBROS PRESUPUESTARIOS	Fuentes de Financiamiento ($ 000)			
	AID	IICA	CAC	TOTAL
A. Secretaría de Coordinación	--	29	--	29
B. Unidad de Investigación y Análisis				
Director (IICA)	--	94	--	94
Enlace Nacional (IICA)	--	66	--	66
Secretaria	--	11	--	11
Fondo Especial (Estudios e Informes)	150	--	21*	171
Administración de Datos, Análisis y Producción	46	14	--	60
Contrapartes Nacionales (7)	--	--	59	59
Equipo y Servicios de Computación	11	2	--	13
Viajes y Viáticos (Secretaría Agric.)	21	5	--	26
Equipo	3	3	--	6
Otros Costos	2	2	--	4
Sub Total (A+B)	233	226	80	539
C. Unidad de Cooperación Técnica Recíproca				
Director, IICA	--	94	--	94
Enlace Nacional (IICA)	--	66	--	66
Secretaria	--	11	--	11
Apoyo Salarial (técnicos nacionales costos por país)	--	--	183	183
Fondo Especial (Viajes y viáticos de expertos	77	--	91*	168
Otra Asistencia Técnica	31	--	14	45
Equipo y Servicios de Computación	15	5	--	20
Suministros Misceláneos	--	--	19	19
Personal de IICA, San José	--	18	--	18
Sub Total	123	194	307	624
D. Evaluación del Proyecto	8	--	--	8
E. Total (A - D)	364	420	387	1,171
F. Contingencias (10%)	--	42	38*	80
G. Gastos Indirectos (10%)**	36	--	--	36
H. GRAN TOTAL (A - G)	400	462	425	1,287

* Contribución en Efectivo

** Los costos indirectos están limitados a la suma indicada, a menos que AID apruebe lo contrario por escrito. En ningún caso aprobará AID costos indirectos en exceso del 15% de la suma total de la donación de AID sin contar los gastos indirectos.

PROJECT GRANT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT

Between the United States of America, Acting through
the Regional Office for Central American Programs
(ROCAP)
on behalf of the
Agency for International Development (AID)
and the
Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation
(IICA)

ENMIENDA AL CONVENIO DE PROYECTO

Entre los Estados Unidos de América, a través de la
Oficina Regional para Programas Centroamericanos (ROCAP)
en nombre de la
Agencia para el Desarrollo International (AID)
y el
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperación para
la Agicultura (IICA)

596-0094-G-00-1066-00

PROJECT TITLE - TITULO DEL PROYECTO	2. PROJECT NUMBER - NUMERO
Agricultural Secretariat Secretaría Agrícola	596-0094
3. AMENDMENT No. - ENMIENDA No. One - Uno	4. DATE OF ORIGINAL GRANT AGREEMENT FECHA DEL CONVENIO ORIGINAL Sept. 30, 1981

5. El Convenio identificado arriba se enmienda por este medio para aumentar el financiamiento original por $300,000. La enmienda queda sujeta a la anuencia del IICA y se dará por aprobada por medio de la firma del Dr. Francisco Morillo, Director del IICA, o la persona designada por él. Los cambios, que aparecen subrayados, son los siguientes:

Artículo 3: <u>Financiamiento</u>

Sección 3.1. <u>La Donación</u>. Para ayudar a IICA a cubrir los costos de ejecución del proyecto, la A.I.D., de acuerdo con la Ley de Ayuda Exterior de 1961, y enmiendas, acuerda donar a IICA bajo los términos de este Convenio una suma

5. The Project Grant Agreement identified above is hereby amended to increase original funding by $300,000. The revision of the Agreement is made subject to the concurrence of IICA whose approval is indicated below by the signature of Dr. Francisco Morillo, Director of IICA, or his designee. Changes, which are underlined, are the following:

Article 3: <u>Financing</u>

Sección 3.1. <u>The Grant</u>. To assist the Grantee to meet the costs of carrying out the project, A.I.D., pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended agrees to grant IICA under the terms of this Agreement an amount not to exceed

que no exceda de Trescientos Mil Dólares Estadounidenses (U.S.$300,000) ("Donación") con lo cual la contribución de AID a la fecha asciende a $400,000. La Donación puede ser usada para financiar costos en moneda extranjera según se define en la Sección 6.1, y costos en moneda local según se define en la Sección 6.2 de bienes y servicios requeridos para el Proyecto.

Todas las demás disposiciones del Convenio original permanecen sin cambio.

Three Hundred Thousand United States Dollars ($300,000) ("Grant"), making ROCAP's total contribution to date $400,000. The Grant may be used to finance foreign exchange costs, as defined in section 6.1, and local currency costs, as defined in 6.2, of goods and services required for the project.

All other provisions of the original agreement remain the same.

6. FOR THE GRANTEE - POR EL DONATARIO	7. FOR THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT - POR LA AGENCIA PARA EL DESARROLLO INTERNACIONAL
Francisco Morillo A.	Paul A. Montavon
Signature - Firma	Signature - Firma
Title - Título	Title - Título
Director General, IICA	Director, ROCAP
Date - Fecha	Date - Fecha
Aug. 3, 1982	July 16, 1982

ENMIENDA AL CONVENIO DE PROYECTO

Entre los Estados Unidos de America, a traves de la
Oficina Regional para Programas Centroamericanos
(ROCAP)
en nombre de la
Agencia para el Desarrollo International (AID)
y el
Instituto Interamericano de Cooperacion para la Agricultura
(IICA)

PROJECT GRANT AGREEMENT AMENDMENT

Between the United States of America, Acting through
the Regional Office for Central American Programs
(ROCAP)
on behalf of the
Agency for International Development (AID)
and the
Inter-American Institute for Agricultural Cooperation
(IICA)

596-0094-G-00-1066-00

TITULO DEL PROYECTO - PROJECT TITLE	NUMERO - PROJECT NUMBER
Secretaria Agricola Agricultural Secretariat	596-0094
ENMIENDA No. - AMENDMENT No. Dos - Two	FECHA DEL CONVENIO ORIGINAL DATE OF ORIGINAL AGREEMENT Sept. 30, 1981

CONSIDERANDO, que A.I.D. e IICA firmaron un Convenio para el proyecto de la Secretaria Agricola el 30 de septiembre de 1981, al cual se le hicieron enmiendas posteriormente el 16 de julio de 1982 (a los cuales nos referiremos como el "Convenio"); y

WHEREAS, A.I.D. and IICA entered into a Project Grant Agreement for Agricultural Secretariat dated September 30, 1981, which was subsequently amended on July 16, 1982 (together referred to as the "Agreement"); and

CONSIDERANDO, que la A.I.D. desea enmendar el Convenio para refinar la definicion de areas elegibles del proyecto; y

CONSIDERANDO, que la A.I.D. desea agregar fondos;

POR LO TANTO, A.I.D. e IICA convienen en lo siguiente:

1. El Articulo 2 del Convenio se enmienda agregandole una seccion nueva, 2.1(a), la cual estipula:

> "Seccion 2.1(a) Restricciones de Areas del Proyecto. A.I.D. e IICA convienen que fondos suministrados de acuerdo con este Convenio no seran comprometidos, desembolsados o utilizados en areas donde el proporcionar tales fondos contraviniere cualquier estipulacion de la Ley de Asistencia Externa de 1961, y sus enmiendas. A.I.D., cada cierto tiempo, informara a IICA por escrito, sobre tales areas."

2. El Articulo 3 del Convenio se enmienda por medio de los siguientes cambios a las Secciones 3.1 y 3.2:

WHEREAS, A.I.D. wishes to revise the Agreement to refine the definition of eligible project areas; and;

WHEREAS, A.I.D. wishes to add funds

NOW THEREFORE, A.I.D. and IICA hereby agree as follows:

1. Article 2 of the Agreement is amended by adding a new Section 2.1(a) which provides:

> "Section 2.1(a) Project Area Restrictions. A.I.D. and IICA agree that A.I.D. funds provided pursuant to this Agreement shall not be committed, disbursed or otherwise utilized in areas where the provision of such funds would contravene any provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. A.I.D. shall advise IICA in writing from time to time of such areas."

2. Article 3 of the Agreement is amended by revising Sections 3.1 and 3.2 to provide:

"Seccion 3.1. La Donacion. Para asistir a IICA en el financiamiento de los costos del Proyecto, A.I.D., de conformidad con la Ley de Asistencia Externa de 1961 y sus enmiendas, acuerda donar a IICA, bajo los terminos de este Convenio, una cantidad que no exceda de Cuatrocientos Cincuenta Mil Dolares Estadounidenses (EU$450,000) ("Donacion"), con lo cual la contribucion total de AID, a la fecha, asciende a Ochocientos Cincuenta Mil Dolares Estadounidenses (EU$850,000). La donacion puede ser utilizada para financiar costos en moneda extranjera, segun se define en la Seccion 6.1, y costos en moneda local segun se define en la Seccion 6.2, de bienes y servicios necesarios para el Proyecto".

"Section 3.1. The Grant. To assist IICA to meet the costs of carrying out the Project, A.I.D., pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, agrees to grant IICA under the terms of this agreement an amount not to exceed Four Hundred Fifty Thousand United States Dollars ($450,000) ("Grant"), making AID's total contribution to date Eight Hundred Fifty Thousand United States Dollars ($850,000). The Grant may be used to finance foreign exchange costs, as defined in Section 6.1, and local currency costs as defined in Section 6.2, of goods and services required for the project."

Seccion 3.2. Recursos del Donatario para el Proyecto

"(b) Los recursos proporcionados por el Donatario o que el Donatario haya asegurado que se proporcionen para el Proyecto no seran menores del equivalente a Novecientos Ochenta y Tres Mil Dolares Estadounidenses (EU$983,000), incluyendo los costos sufragados "en especie" durante la vigencia del Proyecto."

Section 3.2. Grantee Resources for the Project

"(b) The resources provided or caused to be provided by the Grantee for the project will not be less than the equivalent of nine hundred eighty-three thousand United States Dollars (US$983,000), including costs borne on an "in-kind" basis, over the full life of the Project."

3. La Seccion 3.3 del Convenio se enmienda quitandole la fecha de "30 de septiembre de 1983" y substituyendola con la fecha "31 de marzo de 1985."

3. Section 3.3 of the Agreement is amended by deleting "September 30, 1983" and substituting therefor "March 31, 1985."

4. La Seccion 5.2 del Convenio se enmienda agregandole el siguiente parrafo:

El Donatario tambien conviene en que tales estudios se orientaran hacia la politica y seran seleccionados con el proposito de contribuir a que los Ministros de Agricultura de los paises miembros del Consejo Regional tomen decisiones en forma efectiva y coordinada.

4. Section 5.2 of the Agreement is amended by adding the following paragraph:

The grantee further covenants that such studies will be policy oriented and will be selected with the objective of contributing to effective, coordinated decision making by the Ministers of Agriculture of Regional Council member countries.

La Seccion 5.4 del Convenio se enmienda como sigue:

"Seccion 5.4. Recursos del Donatario para el Proyecto. Salvo que la A.I.D. acuerde lo contrario por escrito, el Donatario conviene proporcionar los bienes y servicios requeridos durante la vigencia del proyecto, segun se convenga entre el Donatario y la A.I.D., en una suma no menor al equivalente de $983,000, incluyendo costos sufragados "en especie".

5. Section 5.4 of the Agreement is amended to provide:

"Section 5.4. Grantee Resources for the Project. Except as A.I.D. may otherwise agree in writing, the Grantee covenants to provide such goods and services required for the project for the full life of the Project as may be agreed upon between the Grantee and A.I.D., in an amount not less than the equivalent of $983,000, including costs borne on an "in-kind" basis."

Articulo 6.: Las Estipulaciones Especiales se enmiendan para incluir las siguientes nuevas estipulaciones:

6. Article 5: Special Covenants is amended to include the following new covenants:

98

(a) Seccion 5.6. Contribuciones en Efectivo de los Paises Miembros. El donatario conviene que todas las contribuciones en efectivo de los paises miembros seran reportadas con prontitud y que los planes para la utilizacion de dichos fondos se presentaran oportunamente de conformidad con el presupuesto del proyecto.

(a) Section 5.6. Cash contributions by member countries. The grantee covenants that all receipts of cash contributions from member countries will be promptly reported and that plans for the use of such funds will be submitted on a timely basis in accordance with the project budget.

(b) Seccion 5.7. Cooperacion con Otras Instituciones Regionales. El donatario se compromete a dedicar su mejor esfuerzo para cooperar con las otras instituciones regionales en la iniciacion de estudios y el intercambio de asistencia tecnica.

(b) Section 5.7. Cooperation with Other Regional Institutions. The grantee covenants to make its best effort to cooperate with other regional institutions in the undertaking of studies and the exchange of technical assistance.

(c) Seccion 5.8. Aprobacion Anticipada de la Utilizacion de Fondos. El donatario se compromete a presentar a ROCAP propuestas y presupuestos detallados para los estudios, informes y reuniones a ser financiados por el proyecto, por lo menos 30 dias antes de la iniciacion de tales estudios o informes. Las propuestas y presupuestos para intercambio de asistencia tecnica y para viajes y viaticos de personal de IICA, a ser financiados por el proyecto, seran presentados a ROCAP por lo menos 14 dias antes de la fecha en que se inicien dichos viajes.

(c) Section 5.8. Advance Approval for Use of Funds. The grantee covenants that detailed proposals and budgets for studies, reports and meetings to be financed by the project will be submitted to ROCAP at least 30 days prior to the undertaking of such studies or reports; and that proposals and budgets for technical assistance exchanges and any travel and per diem by IICA personnel to be financed by the project be submitted at least 14 days prior to the beginning date of such travel.

7. La Descripcion del Proyecto en el Anexo I del Convenio, se enmienda para que incluya los siguientes cambios:

(a) En el parrafo III "Resumen del Proyecto" cambiese "$400,000 por "850,000, cambiese "dos años" por "cuarenta y dos meses; y cambiese "$887,000" por "$1,959,000".

(b) En el parrafo III.A.1 "Fondo Especial para Estudios" quitese las cantidades "$171,000", "$150,000" y "$21,000" y sustituyanse con las cantidades "$400,000", "$350,000" y "$50,000" respectivamente.

(c) En el parrafo III.A.2 "Fondo Especial para el Intercambio de Expertos Tecnicos" cambiense las cantidades "$168,000", "$77,000", "$91,000", "$31,000" y "$14,000" y sustituyanse con las cantidades "$400,000", "$150,000", "$250,000", "$70,000", y "$31,000", respectivamente.

8. Como Anexo A a esta Enmienda se adjunta un Presupuesto enmendado, el cual muestra, por rubro aprobado, el nuevo total de financiamiento de todas partidas que sera suministrado durante la vida del proyecto.

7. The Project Description in Annex I of the Project Agreement is amended to include the following changes:

(a) In paragraph III "Project Summary" delete "$400,000 and replace it with "$850,000", delete "two-year" and replace it with "forty-two months"; and delete "$887,000" and replace it with "$1,959,000".

(b) In paragraph III.A.1 "Special Fund for Studies" delete "$171,000", "$150,000" and "21,000 and replace them with "$400,000", "$350,000" and "$50,000", respectively.

(c) In paragraph III.A.2. "Special Fund for Exchange of Technical Experts" delete "$168,000", "$77,000", "$91,000", "$31,000" and "$14,000" and replace them with "$400,000", "$150,000", "$250,000", "$70,000" and "$31,000", respectively.

8. Attached as Annex A to this Amendment is a revised Project Budget which shows, by approved line item, the new total of funding from all sources that will be provided over the life of the Project.

100

9. Excepto por las enmiendas aqui estipuladas, el Convenio seguira en plena vigencia.

9. Except as amended hereby, the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

POR EL DONATARIO - FOR THE GRANTEE	POR LA AGENCIA PARA EL DESARROLLO INTERNACIONAL - FOR THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Francisco Morillo A.	Paul A. Montavon
FIRMA - SIGNATURE	FIRMA - SIGNATURE
TITULO - TITLE	TITULO - TITLE
Director General, IICA	Director, ROCAP
FECHA - DATE	FECHA - DATE

ANNEX A

AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT
AMENDED PROJECT BUDGET

BUDGET LINE ITEMS	Source of Funds ($ 000)			
	AID	IICA	CAC	TOTAL
A. Coordinating Secretary	--	61	--	61
B. Research and Analysis Unit				
Director (IICA)	--	200	--	200
National Liaison (IICA)	--	140	--	140
Secretary	--	24	--	24
Special Fund (Studies and Reports)	350	--	50*	400
Data Management, Analysis and Output	100	30 1/	--	130
National Counterparts (7)	--	--	126	126
Equipment and Computer Services	20	5	--	25
Travel & Per Diem (Ag. Secretariat	40	10	--	50
Equipment	6	6	--	12
Other Costs	4	4	--	8
Sub-Total (A+B)	520	480	176	1,176
C. Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Unit				
Director, IICA	--	200	--	200
National Liaison (IICA)	--	140	--	140
Secretary	--	24	--	24
Salary Support (National Technicians in Country Costs)	--	--	390	390
Special Fund (Travel & Per Diem of Experts)	150	--	250*	400

	AID	IICA	CAC	TOTAL
Other Technical Assistance	70	--	31*	101
Equipment and Computer Services	30	10	--	40
Miscellaneous Supplies	--	--	40	40
IICA - Staff San Jose	--	40	--	40
Sub-Total	250	414	711	1,375
D. Project Evaluation	10	--	--	10
E. Total (A - D)	780	894	887	2,561
F. Contingency (10%)	--	89	89*	178
G. Overhead Costs	70	--	--	70
H. GRAND TOTAL (A - G)	850	983	976 2/	2,809

*Cash Contribution

1/CIDIA/PIADIC

2/Of the $976,000, the countries will be contributing $420,000 in cash. $420,000 ÷ 7 countries = $60,000 per country for life of project.

PILS FOR AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT PROJECT

Number	Date	Subject
16	28 AUG 85	Extends PACD
15	12 JUL 85	Mentions Completion of Project Policy Studies
14	18 JAN 85	Discusses: (1) transfer of Ag. Secretariat to Guatemala (2) Phase I policy - diagnostics (3) Phase II policy - analysis of potential policy alternatives identified in Phase I
13	30 MAR 84	Funding
12	16 AUG 83	Put RTCU head in San Jose, even stated no additional funding until accomplished
11	23 MAY 83	Funding
10	13 APR 83	Concerning audit procedures
9	25 MAR 83	Indicated importance of cash contributions as a measure of support for Ag. Secretariat
8	14 OCT 82	Requested location of RTCU in San Jose
7	10 SEP 82	Funding
6	8 SEP 82	Screw worm project
5	15 JUN 82	Receipt of contract materials
4	27 MAY 82	Extended data for submission of contract materials
3	26 FEB 82	Extended data for submission of contract materials
2	15 JAN 82	Receipt of contract materials
1	12 NOV 81	Disbursement of project funds

PADS

"AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT"

No.	Subject
1.	Concurs to pay travel and per diem expenditures to attend first planning meeting of the screw worm study. September 28, 1982.
2.	Agree to set aside 25% of Ag. Secretariat funds for travel & per diem for technician exchange activities. November 29, 1982.
3.	Approves payment of travel & per diem for Ricardo Escobar to provide T.A. to the Dominican Republic. No date.
4.	Approval of $2,541.30 for exchange of El Salvador technician, who will participate in a "piscicultura" training. March 18, 1983.
5.	Proposal submitted in Memorandum AN/CR-210/83 from Ing. Araujo denied in ROCAP Project Review held on April 20/83. May 2, 1983.
6.	Concurrence with expenditures involved in purchase of technical services of Dr. Julio Delgado. May 9, 1983.
7.	Agree to use Project funds for costs associated with technical exchange of Ing. Jorge Anibal Escobedo of Guatemala to assist the Republic of Panama. May 27, 1983.
8.	Inform IICA receipt of first semester, 1983 documentation as well as Annual Report due 1st February and Quarterly Report due March 31st. Reminding them that next Quarterly Report is due June 30, 1983 ROCAP is looking forward to the release of the first evaluation document now under preparation at IICA. June 14, 1983.
9.	Agrees to use Project funds for technical exchange of Dra. Ana Maria Ricard of Dominican Republic to assist in the I.H.I.M.V. in Honduras. (COTER Exchange). June 24, 1983.

10. Agrees out of region travel for Dr. Araujo who will travel to Honduras, Guatemala and Mexico. June 24, 1983.

11. Approves technical exchange between El Salvador and Honduras for two, one week technical assistance to mission to Honduras of Lic. Soto and the Chief of Agricultural Statistics of El Salvador. June 24, 1983.

12. Acknowledge receipt of Quarterly reports period April/June 1983. July 18, 1983.

13. ROCAP approves use of project funds to finance the meeting of the Technical Coordinating Committee to be held in Managua, September 6-9, 1983, not to exceed $7,705.00. Requests for approval of use of project funds to support Technical meetings could be submitted at least three weeks in advance of the event. August 25, 1983.

14. ROCAP agrees to finance 75% of estimated costs of contract to carry out the Regional Food Security Strategy Study. September 9, 1983.

15. ROCAP approves use of Project funds up to US$6,000 dollars to complete the collection of the larvae samples under the Screw Worm Study during the months of October, November and December, 1983. September 26, 1983.

16. ROCAP acknowledges receipt of the Quarterly Report for the period June/August, 1983. October 13, 1983.

17. ROCAP approves the use of approximately $330.00 from the project for Victor Tunarosa's travel to Managua, October 17-18, 1983. October 14, 1983.

18. ROCAP approves use of funds up to US$5,340.00 from the project to partially finance the proposed COTER mission of three (3) Honduran technicians to the Dominican Republic for training in bacteriology. October 17, 1983.

19. ROCAP approves use of project funds up to US$2,500.00 to finance approximately 50% of the proposed COTER mission of four (4) Guatemalan technicians to Panama for in-service training in Aquaculture. November 4, 1983.

20. ROCAP approves use of approximately US$2,000.00 of project funds for travel of M. A. Araujo and V. Tunarosa to prepare for the 4th. Regular Meeting of CORECA. November 16, 1983.

21. ROCAP approves use of approximately US$5,500.00 of project funds for travel and per diem related to the 8th Meeting of the Technical Committee, and the 4th Meeting of CORECA, to be held in Tegucigalpa, Honduras, December 5-8, 1983. November 28, 1983.

22. Acknowledge receipt of the Quarterly Report for the period September/November 1983. January 5, 1984.

23. Approves use of approximately $1,000.00 for the proposed trip of M. A. Araujo. February 9, 1984.

24. Approves use of approximately $750 for travel and per diem expenses of Dr. Miguel A. Mora of CIGRAS to carry out COTER consultancy with MIDA/Panama. March 28, 1984.

25. Acknowledges receipt of Annual Report and Quarterly Report. April 3, 1984.

26. Approves use of funds to contract Dr. Alberto Salinas to prepare informative document on CORECA activities. April 3, 1984.

27. Approves use of approximately $1,355 for travel & per diem of M. A. Araujo to the Dominican Republic, Honduras and El Salvador. April 3, 1984.

28. Approves use of approximately $420 for travel expenses of Victor Tunarosa to Panama and prepare document for the "Ninth CORECA Technical Committee Meeting". April 4, 1984.

29. Approves expenditure of approximately $1,200 from COTER special fund for consultancy of Jose Lenero from San Jose, Costa Rica to MIDA/Panama. April 12, 1984.

30. Approves expenditure of approximately $7,570 for the Ninth Regular CORECA Technical Committee Meeting in Dominican Republic. April 24, 1984.

31. Approves expenditure of approximately $1,200 from COTER Special Fund for consultancy of Marco Tulio Garcia from Guatemala to Costa Rica. April 24, 1984.

107

32. Approves expenditure of approximately $2,600 from COTER Special Fund to assist the Dominican Republic in a planning seminar on "Development and Use of Intensive Milk Production Systems." April 30, 1984.

32-A. ROCAP approves use of approximately US$2,365.00 of project funds for travel and per diem expenses for Dr. Cohen Orantes' participation in evaluation agreement between IICA and the Agricultural Secretariat countries. May 7, 1984.

33. ROCAP agrees with proposed COTER consultancy of Dr. Wladimir Hermosilla and approves expenditure of approximately US$2,300 of ROCAP funds from the COTER "Other Technical Assistance - outside the Region" line item of project funds for per diem and travel expenses related to this mission. June 4, 1984.

34. ROCAP authorizes use of approximately US$575.00 of project funds for the COTER Mission to Costa Rica of Oscar Zamora to assist the Costa Rica National Citrus Program. June 27, 1984.

35. ROCAP agrees the COTER Missions of Mario Solano and Edgar Valverde to Panama from July 1-7 and August 5-11 respectively, and approves expenditure of approximately US$700.00 of project funds for each of these missions. July 5, 1984.

36. ROCAP authorizes use of approximately US$940.00 of project funds for travel and per diem expenses of the CORECA Coordinating Secretary to travel to El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua from July 4-11. July 5, 1984.

37. ROCAP approves use of approximately US$3,880.00 from special fund for costs related to the consultancies of Mayo Vega Luna and Eduardo Cobas from July 15-28, 1984. July 11, 1984.

38. Acknowledge receipt of Quarterly Report which was due May 31, 1984. July 16, 1984.

39. ROCAP approves use of funds from the COTER Special Fund to cover travel and per diem for 5 Hondurans and 2 Guatemalans to attend Management of Africanized Bee, and three Panamanians to Guatemala to attend Early Weaning of Milk Calves and Raising of Replacement Female Chicks. July 18, 1984.

108

40. Approves expenditures of approximately $4,300 for COTER activities - training for 4 Panamanians and 3 Guatemalans in Costa Rica. August 9, 1984.

41. Approves Miguel A. Araujo's travel to the CORECA member countries July 28-August 4, 1984. August 9, 1984.

42. Approves expenditures of TCC Meeting and Miguel Bonilla's trip to Washington, D. C. August 22, 1984.

43. Approves expenditures of approximately $1,500 for COTER activities. September 19, 1984.

44. Acknowledge receipt of Quarterly Report for June/July/August, 1984. October 4, 1984.

45. Approves expenditure of approximately $3,000 from COTER line item. October 11, 1984.

46. Approves expenditure of approximately $3,700 from COTER line item. October 11, 1984.

47. Approves expenditure of approximately $3,500 for technical assistance to the Dominican Republic. November 7, 1984.

48. Approves expenditure of approximately $1,800 from COTER Travel & Per Diem for technical assistance to Honduras. November 7, 1984.

49. Acknowledges receipt of Quarterly Report for period September/November, 1984. January 21, 1985.

50. ROCAP approves expenditure of US$900.00 for travel of M.A. Araujo to work with Lee Fletcher on Policy Studies. February 8, 1985.

51. ROCAP approves expenditure of US$12,000 for contract with Lee Fletcher. February 26, 1985.

52.

53. Approval of expenditure of US$409.60 for technical assistance of Edgar Alvarado. March 11, 1985.

54. Approval of expenditure of additional $460 for COTER mission of Dr. Cornelius Hugo. March 21, 1985.

55. ROCAP approves expenditure of US$1,000 for travel and per diem of Dr. Agustín Millar. March 21, 1985.

56. Approves expenditure of US$960.00 for travel and per diem expenses of the technical assistance of Carlos Bonilla. April 8, 1985.

57. Approves expenditure of US$3,335 for travel for COTER country meetings. May 10, 1985.

58. ROCAP approves expenditure of US$1,300 for travel and per diem expenses of technical assistance mission of Hugo Vargas. May 10, 1985.

59. ROCAP approves expenditure for technical assistance missions. May 31, 1985.

60. Approves expenditure of approximately US$1,650 for travel and per diem to technical assistance mission of Dr. Richard Phillips. June 7, 1985.

June 14, 1985.
0030a

Appendix E

COUNTRY QUOTA PAYMENTS
TO
AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT

Appendix E

COUNTRY QUOTA PAYMENTS
TO
AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT
(U.S. Dollars)

Panama		
May 1984	30,000	
December 1984	30,000	
	60,000	60,000
Honduras		
August 1983	30,000	
January 1985	30,000	
	60,000	60,000
Guatemala		
September 1983	30,000	
July 1985	3,571	
	33,571	33,571
Nicaragua		
August 1985	30,000	30,000
Costa Rica		
March 1985	2,663	
May 1985	8,971	
	11,634	11,634
El Salvador	0	0
Dominican Republic	0	0
		$195,205

a. Panama has made an additional $40,000 of quota payments to the Agricultural Secretariat which covers a time period beyond the ROCAP funding.

b. Honduras has made an additional $20,000 of quota payments to the Agricultural Secretariat which covers a time period beyond the ROCAP funding.

c. Costa Rica has made $17,412 of quota payments to the Agricultural Secretariat after the end of ROCAP funding.

Appendix F

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE OF MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE INTERVIEW

Page 1

Date:_____
Number of Interview:_____

1. Has your country benefited from its participation in CORECA?
   a. yes, how:_____
   b. no, why:_____

2. As a result of the meeting of the Consejo de Ministros has there been any policy change or other actions undertaken in your country?_____
   _____
   _____

3. Have there been any other activities undertaken by CORECA which have resulted in changes in your country?_____
   _____
   _____

4. What have been the benefits to the region from CORECA?_____
   _____
   _____

5. What do you feel should be the role of CORECA?_____
   _____
   a. policy analysis and advice:_____
   b. technical exchange:_____
   c. meeting of Ministers to exchange ideas:_____
   d. data base:_____

6. Administratively, where should CORECA be placed?_____
   _____
   a. Inside IICA:_____
   b. Outside IICA:_____

7. If CORECA were to remain in IICA should it be placed elsewhere in the administrative structure?

   a. where/why:_____
   _____

8. Are there advantages or disadvantages in having CORECA place nearer the Director General in the administrative structure of IICA?

   a. advantages: _____
   b. disadvantages: _____

9. If CORECA were placed closer to the Director General of IICA, should the function of technical assistance (COTER) be placed in one of the technical divisions?

   a. yes, why: _____
   b. no, why: _____

10. What do you feel is the future of CORECA? _____

11. Has participation in CORECA made your job as Minister easier?
    yes: _____
    no : _____

12. Do you consider CORECA aviable mechanism to assist in regional development and integration?

    a. yes: _____
    b. no : _____

13. Is there anything which we have not covered which you feel is important to discuss about CORECA? _____

14. What should CORECA do about the member countries who, for whatever reason, cannot make their contribution to CORECA?

Appendix G

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE CONDUCTED BY THE RECIPROCAL TECHNICAL COOPERATION UNIT

October 4, 1985

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Costa Rica

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1.	31	Apr.24/84	T.A. in vegetables prod. (April/May/84)	Marco T. García	Guatemala	1,200.00	
2.	33	Jun. 4/84	Evaluation of WRR CATIE	Vladimir Hermosilla	(Other T.A.) Chile	2,300.00	
3.	55	Mar.21/85	Irrigation Research (Apr.14-20/85)	Agustín Millar	IICA/ Dom. Republic	1,000.00	
4.	60	June 7/85	Basic Grains Mktg. (June 9-22/85)	Richard Phillips	(Other T.A.) KSU	1,650.00	
5.	61	Jun.27/85	Seminar Workshop on Beans (Jul. 7-13/85)	Luis Elías	INCAP/ Guatemala	670.00	
6.	63	Jul.15/85	Course on Insects Diseases (Aug.9-20/85)	Manuel Revelo	(Other T.A.) IICA/Surinam	1,672.00	
7.	68	Aug. 9/85	Course on Feeding Techniques (Sept. 1-14/85)	Santiago Rús Gustavo Cubillos	Panama	2,361.00	
	70	Aug.30/85	Train Personnel on Cacao Prod. Systems (Sept. 8-21/85)	Humberto Gutiérrez	(Other T.A.) Colombia	1,340.00	
	70	Aug.30/85	To Assist Ag. & Livestock Ministry in elaborating a plan for Assisting Cacao Producers (Sept.8-21/85)	Hernán Salazar Calderón	Colombia	1,340.00	
	70	Aug.30/85	To Train SENARA techns. in Planning, installing and conducting irrigation experiments (Sept.23-28/85)	Agustín Millar	IICA/ Dom. Republic	990.00	

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Panama

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1.	7	May 27/83	T.A. in Animal Health (May 30/83)	Jorge A. Escobedo	Guatemala	?	
2.	24	Mar.26/84	Mgt.of beans storage (Mar.25-31/84)	Miguel A. Mora	Costa Rica	750.00	
3.	29	Apr.12/84	Project Management Systems (May 13-26/84)	José Leñero	Costa Rica	1,200.00	
4.	35	Jul. 5/84	Prod. & Post-Harvest Handling of Onions (Jul.1-7/84)	Solano, Valverde	Costa Rica	700.00	
5.	35	Jul. 5/84	(Aug.5-11/84)				
6.	39	Jul.18/84	Training Early Weaning of Milk Calves (Jul.22-31/84)	3 Panamanian	Guatemala	2,950.00	
7.	40	Aug. 8/84	Training on Milk Production Technologies (Sept.17-21/84)	4 Panamanian 3 Guatemalans	Costa Rica	4,300.00	
8.	45	Oct.11/84	Animal Quarantine (Oct.14-27/84)	Margarito Acevedo	Mexico	3,000.00	$ 3,113.73
9.	45	Oct.11/84	(Nov.11-24/84)				
10.	52	Mar. 1/85	Assistance with evaluation of Post-Harvest Grain Mgt. in Panama (Mar.24-30/85)	Miguel Mora Cornelius Hugo	(Other T.A.) Costa Rica/ KSU	1,520.00	
11.	54	Mar.21/85	Training Needs of the Panam. Mktg. Inst. (Mar.24/85)	Cornelius Hugo	KSU (Other T.A.)	460.00	
12.	56	Apr. 8/85	Salt Prod. (Mar.10-19/85)	Carlos Bonilla	Costa Rica	960.00	
13.	58	May 10/85	Assistance in Milk Improvement (May 1-11/85)	Hugo Vargas	Guatemala	1,300.00	

October 4, 1985

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Panama

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
14.	59	May 31/85	Project Formulation (June 10-21/85)	Marco T. Araniva	Guatemala	1,655.00	
15.	61	Jun.27/85	Analysis of Livestock Research (Jun.23-30/85)	Angel Iturbide	Guatemala	991.00	
16.	61	Jun.27/85	Methodology Livestock Res. (Jun.23-July 6/85)	Héctor Muñoz	IICA/ Guyana	2,102.00	
17.	63	Jul.15/85	Prod. of Sugar by-products (Jul.22-Aug.3/85)	Arnoldo Veras	(Other T.A.) IICA/Brazil	2,712.00	
18.	68	Aug. 9/85	Give Training on Application of Pesticides (Aug. 11-18/85)	José O. Castillo Jorge Moya	Dom. Republic	1,726.00	
19.	69	Aug.20/85	Ag. Livestock Foundation (Aug. 25-30/85)	Luis Marcano	?	445.00	
20.	71	Sept. 4/85	Present a seminar to the IMA personnel on post-harvest Grain Mgt. in Panama (Sept.13-20/85)	Miguel Mora and Cornelius Hugo (KSU)	CIGRAS/ Costa Rica and Kansas	1,626.00	
21.	72	Sept. 6/85	Provide T.A. to IMA on Grain Drying (Sept. 13-20/85)	Luis José Lizarazo	IICA/ Nicaragua	1,045.00	

118

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Dominican Republic

October 4, 1985

PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1. 3	Dec. /82	Production and Plant Breeding in Afr. Palm (May 2/83)	Ricardo Escobar	(Other T.A.) IICA/Brazil	$ 2,370.00	
2. 32	Apr.30/84	Seminar on Milk Prod. Systems (May 20-23/84)	Vargas, Villegas Cubillos	Guatemala/ Costa Rica	2,600.00	
3. 43	Sept.19/84	Remod.of 6 Public Mkts. (Sept.23-Oct.6/84)	Guillermo Moreno	Costa Rica	1,500.00	
4. 47	Nov. 7/84	T.A. in Computers (Jan. 13/85)	Alvaro Sánchez	IICA/ Costa Rica	3,500.00	
5. 63	Jul.15/85	Cacao Marketing (Jul.22-Aug.2/85	Otto Soledade	(Other T.A.) Brazil	2,250.00	
6. 69	Aug.20/85	Design Data Base (Aug. 25-Sept.7/85)	Alvaro Sánchez	Costa Rica	1,267.00	

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Honduras

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1.	4	Mar.18/83	Training in Aquaculture	2 Hondureans 2 Salvadoreans	Panama	2,541.30	
2.	9	Jun.24/83	Veterinary Diagnostic (July 6/83)	Ana María Richard	Dom. Republic	1,553.00	
3.	11	Jun.24/83	Information & Ag. Statistics (June 17/83)	José E. Soto	El Salvador	990.00	
4.	18	Oct.17/83	Training in Bacteriology (Nov. 1/83)	3 Hondurean Technicians	Dom. Republic	5,340.00	
5.	39	Jul.18/84	Training Mgt. Afr. Bee (Jul.22-31/84)	5 Hondureans 2 Guatemalans	Panama	8,500.00	
6.	46	Oct.11/84	Mktg. of Ag. Products (Nov.12-23/84)	Oscar Zamora	CEPAL/ México	1,500.00	
7.	48	Nov. 7/84	Prep. Methodologies for Technical & Financial Cooperation (?)	Daniel del R. Valdez	Dom. Republic	1,800.00	
8.	62	Jul. 5/85	Seminar on rice (Jul.15-27/85)	Manuel Carreras	Costa Rica	1,376.00	
9.	66	Aug. 1/85	Provide Training Tech. of Aquaculture (Aug.15-16/85)	Efraín Rodríguez	Panamá	1,512.00	
10.	66	Aug. 1/85	Analyze Information Network (Aug.19-24/85)	Pedro Oñoro	IICA/ Costa Rica	1,715.00	
11.	66	Aug. 1/85	(Sept.16-20/85)				
12.	67	Aug. 7/85	Seminar on Audiovisual Educ. (Sept. 1-14/85)	Francisco Rubio	Guatemala	1,412.00	

120

October 4, 1985

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Honduras

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
13.	67	Aug. 7/85	Workshop on Scientific Comm. (Sept. 2-14/85)	Rolando Samayoa	Guatemala	1,412.00	
14.	70	Aug.30/85	Train CEDIA personnel in Handling of Agrinter Sys. (Sept. 9-13/85)	María José Galvao	IICA/CEDIA Costa Rica	652.00	
	70	Aug.30/85	Assist CEDIA on Techniques of Lists, practices and Features in Doc. Service (Sept.9-13/85)	Ana María Arias	CATIE/ Costa Rica	652.00	
15.	73	Sep.18/85	Assist Ag. Gen. Directorate of Honduras Nat. Resources on Flowers Project (Sept. 23-28/85)	Manuel Roberto Yurrita	Guatemala	620.00	

121

October 4, 1985

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
El Salvador

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1.	4	Mar.18/83	Training in Aquaculture	2 Hondureans 2 Salvadoreans	Panama	2,541.30	
2.	53	Mar.11/85	Cardamom (Mar.25-29/85)	Edgar Alvarado	Guatemala	409.60	
3.	61	Jun.27/85	Coffee Research (Aug.5-9/85) (Sept. 2-6/85)	Luis Navarro	CATIE/ Costa Rica	1,392.00	
4.	69	Aug.20/85	Course on African Bee (Aug. 25-Sept.1/85)	Román Benegas	Panamá	912.00	

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Guatemala

	PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
1.	19	Nov. 4/84	Training in Aquaculture (Oct.2-15/83)	4 Guatemalan Technicians	Panama	2,500.00	
2.	39	Jul.18/84	Training Mgt. Afr. Bee (Jul.22-31/84)	5 Hondureans 2 Guatemalans	Panama	8,500.00	
3.	40	Aug. 8/84	Training on Milk Production Technologies (Sept.17-21/84)	4 Panamanian 3 Guatemalans	Costa Rica	4,300.00	
4.	46	Oct.11/84	Fruit Prod. (Nov.5-10/84)	Enríquez, Zamarrón	México	2,200.00	
5.	46	Oct.11/84	(Nov. 12-17/84)				
6.	59	May 31/85	Fruit Culture (Jun.16-26/85)	Zeev Markus	Costa Rica	830.00	
7.	59	May 31/85	Intensive Milk Prod. Systems (June 4-15/85)	Luis Villegas	Costa Rica	888.00	
8.	64	Jul.15/85	Eval. Livestock Genetic Improvement (Jul.22-Aug.2/85)	Marcial Java	Honduras	965.00	
9.	69	Aug.20/85	Seminar on Sawmill Techniques (Sept.16-28/85)	Miguel A. Mejía	Honduras	832.00	
	70	Aug.30/85	To advise Guat. Technical Director of Irrigation and Drainage on Methods for Treatment of Basic Info. on Groundwater (Sept. 23-30/85)	Marcelino Losillo	Costa Rica	602.00	
	70	Aug.30/85	To train technicians in Agro-Indus. production and Commercialization projects (Sept. 16-27/85)	Humberto Colmenares	CEPI/IICA Costa Rica	1,015.00	

122

October 4, 1985

Reciprocal Technical Cooperation Activities
Guatemala

PAD NUMBER	PAD DATE	ACTIVITY	NAME	DONOR COUNTRY	ESTIMATED COSTS	ACTUAL COSTS
70	Aug.30/85	To advise INACOOP in the Establishment and Operation of Cooperative Insur. in Guatemala	Luis Avalos	Colombia	1,324.00	